

HISTORY

Paper 0470/01

Paper 1

General comments

Examiners noted that the majority of candidates were well-prepared to meet the demands posed by Paper 1. This resulted in many good answers being seen with candidates demonstrating the skills required to meet the demands of individual questions.

Whilst many candidates now restrict the length of their answers to (a) questions, achieving maximum credit with relatively short answers, too many continue to produce lengthy responses which often deviate from the focus of the question. The assessment objective target for all (a) questions throughout the paper is recall and full marks can be achieved by giving four short, specific responses. The question does not seek from candidates any explanation of the points being made. Sometimes candidates' responses to (b) questions remain descriptive or just identification. Learners should be encouraged to turn their statements into causal explanations so that in the examination they are able to show the Examiner their understanding of that particular aspect of history in the context of the period it happened.

Many sound answers were seen in relation to (c) questions that developed both sides of the argument. It is not necessary for candidates to make a judgement at the start of their answer. Indeed this approach often results in them failing to challenge the hypothesis. They may find it useful to think of a plan which allows for an initial paragraph, or paragraphs, to support the hypothesis and then to put forward reasoned arguments as to why the hypothesis should be challenged. Once a more balanced answer is produced, candidates are in a better position to make a supported judgement or reach a valid conclusion. It is important that candidates move away from writing a summary of what has just been said as an attempt to reach their judgement. However, a number of candidates fail to achieve high level marks as they only write about one side of the argument.

Candidates are expected to answer the question as set and not re-write it. This applied particularly to **Question 5(c)** where the question referred to the idea of 'unfair'. Answers were often written as though the question had used the word 'harsh'. This gave a completely different meaning to the question.

It was noted that an increased number of candidates took advantage of the extra time to plan out their responses, particularly to **part (c)** questions. This approach generally produced a better quality of answer which had a more logical approach to it.

Some Examiners reported an increase in the number of rubric errors committed by candidates. Where this happened it was often because two questions from the Depth Study were answered. This failure to adhere to the instructions for the examination often resulted in an impoverished mark as not enough time was devoted to constructing good responses to the required number of answers.

Inadequate presentation of the written answers from some candidates was also noted. Answer sheets were put together out of order and often not fastened securely.

Comments on specific questions

The following comments are given to aid teachers in their work with learners. They reflect where either the response failed to meet the demands of the question or where misconceptions were identified. These comments relate to the more popular questions and do not imply that those questions identified were poorly answered.

Section A – Core Content

Question 1

Part (a) was generally answered well with many able to describe the events in the first half of 1848. A very small number of candidates confused 1848 with the events of 1789 onwards. Answers to (b) focused on the restrictions within Austria that had curtailed the freedom of the press and the activities within the universities. Answers also explained the lack of employment opportunities. Less well developed was the role of Metternich. In relation to (c) many answers remained in the lower levels. Success was identified but often not explained by referencing to revolution in specific countries. Candidates tended to concentrate on reasons for the revolutions, rather than explaining how successful they were.

Question 2

Part (a) was generally well answered, with detailed knowledge of the Zollverein being demonstrated. Many candidates in response to (b) identified reasons such as the Frankfurt Parliament and the Treaty of Olmutz, but these were often not clearly explained. Some sound answers were seen which developed not only nationalism but also the role of Bismarck, the Prussian economy and unification through force in (c).

Question 3

This question failed to attract many responses and therefore comments from this limited number of candidates would not be helpful.

Question 4

Many candidates quickly showed they were fully aware of the Alliances and were able to name correctly the countries involved. Many better candidates went on to provide detailed background information that was not required by the question. This wasted precious time. The quality of response to (b) was variable. There were many good answers where candidates clearly knew about each of the events and showed how specific aspects resulted in increased tension. This approach gained high marks. On the other hand there were those who failed to demonstrate any knowledge and understanding, being content to write vaguely about European rivalry. In between were those candidates who identified relevant events but failed to develop the 'increased tension' aspect. In (c) it was relatively rare for candidates to offer a clear explanation relating to the invasion of Belgium. Explanation often focused on Anglo-German naval rivalry and the Alliance System. Some totally ignored the word Britain in the question, being content to offer more general reasons as to why there was a war.

