

HISTORY

Paper 0470/01

Paper 1

General comments

A significant majority of candidates demonstrated a sound factual knowledge of the content of the syllabus they had studied and used this to good effect in answering part (a) of a question. This knowledge was also used appropriately in 'setting the scene' for the context of the (b) and (c) parts. However, candidates must realise that the second and third parts of a question demand more than just recall. Many have realised this and produced detailed, well-developed explanations and arguments that achieved high marks. Within (b) and (c) parts of the question 60% of the marks are allocated to explanation and analysis and many candidates fail to achieve these marks as their answers remain in descriptive mode.

Whilst it is important that candidates recognise key words in a question it is also important they put these within the question context so that the thrust and direction of the question is recognised. Time spent thinking about the question, and planning a response, can prove to be beneficial in the overall quality of an answer. An example of this eagerness to answer a question was often seen in relation to 5(b) where candidates explained the weaknesses of the League in general rather than as the question requested, in relation to Manchuria.

Whilst the vast majority of candidates now realise there are two sides to every (c) part of a question, a significant minority still only write about one. This is usually the one given in the question. It is important that candidates realise they cannot address 'how far', 'most important' and 'main reason' if they do not offer a wide range of explained reasons for something taking place. The question will give one view, which also needs explaining, whilst candidates are expected to explain other reasons.

There were relatively few rubric errors. Where this occurred the candidate often answered both of the Depth Study questions. Candidates generally used the time allocation well although some still did not finish the paper. This usually related to over long answers in part (a).

Centres should note that from 2007, the time for this paper will increase to 2 hours and this should give greater opportunity for candidates to give increased time to some of the points made above. It is not expected that the length of answer will increase significantly.

Comments on specific questions

Section A – Core Content

Questions 1–4 failed to attract many responses and therefore comments from this limited number of candidates would not be helpful.

Question 5

This was by far the most popular question. The majority of candidates had no trouble securing high marks for (a) with sound knowledge of events relating to the Aaland Islands, Upper Silesia and Greece/Bulgaria being well handled. A good number ignored 'peacekeeping in the 1920s' in part (b) and wrote at length about Corfu, the 1930s and humanitarian successes. Facts relating to the invasion of Manchuria and general weaknesses of the League were well known, but many candidates did not get beyond Level 2/4 marks because they failed to make explicit how the facts demonstrated the League's weaknesses. Whilst it was encouraging to see greater use of the source than normal, some candidates spent some time on describing the source but again failed to make the necessary links. Some candidates incorrectly thought that sanctions had been imposed on Japan by the League whilst others stated the 'League did nothing' forgetting the Lytton Report that was in the source. Answers to part (c) often disappointed. The Depression, whilst well known, was often not linked to the failure of the League and where it was, revolved around the

perceived role of the League 'to sort it out'. Here a number of candidates thought that League was responsible rather than the outcomes in terms of say the growth of extreme parties. Abyssinia was better, although even here numerous candidates concentrated on the 'story' rather than the impact of the failure of the League. A number of candidates introduced other reasons for the League's failure. In this question this was not required.

Question 6

The quality of responses varied considerably in relation to part (a). As Munich is a significant aspect of this period it was anticipated that candidates would be fully aware of what was agreed. Those who had been well-prepared had little difficulty scoring high marks dealing with those who were present, the giving to Hitler of the Sudetenland and also territory to Hungary and Poland together with the guaranteeing of Czechoslovakia's new frontiers. Some related the Conference to the signing of the Nazi-Soviet Pact whilst others were convinced, incorrectly, that the Sudetenland was taken from Germany at Versailles. Part (b) allowed many candidates to show their understanding of the period although some explanations lacked clarity, particularly in relation to the significance of Poland. Some good answers were seen in response to part (c), with many candidates going into far greater depth than was required in relation to the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. The key was the fact that the Treaty was harsh causing many Germans to want revenge. The counter arguments were often well developed around appeasement and the failure of the League. The better candidates developed Hitler's aggression and the Nazi-Soviet Pact. In a number of instances responses to the 'other side' left examiners frustrated as they were little more than the identification of a number of issues. In relation to Hitler's foreign policy many candidates still remain unclear between his actions in destroying the Treaty and his actions in relation to lebensraum.