Question 5

Answers to **part (a)** were generally well organised with candidates giving precise details relating to reductions in German armed forces. Many candidates scored high marks but often went on to waste time by writing about other terms of the Treaty which affected Germany. Others explained the reduction, something that is not required in an (a) question. Many mentioned the demilitarisation of the Rhineland. Whilst this was a term of the Treaty it did not weaken the armed forces and therefore did not receive credit. There were many good responses to (b) with detailed understanding of the position held by Clemenceau. Some candidates introduced the views of Lloyd George and Wilson. This was not required by the question. A significant number thought, or gave the impression, that Alsace-Lorraine was lost during the First World War. Here was an example of where those who had given thought to their response benefited as Examiners noted that responses set out clearly, with a paragraph approach, scored more highly. **Part (c)** produced many good answers with candidates able to explain the fairness of the Treaty using explanations such as 'diktat', loss of a military defence and attitudes towards reparations. It was pleasing to see many using as an example the treatment of Russia under the Brest–Litovsk Treaty. However, there was a significant minority of candidates who failed to gain higher level marks. In many instances these candidates switched the word 'unfair' for that of 'harsh'. Candidates must realise that they should answer the question as set. After all something can be 'harsh' yet 'fair'. Others offered arguments from their personal perspective rather than presenting arguments based on historical fact.

Question 6

Part (a) was generally well answered with the vast majority being aware of disarmament, sanctions and trade. A small number needlessly wrote about structure. Overall, the answers to **part (b)** were disappointing with many candidates thinking Corfu was Abyssinia. A number were able to tell the 'story' but failed to turn this into explanation. The Conference of Ambassadors and the context of the period were often ignored. Many responses to **part (c)** were also disappointing. The question allowed candidates to access material from any aspect of the work of the League but this often resulted in too many incidents being addressed too thinly. Candidates would have been better served by concentrating on two successes and two failures in more detail. With a question on the League candidates are prone to limit their responses to identification and fail to extend these into explanations.

Question 7

Pleasingly, many candidates described the Cold War very well in (a), referring to a clash of ideologies, an arms race and war by proxy. In (b) information was well known and handled well. There was, however, a tendency to go much further than the question demanded with many answers going up to the Cuban crisis. Many candidates in (c) were good at explaining events in relation to the escalation of the Cold War but their work on the Blockade was often in narrative format without reference to how it contributed towards the increasing tension. Some still confuse the Blockade with the building of the Wall.

Question 8

Many responses to (a) contained appropriate detail, with most putting the Berlin Wall into a relevant context. A small number considered it was built around Germany. Whilst some candidates were content to describe the events in Hungary in 1956 in **part (b)**, most were able to offer more than one reason as to why the rising took place. In (c) candidates were often more comfortable dealing with Solidarity rather than the impact of events in Czechoslovakia.

Section B – Depth Studies

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945

Question 9

In response to (a), the vast majority of candidates were able to demonstrate a sound factual knowledge base in relation to the Weimar Constitution, scoring high marks. In response to (b) there were many good answers dealing with the French/Belgium invasion, the actions of the German government and the disastrous results including hyperinflation. Fewer candidates brought in the Munich Putsch, whilst others caused themselves problems by writing about the Rhineland. The quality of answer to (c) was variable, often being one-sided. The work to bring Germany into the international fold was often unexplained as was the impact of the changing social scene. Consideration of 'to what extent' was often limited to an explanation of what happened when the loans from America were lost.

Question 10

Part (a) was done well by those who did not refer to the school curriculum. Some unfortunately embarked on a survey of educational policies whilst others thought 'school' and 'youth' were interchangeable and failed to get to grips with the question. In (b) there were many references to conscription, re-armament and public works although the answer sometimes was more identification of ways rather than explanation. Candidates' answers were less strong in relation to the Labour Service Corps, Jews or women. Answers to (c) were, on the whole, disappointing. Answers were often long, vivid descriptions of Nazi attitudes to women and child-bearing, often using their imagination to add to their knowledge. Even stronger candidates often failed to consider success even in relation to the birth rate. Some moved their answers into areas of opposition to Nazi rule.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-41

Question 11

Part (a) was generally well answered with many candidates scoring highly. In response to (b) most were aware of the October Manifesto and the return of troops from the war with Japan. In numerous instances candidates were less secure in turning Level 2, description into Level 3, explanation. For example it was a fact that the troops did return but it was rare to see the importance of them remaining loyal to the Tsar. Some excellent answers were produced in response to (c), detailing explanation for the Tsar's abdication. Most were able to explain the actions of the Tsar, the impact of defeats and the influence of Rasputin. Others linked the war failures to the discontent at home which was multiplied by the war effort.

Question 12

This question was less popular than the alternative. Most found enough to score well in (a), relating to portrayal of image and being seen as a God. In (b) many were aware of the Purges and their impact but were less secure in explaining why Stalin carried them out other than to remove opponents. Most of the answers to (c) centred round Stalin's Five Year Plans and the impact these had, both economic and humanitarian. Whilst some mentioned agriculture, little else was seen with rarely any reference being made to advances in medicine and education.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-41

Question 13

Most candidates were aware of Prohibition and what it prevented in (a), although a small minority restricted their answers to 'alcohol was banned'. Some interpreted the question as 'prohibition era' and therefore wrote about speakeasies and bootleggers which more correctly fitted into (b). Where this happens, candidates need to repeat information already used in the relevant answer. It is not acceptable to ask the Examiner to refer to a previous answer. The sleazy side of Prohibition is clearly attractive to candidates, (b), where many well explained answers about corruption and gangsters were seen. In (c) most were aware of the new found freedom, particularly for women but failed to explain this in the context of the USA in the 1920s, being content to describe what happened. Responses to 'hatred' were often solely about prejudice towards black people. Few mentioned the Monkey Trial and though the Red Scare and Sacco and Vanzetti were touched on, few had much to say about them.

Question 14

Most candidates in (a) were aware of at least two economic effects, often businesses going bust and people unable to support home and family. Some wasted time writing about the social effects. In response to (b) most developed answers relating to speculation and credit buying but there were few answers that mentioned that the economy was slowing down or the impact of the government's tariff policy. Responses to (c) were disappointing. The idea of Hoover's policies being heartless and uncaring did not come over as strongly as it should, whilst Roosevelt's ideas were treated superficially.

Questions 15-19 had very few responses and thus it is not possible to offer any comments.

Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994

Question 20

Many candidates were unable to show the detail of knowledge expected to gain marks in (a). For (b) the two points that came up time and time again were (i) the PLO lost faith in Arab states to bring about effective change and (ii) they started to take a long-term view that discussion and diplomacy might be more successful than aggression. There was an opportunity in this question to use examples to explain why change took place. Candidates in responding to (c) made the points that they got rid of the PLO, they set up a pro-Israeli government and they reduced the influence of Syria. Candidates often failed to develop these points into explanation.

Question 21

Candidates were well versed in describing conditions in a refugee camp, often gaining high marks. Answers to (b) relied heavily on arguing that the only reason was the attitude of Israel. Often little else was offered in terms of explanation. The responses to (c) were pleasing. Candidates often developed both sides of the argument using a wide range of issues and many scored heavily.

Questions 22-25 had very few responses and thus it is not possible to offer any comments.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/02

Paper 2

General comments

The overwhelming majority of candidates were entered for Option B although a few candidates appeared to answer Option A questions simply because they were the first ones they encountered on the paper even although they had not studied the nineteenth century. Candidates who have studied the twentieth century option should be reminded that their sources and questions appear later in the paper. The overall standard was similar to that of previous years although there were slightly more candidates who did not appear to be familiar with the demands of this paper. A minority of candidates ignored the sources and wrote pages based on their knowledge of the topic. However the majority of candidates were able to demonstrate a wide range of source skills and good sound contextual knowledge.

Some candidates failed to understand the role of their contextual knowledge in this paper. Such knowledge is crucial for high marks but it needs to be used relevantly. It should only be used to say something about the sources. Knowledge can be used to interpret sources, indeed, many sources, particularly cartoons, can only be successfully interpreted using knowledge of the historical context. It is particularly important in inferring the message and purpose of a source. Knowledge can also be used to evaluate sources either by using it to check the claims made in a source or to make an informed use of the provenance of the source and ask about the role, interests and purpose of the author or artist.

Some candidates need more help with tackling comparison questions. They must not simply paraphrase each source in turn. When they are asked to compare sources they need to do this point by point i.e. they need to explicitly compare what the sources say about one point, and then do the same about another point. However, it is also important to go beyond comparing points of detail and to ask about the 'big message' of each source and to compare these.

It is still common to find candidates failing to infer from sources. Instead, they make surface readings of sources. It is important to consider the tone and language of sources in conjunction with knowledge of the context to tease out the message of sources - this is especially important when using cartoons. Sometimes the message of a source can be the opposite to what it appears to be on the surface.

Some candidates are still struggling with evaluating the sources. When a question clearly asks for this e.g. 'Do you trust this source?', answers are reasonably successful, but when the need to evaluate is a little less clear e.g. 'Do these sources prove that...?', candidates tend to uncritically accept what the sources say.

Finally, it is important to note that some candidates lose a lot of marks because they have not understood the requirements of **Question 6**. Please refer to the comments below about this question.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: 19th Century topic

Question 1

This question was not answered as well as it should have been. Many of candidates were able to form an impression of each person but failed to use details in the sources to support these impressions. Only a few candidates compared the impressions. Most wrote about the two figures separately. There were also a number of candidates who completely ignored the sources and wrote about Cavour and Garibaldi from their own knowledge. Some of these answers were detailed but were not answering the question.