Question 7

Whilst not producing as many answers as the previous two questions, one examiner commented that 'Question 7 was the most enjoyable to mark and a question enjoyed by most candidates'. On the whole the question was well handled. In (a) candidates were able to note the change in relations and how relations deteriorated although some did waste time going on to the arrival of the missiles. There were many good answers to (b) which demonstrated a sound understanding that was well explained. Part (c) allowed the candidates to use their knowledge perceptively. There were many good responses, with the less able telling the story and trying to bring in their interpretation of success. If a criticism was to be made of some responses it would be the total absence of reference to the Cold War.

Question 8

There were few responses to this question compared to the other twentieth century ones. Few demonstrated full awareness of the events in Korea before the invasion of the South in 1950 (part (a)), being limited to the division between North and South. Time was wasted by many who used information more appropriate to (b) in answer to (a). The quality of response to (b) was variable with many treating the question as 'Why did the USA become involved?' It is important that candidates are able to consider the role of the UN, the relationship of the USA with the UN as well as the absence of the USSR from the Security Council. Answers to part (c) were disappointing and often limited to the fact that in Korea the UN was not successful as it failed to bring democracy to all. The knowledge displayed about the Congo was very limited.

Section B – The Depth Studies

Germany, 1918–1945

Question 9

The vast majority of responses to (a) demonstrated a sound knowledge of the events of the Putsch but were less convincing on the reasons why it happened. Most concentrated on 'over throwing the government' with many relying on the written extract. It is important that if an extract is used, it is not just copied out. Candidates, on the other hand, provided some good answers to (b) including Hitler's re-think and that the Putsch had demonstrated that the Weimar Republic was stronger than Hitler had anticipated. Answers to (c) often demonstrated an insufficient command of the politics of early 1930s Germany to do justice to this question, with 'because they thought they could control him' being a common comment.

Question 10

Candidates had a lot to say about the background to the Night of the Long Knives but often commented little on the night, or weekend as many pointed out, itself. Reports have often commented on the reluctance of candidates to explain the points they are making in response to a (b) or (c) part. Here the vast majority treated that question as a (b) one with detailed explanation, when what was required was a simple description of events over the weekend. Part (b) was often well answered with many fully conversant with the work of Goebbels and his importance to Hitler. Where some fell down was on an over-reliance on telling the story of Goebbels, for a Level 2 mark, and not turning this information into explanation to gain marks within Level 3. An example of this related to for example the removal of the freedom of the press, a Level 2 response, which needed further comment to show how Hitler benefited. There were many good responses to (c) which explained how Hitler had achieved support by positive measures. Some went further to explain how his one party state and the use of violence ostensibly maintained that support. On the other side the better candidates were able to explain the different types of opposition which existed. Occasionally a response concentrated on just stating the achievements of the Nazis and thus failed to answer the question.

Russia, 1905–41**Question 11**

Most candidates were aware of the problems facing the Provisional Government in answer to (a). When answering (b) many wrote about the Civil War rather than the overthrow of the Provisional Government. Others were limited to Stalin's 'Peace, bread and land.' Other explained valid reasons were rarely seen. In (c), War Communism was generally well known, particularly in relation to the provision of food. The relation to the provision of equipment for the Red Army was often the province of the more able. Most were strong on other reasons, producing many detailed explanations that easily achieved the marks available.

Question 12

Most answers indicated an awareness of what collectivisation was and the reasons why it was introduced by Stalin gaining good marks within both parts (a) and (b). Surprisingly, answers were less strong on Stalin's relationship with the kulaks. Examiners commented that responses to (c) were often disappointing with a lack of detail relating to both the economy and the Soviet people. Knowledge of the Five year Plans seems to be concentrated on their introduction rather than their impact and often other than 'some met their targets', the number of Plans and the programme being interrupted by the Second World War, there was little for the examiner to credit. On the other side, strict discipline and punishments did give some opportunities for explanation but other issues failed to materialise.