Question 2

This question was answered well. Most candidates were at least able to focus on the provenance of the source and use it to raise doubts about the description of Garibaldi. A small number concentrated on the language and tone of the source and used examples to explain that the author was not being objective. An encouraging number went further and used their knowledge of the topic to make an informed use of the provenance e.g. they explained who the 'Thousand' were and why they would be biased in Garibaldi's favour. Other candidates used their knowledge of Garibaldi and his exploits or cross-referenced to other sources on the paper to check the claims being made in Source C.

Question 3

Some candidates struggled with using three sources together and ended up making rather a mess of their answers. A number got bogged down in trying to compare details and failed to focus on the 'big message' of each source about the importance of Garibaldi or Cavour. However, a good number of candidates were able to explain the differences between Sources D and F - one praises Garibaldi, while the other praises Cavour. Source E posed more challenges because it is more balanced, and qualified, in its treatment of both individuals. E could have been used to both support and question both Sources D and F but many candidates struggled with it. Perhaps candidates need more practice in using sources that are not clear cut in their judgements and are qualified or even ambiguous.

Question 4

Some candidates struggled with interpreting the cartoons. There were some surface and naive readings of the cartoons and even difficulties with identifying the correct individuals. The key to interpreting cartoons is to view them in context. Bringing knowledge and understanding of the events leading to Italian unification to these two cartoons helps make sense of them. Source G shows Garibaldi to have the upper hand because of his conquests, while Source H shows Garibaldi agreeing to hand over his conquests to Victor Emmanuel II (reference was made to these events in the Background Information at the beginning of the paper). Some of those candidates who were able to interpret the cartoons successfully then forgot to compare them.

Question 5

This question produced many good answers. Weaker candidates simply concentrated on Garibaldi's suggestion in Source J that he would not obey Victor Emmanuel II, but many candidates made good use of Source I and explained in detail the feared consequences of Garibaldi taking his actions further.

Question 6

Many candidates scored high marks in this question but there is still a minority of candidates who do badly. It is worrying that many of the candidates who fail to understand what is required come from a small group of Centres. This question carries a lot of marks and can have a dramatic impact on a candidate's final mark. For this reason it is worth ensuring that candidates understand exactly what is required. Firstly, candidates base their answers on the sources. The question is not asking whether candidates agree with the hypothesis but whether the sources provide evidence to support it. Secondly, candidates must test the hypothesis they are given. Some appear to test a slightly different one, for example 'was Garibaldi an important figure in unification'. Thirdly, candidates should not assert that a source does or does not support the hypothesis. They must explain how it does this. Finally, they should be aware that there are always sources that support the hypothesis and others that disagree with it. Many candidates simply explained how the sources supported the hypothesis and did not attempt to show how other sources disagreed with it. Candidates should also be reminded that extra marks are awarded for evaluating the sources.

Option B: 20th Century topic**Question 1**

This question was generally answered well although a few candidates still have little idea of how to compare two sources. These candidates simply summarise each source and then add an assertion that they are different or similar. Candidates should identify an issue and then explain whether the sources agree or disagree over this issue. They should then proceed to another issue and do the same with this. Most candidates were able to do this with points of detail e.g. both sources mention the Soviet absence. However, the factor that distinguishes middle ranking answers from the best is whether answers have concentrated on points of detail or on overall agreements or disagreements. These sources agree and disagree on several

points of detail but disagree over two major points - who was to blame and who was in control of the war effort. Source A clearly places the blame on North Korea but Source B talks about continuing hostilities spilling over into war thus blaming no one. Source A gives the impression that the UN was in control while Source B indicates that the US was in charge. Some candidates did not read the sources carefully enough and claimed e.g. that both sources say the US was in control. Sources need to be read carefully and candidates need to be ready to draw inferences from them rather than focusing on surface statements of detail. While Source A does mention that the majority of troops came from the US the overall message of the source is that the UN was in charge.

Question 2

A significant number of candidates did badly on this question because instead of explaining why Sources C and D disagree they explained how they disagree. Candidates must read questions carefully although it was clear that some of these candidates were trying to explore why the sources disagree but had little idea of how to do it. A minority of candidates, however, (and these came from limited number of Centres) did tackle the question asked. Some of these got no further than assertions based on the provenance of the sources e.g. they disagree because one is Chinese and one is South Korean, but better candidates went on to explain why these two would disagree with each other. Some candidates placed their explanation in the broad context of the Cold War while others concentrated on the Korean War -both approaches were acceptable. What mattered was that candidates related the context to the sources. Some candidates wrote about the context in great detail but failed to use this context to explain why the two sources disagree. The best candidates considered, in context, the purpose of each source and used the different purposes as the explanation for why the sources disagree. This approach meant that provenance of the sources, interpretation of the sources and the context were used together to produce excellent answers.

Question 3

Some candidates dealt with Lie and Truman together throughout their answers when to reach high levels in the mark scheme they needed to separate them. The content of Sources E and F should have encouraged candidates to consider them separately. Each Source, E and F, needed to be compared with what Connally says in Source G. A surface reading of the sources suggests that all three agreed that something needed to be done, or that Lie and Connally mention the UN while Truman does not, but a more careful reading can lead to more sophisticated answers. For example, while both Lie and Connally agree that the UN needed to do something, Connally clearly has little faith in the organisation. This suggests that he may have agreed with Truman in Source F who thinks that it is a job for US. The best candidates went on to use their contextual knowledge to develop their answers.

Question 4

Most candidates were able to score some marks by explaining that Source I suggests that the US did not support the UN. Better candidates differentiated between MacArthur and the US and explained how Source I does not necessarily suggest that the latter was not supporting the UN. Candidates struggled more with Source H. Many surface interpretations that claimed that the US was controlling the UN, or alternatively that it was helping the UN. Only the best candidates considered the cartoon carefully and realised that MacArthur is stopping South Korea from attacking China. In other words, he was supporting UN policy towards China. These candidates were then able to use their knowledge of MacArthur to question the cartoon and the extent to which it 'proves' that the UN was supporting the UN.

Question 5

It was encouraging to see the overwhelming majority of candidates answering the question and telling the Examiner whether they were surprised or not. In the past some candidates have failed to do this with 'are you surprised?' questions. The weaker candidates only used Source J and claimed that they were not surprised by what MacArthur was saying because he would be grateful for getting the job. Slightly better answers explained that they were or were not surprised that the US President was appointing the UN Commander. Many candidates scored a reasonable mark by comparing J and K and explaining that the loyalty MacArthur promises in J is not present in K. Better candidates used their knowledge of MacArthur and his actions in Korea to support whether they were surprised or not. The very best candidates explained how it is possible to be both surprised and not surprised by J. It is worth mentioning to future candidates that with this type of question it is important to consider the whether there are sound grounds for both answers - being surprised and not being surprised.

Question 6

Many candidates scored high marks in this question but there is still a minority of candidates who do badly. It is worrying that many of the candidates who fail to understand what is required come from a small group of Centres. This question carries a lot of marks and can have a dramatic impact on a candidate's final mark. For this reason it is worth ensuring that candidates understand exactly what is required. Firstly, candidates base their answers on the sources. The question is not asking whether candidates agree with the hypothesis but whether the sources provide evidence to support it. Secondly, candidates must test the hypothesis they are given. Some appear to test a slightly different one, for example 'the US was in control of the UN'. Thirdly, candidates should not assert that a source does or does not support the hypothesis. They must explain how it does this. Finally, they should be aware that there are always sources that support the hypothesis and others that disagree with it. Many candidates simply explained how the sources supported the hypothesis and did not attempt to show how other sources disagreed with it. Candidates should also be reminded that extra marks are awarded for evaluating the sources.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03

Coursework

General comments

A very small proportion of Centres entering candidates for the November sitting of IGCSE History use the coursework option. This is surprising because the general quality of work submitted is very high. Most Centres use the CIE approved assignments and this has ensured that candidates are given tasks that target the relevant skills and understandings. Centres can amend these assignments if they wish and can submit the amendments to CIE for approval. A few Centres have devised their own assignments and all of these work well.

All Centres used appropriate levels of response mark schemes. The candidates' work was marked carefully and few changes to marks had to be made. Where adjustments were necessary they were in all cases minor. The Moderator found the comments on, and the detailed annotations to, candidates' work useful in understanding why certain levels and marks had been awarded. Providing such comments helps the Moderator confirm a Centre's marks. The marking of Assignment 1 questions about short and long term factors is sometimes generous. For high marks candidates must demonstrate an understanding of the nature and function of both short term and long term factors. Simply describing them does not merit high marks.

Overall, Assignment 1 testing knowledge and understanding is done slightly less well than Assignment 2 which tests source skills. Sometimes the work for Assignment 1 drifts into description and narrative rather than explanation and analysis. It can help candidates to give them similar tasks on different content earlier in the course to enable them to practice producing high quality analysis. Discussion of such work with candidates will help them to understand what is required. The work submitted for Assignment 2 was of a high quality and the marks awarded were well merited.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/04

Alternative to Coursework

General comments

In this session of examinations, Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945, was overwhelmingly the most popular choice for candidates. Also, there were substantial numbers attempting the questions set for Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941, and Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941. Other Depth Studies were attempted but the numbers choosing them were very small compared to those opting for Depth Studies A, B and C.