The USA, 1919–41**Question 13**

Many answers to (a) were good, describing in detail the work of Ford and the impact of his work on car production and availability. Some candidates took time up unnecessarily by developing the answer to include associated industries, although this was not required by the question. Some good answers were seen in response to (b), with the vast majority of candidates explaining at least one reason for the problems of farmers. Over-production and competition were dealt with particularly well. In (c), Republican policies were well-known and generally well explained in relation to the boom. Examiners reported that other factors relating to the causes of the boom were covered exceptionally well.

Question 14

Part (a) was well answered with many gaining full marks for the descriptions provided. A good understanding of the workings of the stock market was demonstrated by significant numbers of candidates and this allowed them to explain in detail the reasons for the Crash of 1929. Perhaps one criticism that can be levelled at some candidates was their insistence to link, or confuse, the Crash with Depression resulting in over long answers. In (c) candidates demonstrated their strength in relation to Hoover, developing reasons in some detail as to why he was rejected by the American voters. Roosevelt proved to be a little more difficult for some but nevertheless he was usually dealt with creditably. Some answers did take the detail of Roosevelt into what he did after the election. This approach did not gain credit.

Israelis and Palestinians, 1945–c.1994

Question 20

In answering this question candidates demonstrated a sound knowledge of all aspects being tested. The proposals for Palestine were well known and clearly documented with many candidates scoring highly. In (b) there were many references to the significance of Palestine being the ancestral home, the sacredness of Jerusalem to Muslims and the view that the UN did not have the right to make these proposals. These points were on many occasions well developed into explanation. The strength of answer to (c) was in the understanding of the strength of unity amongst Israelis with the army and people being at one in the war. Most commented on the lack of poor organisation of the Arabs.

Question 21

This question was not as popular. However, those who had been well-prepared were able to describe the situation following the Six Day War particularly in relation to the Palestinians. Better candidates were aware of the impact with regard to refugees. Most commented on the disapproval of King Hussein but lacked depth of understanding of the topic in (b) as a whole. Part (c) was generally well done with the majority able to put forward at least one argument for and against the success of the PLO.

Questions 15–19 and 22–25 failed to attract many responses and therefore comments from this limited number of candidates would not be helpful.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/02

Paper 2

General comments

The 20th Century option remains by far the more popular one with only a handful of centres entering candidates for the 19th Century. There were, however, a small number of candidates who appeared to have tackled the 19th Century option simply because it appears first in the paper. They clearly had not studied the period and did badly. Some candidates obviously need to be reminded which topic they have prepared for before they go into the examination.

The overall standard of answers was a little higher than in previous years. The overwhelming majority of candidates clearly understand the sources and the questions, and there were very few poor scripts. The most important area where there was improvement was the focused nature of many of the answers. Past reports have mentioned that many candidates write down everything they know about the topic rather than simply answering the questions set. This year answers were briefer and more relevant. With the exception of **Question 6** it is possible to score full marks on any question with answers no longer than five or six lines. What matters is how carefully candidates think about what the questions are asking and how they should deploy their knowledge, understanding and skills to provide a well focused, concise and relevant answer.

Some candidates are struggling with questions that ask for sources to be compared. In answering these questions it is not enough to simply provide a summary of each source and then assert that they agree or disagree. Nor should candidates simply compare the provenance or the surface features of the sources. What needs to be compared is the candidates' interpretation of the messages or purposes of the two sources.

It is important that candidates answer the questions set rather than using them as excuses to show off the full range of their source skills. Some candidates describe, interpret and evaluate every source no matter what the question is and often end up failing to produce an answer to the question set. For example in response to questions about how far candidates are surprised by what certain sources tell them candidates are expected to say whether they are surprised and then provide reasons.

Candidates should remember that when they are asked whether certain sources prove that other sources are right or wrong or can be trusted, they need to use contextual knowledge to evaluate the sources under scrutiny. A simple comparison of the sources for agreements and disagreement will not score high marks.