On the whole, Examiners reported that the scripts were well set out and organised so that all that the candidates wished to convey was accessible to the Examiners. However, contrary to previous trends, there was an increase in the number of rubric offences and an increase in the numbers using very pale inks, which made Examiners' work more taxing. It is crucial that candidates know before they enter the examination room what is expected of them by way of the number of Depth Studies to be attempted, the manner in which they are to be attempted, and that they have the appropriate inks in their pens, as instructed on the front of the examination paper.

There were a number of trends seen in this session of examinations which deserve general comment. Comments on specific questions will appear later. On the praiseworthy side, there was an increase in the number of candidates that recognised and commented upon the balance of evidence in all Source B questions (**Questions (a) (ii)**). These candidates achieved creditable marks for their even-handed answers. However, although many candidates were able to draw valid inferences from Source A (**Questions (a) (i)**), many went on to write long, often accurate tracts, which contained contextual knowledge only. Contextual knowledge is a valuable tool to assist answers in **Part (a)** but it must not be used without reference to the source and the evidence therein. More candidates are aware the tests for reliability are required for answers to **Questions (a) (iii)**, but many are offering stock evaluations e.g. 'This book is much later than the event and so the writer will have had time to research the subject'. This last statement may well be true but candidates must find something specific to the actual source to test for reliability. The assertions must be explained in terms of provenance, time, tone, language, motive, purpose, valid contextual knowledge or supporting cross reference etc.

Nevertheless, many candidates scored well on **Part (a)** questions. The very best scripts were on a par with any that had been seen in previous seasons of examination, but there was a substantial number whose performance on **Part (b)** questions was poor, either by way of misunderstanding the thrust of the questions or by simple lack of knowledge. Hence, Examiners reported that **Part (b)** answers ranged from the sublime to the very disappointing.

Comments on specific questions.

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945.

In their answers to **Question (a) (i)**, most candidates were able to draw valid inferences about the superiority of the Aryan race, its contempt for the Jewish, inferior and democratic races, and the need to instil these ideas into the whole German people. There were many good answers which linked their inferences to the information in the source. However, weaker candidates were seduced by the sight of the word 'Jews' to write long and detailed answers which concentrated on the treatment of the Jews from 1933 to 1945. While these answers attracted some credit, they were not dealing with the focus of the question about evidence in the source. These long answers wasted much valuable time. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)** showed better balance than in previous seasons of examination, with a considerable number able to show that the Nazi Labour Corps leader approved of Hitler's policies towards the homeless, unemployed Germans but he was opposed to the ill treatment of the Jews. There was evidence that some candidates did not understand the word 'approved' as they began their answers saying that Germans 'approved of Hitler's policies' and gave as the first example the Nazi Corps leader's comments about the treatment of the Jews. Other candidates

thought that the source was trying to say that the Jews treated the Germans badly. Candidates were more aware of the need to test for reliability in answers to **Question (a) (iii)** but many answered with stock evaluations of 'He was American so was not there and would not know', or 'He was a Nazi so would know everything'. Better candidates chose to comment on the sarcastic tone of the American or commented on American views about totalitarian states and recent First World War history between the two states. Also comments on the Nazi Labour Leader were tested by observations that in 1938 he would be putting himself in some danger by giving such even-handed comments, that he had nothing to gain by being honest and that as a Nazi insider, he would be privileged to special knowledge.

Answers to **Part (b)** questions ranged from the excellent to the inadequate. Most candidates were able to nominate at least one group, other than Jews, that had been persecuted by the Nazis. However, as the questions proceeded the lack of knowledge of weaker candidates became obvious. There were some outstanding, complete and well supported answers to **Questions (b) (ii), (iii) and (iv)**. All of these were rewarded with very high marks. However, many guessed at the events of Kristallnacht or confused them with the events of the Night of the Long Knives. Scores here were poor. Equally, it was disappointing to find that a majority of candidates did not know what the 'Final Solution' was. Some knew about it and wrote comprehensive reasons for its adoption, even to the point of discussing whether Hitler gave orders for it and whether the German population was aware of it. Some students made vague references to the Jews, while others merely guessed at its meaning, usually stating that it was an agreement that allowed the Nazis or Germany to prosper or be successful in conquest. The 'Final Solution' is arguably one of the most barbarous policies/events of the twentieth century and it was strange that so few candidates, who had chosen this German Depth Study, had no idea of what it meant. In **Question (b) (iv)** the phrase 'coming of war' proved difficult for some. Better candidates chose to answer this question by comparing the way of life in Germany before and during the war. Others chose to show that there was little change in the early days of the war, even some improvements to life were listed, but that as the war progressed, and definitely after the battle of Stalingrad, life in Germany became dangerous, frightening and a permanent nightmare. Both of these treatments were legitimate, but many candidates guessed at the thrust of the question and answered with essays on life during hyperinflation of 1923, life under the Nazis in the 1930s and some went on to describe life in the occupied zones after the Second World War.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