A small number of candidates are still needlessly throwing away a lot of marks in their answers to **Question 6**. Some are writing essays and ignoring the sources completely, while others are failing to explain how the sources support or disagree with the statement. It is important that candidates understand that this question is as much about the sources as any other question on the paper. They have to explain how far the sources support the statement, not whether they as candidates agree with the statement. Some do poorly on this question because they group the sources and then write about the group in general terms. It is important that candidates explain how each source that they use supports or disagrees with the statement. Assertions are not awarded marks.

Reports to centres in previous years have warned against mechanistic preparation of candidates for this paper. There is still a tendency for some candidates to run through their full range of source skills for every question e.g. they will evaluate sources when this is not asked for. Going into the examination room equipped with detailed instructions about how to answer the questions is often counter-productive. It gives candidates a false sense of security and means they are less likely to think carefully about the specific demands of each individual question. It is interesting to note that the questions that surprise candidates the most such as **Questions 2** and **4** in the Twentieth Century option, are often the best answered. Because they have not been prepared in detail for questions like this one they have to rely on their thinking - and as a consequence, they do better. The aim of the teacher in the classroom should be to encourage candidates to

develop their thinking skills and their problem solving abilities, rather than coaching them in the answers to certain kinds of questions.

Option A: 19th Century topic

Question 1

Most candidates achieved a reasonable mark by explaining how the author blames Germany. Better candidates were able to go further and show how the author blames other countries as well. The best answers argued that the author puts most of the blame on Germany but qualifies this by placing some of the blame on other countries such as Britain.

Question 2

The starting point for answering this question is to compare the messages of the two sources. Source C suggests that alliances help keep the peace while Source B has a threatening tone to it and suggests that the Entente Cordiale could lead to conflict with Germany. Some candidates achieved a reasonable mark by using this difference as a reason for being surprised. Better candidates used their contextual knowledge of the period to produce a more considered answer. Weaker candidates compared the surface details of the two sources.

Question 3

Only a small minority of candidates reached the top levels in the mark scheme for this question. The weakest candidates simply agreed that biased sources cannot be believed. A slightly better answer was to use the provenance of the sources in support of claims that the sources are biased. This was done without reference to the content of the sources or to the historical context. Better candidates checked the claims made in the sources against their own knowledge of the period, while the best answers used content and context to consider the likely purpose of each of the sources.

Question 4

This question was generally answered well with most candidates able to interpret the cartoons and then compare these interpretations. Source F sees a strong Germany acting alone in an aggressive way. It is probably approving of what Germany is doing. On the other hand Source G shows a weak ineffective Germany acting together with other powers to try and maintain peace. A number of candidates should have scored high marks but did not because although they interpreted the sources, they failed to compare them. Weaker candidates either claimed that the cartoons are about completely different things or compared surface details with no interpretation.

Question 5

This question produced a range of answers. Weaker candidates based their answers on the provenance of the sources without using their content and without reference to the historical context. Better candidates used their knowledge to check the claims made in the sources while the best candidates used the content of the sources and knowledge of the context together to consider the purpose of the sources and their reliability.

Question 6

This question was generally answered well with most candidates explaining how some sources support the idea that the naval race was a major cause of the First World War and how other sources suggest other factors were more important. There were few attempts made to evaluate the sources and a number of candidates wrote essays and failed to use a single source.

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

This question was answered well by many candidates. Most were able to explain valid ways in which two sources agree e.g. they both suggest the Treaty of Versailles was harsh or that the Germans did not like it. Better candidates realised that there are also ways in which the sources disagree e.g. Source A says the Treaty could have been worse while Source B implies it was as bad as it could be. Some candidates still struggle with comparison questions like this one because they either simply summarise each source and then claim that they agree or differ, or they fail to compare the sources about similar things e.g. they will say that Source A says Clemenceau wanted the Rhineland to be independent while Source B says that the Germans see every difficulty as a punishment. Candidates need to be reminded that sources might contain different information from one another but this does not in itself constitute a disagreement. A minority of candidates would benefit from practising this type of comparison question.