In answers to **Question (a) (i)**, most candidates were able to draw valid inferences from Source A about the traumatic impact of the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917 and they supported their inferences with references to the source detail. Some, however, took the reference to the Kaiser to be a criticism of the actions of the Tsar. These were simple cases of mistaken identity. Most candidates handled the information contained in Source B very well. They chose to answer **Question (a) (ii)**, which asked about the source's evidence of Lenin's natural leadership skills, by comparing his strange appearance with the respect in which he was held. The general thesis was that he did not look like a natural leader but was revered for his intellectual qualities. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)**, often demonstrated successful tests for reliability. It was pointed out that the British minister in Source A would definitely show bias against the Bolsheviks as Britain at the time was sending support to the Whites during the Russian Civil War. The American in Source B was deemed to be fair as he was in part praising Lenin despite American suspicions about Bolshevik doctrines, disappointment at the imminent negotiations to bring Russia out of the First World War, or being fair as the piece was written so early in the Bolshevik government that he would not know what a monster Lenin was to become.

Although many candidates gave accurate details about the July Days, 1917, many did not recognise this label and described other events of that same year. A similar situation was found in answers to **Question (b) (ii)**, where some were able to deliver full, copious and accurate detail of the Kornilov Affair, while others confused Kornilov with Kerensky, and some wrote about either of the two revolutions of 1917. Many candidates misunderstood the thrust of **Question (b) (iii)** which asked for the reasons for a second revolution in Russia in 1917. While the majority correctly identified that this question was asking about the Bolshevik Revolution, many calculated that it was the March Revolution, 1917, which was the 'second Russian Revolution' with the 1905 Revolution being the first Russian Revolution. The question was asking why the second revolution of 1917 had happened, despite a successful first revolution of 1917 which had overthrown the Tsar. Candidates who responded to the thrust of this question often scored very high marks, but those who misunderstood scored poorly. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** again fell into two categories. Some gave excellent balance sheets of full detail of the policies and events during Lenin's leadership to arrive at reasoned conclusions about his overall impact on the Russian people. Other candidates gave far less detail or even wrote very general answers stating that he did his best and was loved by his people. In these last answers, very little concrete detail was offered.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941.

Most candidates saw the evidence in Source A showed that the people of California were apprehensive of the numbers of newcomers, both in terms of the threat to their own jobs but also in the ever growing costs of unemployment relief that fell on the citizens of California. However, there was a minority of candidates who saw the evidence leading in a different direction. These candidates felt that the people of California were demonstrating a 'positive attitude' to unemployment relief and were happy that the increasing amount being collected showed that the unemployed were getting more money, rather than the evidence showing that there were increasing numbers who were unemployed. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)** fell into two categories. Firstly, there were many answers that recognised that Source B had a balance in its evidence to show that the New Deal had both successes and failures. The second group chose only to recognise that the New Deal was failing, giving as evidence that there were 'nine million unemployed' and the 'Works Progress Administration created jobs for only about a third of the unemployed'. These candidates did not choose to recognise that the creation of jobs for a 'third of the unemployed' was something of a success in itself. As ever, some candidates wrote long and detailed descriptions of all elements of the New Deal. This not only wasted valuable time but indicated that these candidates did not fully understand how to answer source based questions. In answer to **Question (a) (iii)**, the tests for reliability were often of the stock variety e.g. 'Source A is from an American newspaper of the time so it would know the situation' or 'Source B is from a British school textbook of 1987 so it would be an unbiased foreign judgement and the author would have had plenty of time to research'. Some candidates did comment on the journalistic licence shown in Source A with reference to 'hordes of newcomers' and 'the County is to demand...'. These also made reference to the careful balance of evidence in Source B, the lack of blame and the clear delivery of evidence for the reader to make up his own mind.

Candidates were able to give many and varied reasons for the establishment of the Tennessee Valley Authority and most scored well on **Question (b) (i)**. More candidates decided to choose Huey Long rather than Father Coughlin in their answers to **Question (b) (ii)**. Most had the general idea that both of these men were critical of the New Deal, but some candidates gave full and detailed answers about the career of Huey Long. These answers were impressive and scored well. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** were mixed. A substantial number either failed to notice that the question was about Roosevelt's success in the 1936 election, or they did not have any information about the 1936 election and chose to write about the 1932 election. However, many of the candidates who correctly identified the thrust of this question and gave reasons for the 1936 victory scored well. **Question (b) (iv)** invited some long and detailed answers to decide on the extent of the New Deal's success. Many candidates scored very well on this question but there were still a noticeable minority who saw the New Deal as a complete success or a complete failure, and even those who wrote in general terms that 'Roosevelt did his best for the American people who loved him'. Candidates must appreciate that all **Questions (b) (iv)** have the highest mark tariff in the question paper and therefore the demands of the question will be beyond weak generalisations. Both sides of the argument must be dealt with and supported by relevant detail, before candidates come to a logical and reasoned conclusion.

Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990.

Very few candidates attempted this Depth Study in this session, making general observations impossible.

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century.

A few Centres had prepared and attempted this Depth Study. For the most part, candidates were able to draw valid inferences from Source A about Steve Biko and they were also able to show where they had found evidence in the source. Equally, most candidates were able to show some kind of balance in Source B about how the source showed that Nelson Mandela supported the Black Consciousness movement. However, some candidates decided to write all they knew about Mandela, wasting much time and drifting from the thrust of the question. In answers to **Question (a) (iii)**, the candidates repeated the source content described in the previous two questions. There were no tests for reliability attempted for this question.

Answers to all **Part (b)** questions were disappointing. Very few could name a Bantustan in answer to **Question (b) (i)**. Although some candidates could nominate the problems surrounding education in Soweto, very few offered information and detail that was specific to each of the questions in **Part (b)**. Answers were very general and applied to Southern African history across the decades rather than information about the 1970s and 1980s as required by the questions. It was not uncommon to find candidates writing almost exclusively about the build up to and the events of Sharpeville, 1960.

Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994

This Depth Study was attempted by few Centres but the quality of the answers was, in many cases, exceptional. Candidates were able to draw valid inferences from Source A about the Egyptian attitudes towards Israel and these answers were often full and detailed. Also candidates were able to find a balance of evidence in Source B to show that in some ways the Palestinians were succeeding in their struggle against the Israelis but were not achieving major victories. The quality of answers to **Question (a) (iii)** was very pleasing with many observations regarding tests for reliability. Nasser's forceful language was seen as the type used in speeches when showing contempt for an enemy, and also candidates contrasted the language used by Nasser with the even-handed language used by the historian in the rest of the source. Candidates saw the tone of Source B to be that of a romantic nationalist, full of pride to be resisting the Israelis but not able to assess the true impact of the Palestinian resistance.

Question (b) (i) and **(b) (ii)** posed few problems for the candidates. They knew the areas occupied by the Israelis during the Six Day War, and they knew the importance and detail of the role of the Israeli air force in this conflict. Some candidates were able to give developed reasons for other countries supporting President Nasser in this war but there was noticeably less confidence shown by candidates in their answers to this question. Again, although there were good and balanced answers to **Question (b) (iv)**, which asked for a comparison of Israel's success in both the Six Day War and the Yom Kippur War, it is fair to say that most candidates did not have sufficient knowledge of, or command of, detailed evidence to sustain the comparison required. Nevertheless, scores achieved by candidates attempting this Depth Study were good.

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society.

Very few candidates attempted this Depth Study in this session, making general observations impossible.

Depth Study H: The Impact of Western imperialism in the Nineteenth Century.

A number of candidates attempted this Depth Study when the rest of the Centres appeared to have been prepared for other Depth Studies. Nevertheless, some of the scripts scored well. Candidates saw that the missionary postcard in Source A was an attempt to show the civilising outcomes of missionary zeal. Source B was used to show that the West's motives for imperialism were selfish, although a few candidates did acknowledge that the Frenchman hinted that he would wish to share information with 'ignorant savages'. There were few successful attempts at testing for the reliability of the sources in answer to **Question (a) (iii)**. This was disappointing because the propaganda qualities of the postcard and the tone and language of the Frenchman were obvious aspects deserving comments about bias. Most candidates preferred to comment upon the content of the source.

In answers to **Question (b) (i)** most were able to name Rhodes as a British politician who pursued imperialist policies. Most of the rest of the names offered were unacceptable. The aims of the missionaries were well known and the majority of candidates scored well in their answers to **Question (b) (ii)**. **Question (b) (iii)** on the reasons for Britain having a large empire by the end of the nineteenth century attracted general answers about big navies and armies, basic economics regarding raw materials and captive markets but there was very little by way of specific examples or other reasons for such a large empire at the time. Equally, there were general assertions about Europeans bringing civilisation to other parts of the world in the nineteenth century (**Question (b) (iv)**) and most of these answers concentrated on Africa alone.