Question 2

The first step in thinking through this question is to compare the messages of the two sources. In Source C Wilson is clearly arguing that the peace must be a just one without revenge. The message of Source D is that exactly the opposite happened. Candidates then needed to explain whether this analysis made them surprised or not. Some candidates achieved a reasonable mark by arguing that they were surprised simply because of the differences between the two sources but better candidates realised that knowledge of the events could be used to produce better answers. The best use of this knowledge is to argue that there is no reason to be surprised by the sources because of what is known about Wilson's hopes and aims, and what is known about the intentions of the France and Britain. Weaker candidates ignored one of the two sources or misread Source C and claimed that Wilson wanted a harsh peace and so the two sources support each other. It is important in questions like this one that candidates produce a direct answer to the question. If they are asked whether or not they are surprised, they must answer this. Some candidates analysed the two sources well but failed to make an explicit statement about being surprised. They were awarded low marks.

Question 3

Again, the starting point for a good answer to this question is to read the sources carefully and compare what they say. Some weak candidates fell at this first hurdle because they misread Source E and claimed that Lloyd George was arguing for a harsh peace. He was, of course, arguing the opposite. In Source F he was demanding a harsh punishment while in Source G we learn that Lloyd George has realised that Germany cannot afford to pay high reparations.

Some candidates, attracted by the suggestion in Source G that Lloyd George was planning to deceive the British people based their answers on this source alone. The question, however, requires that the sources be used together. It is possible to do this without using knowledge by simply finding ways in which these sources tell us similar or different things about Lloyd George's aims and intentions. The best candidates went further than this and used their knowledge of the topic to evaluate the sources. This was often done well but some candidates made the mistake of arguing that Lloyd George cannot be trusted in Source E because he was simply trying to win votes during an election campaign. Such an argument does not stand up because in Source E Lloyd George is arguing against a harsh peace while many British voters were demanding such a peace at that time.

Question 4

This question was answered well by many candidates. This was encouraging because it does need some careful thinking and use of contextual knowledge. The easy answer is to argue that Wilson would/would not have been happy simply because of what is said by Poincare in Source H. It is possible to claim that he would have been happy because Poincare recognises what the American soldiers had done. It is also possible to claim that he would not have been happy because there is an implicit criticism of the American troops and because of the gloomy tone of the speech. Such answers, however, fail to consider the speech in context. When this is done the message and purpose of Poincare, and the likely reaction of Wilson, become clear. Poincare was trying to justify a harsh peace treaty and we know that Wilson was hoping to achieve the opposite to this. It was good to see many candidates using their knowledge and understanding to write developed and well supported answers along these lines.

Question 5

It was encouraging to see only a few candidates using these two cartoons literally. Most tried to explain their messages. Some candidates did this but failed to compare them. However, an encouraging number of candidates did compare interpretations and got as far as explaining how both cartoons suggest that Germany was being punished. Better answers, and there were not too many of these, went one step further and compared the opinions or points of view of the two cartoons. These candidates realised that both cartoons do give an opinion about the Treaty of Versailles. Some of these answers were based on a misinterpretation of Source I. Here the cartoonist is criticising Germany and supporting the Treaty of Versailles, but some candidates thought the cartoonist was criticising the treatment of Germany by the allies. The best answers explained Source I properly and compared this with the opinion of the cartoonist of Source J where the treatment of Germany is being criticised.

Question 6

This question was generally answered well but there were a number of candidates who wrote about whether the sources show that the peace was a harsh one. This is not what the question asked. Candidates should have been writing about whether the sources show that the peacemakers wanted to treat Germany harshly. However, most candidates did answer the question properly and many scored high marks.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

General comments

The number of centres using the coursework option for the November session remains small. However, in nearly all cases the assignments set were appropriate and the marking was consistent and accurate with only a small minority of centres marking a little generously. The work submitted by nearly all centres was clearly labelled and well organised with supporting letters and documents. This made it easy for the Moderator to understand the coursework schemes in each of these centres. The Moderator also found the detailed comments on candidates' work showing where and why certain levels had been awarded most helpful.

Many of the candidates produced work that demonstrated good understanding of concepts such as causation and good source skills such as making inferences and evaluating. However, there are still some areas that could be improved. Some candidates in some centres are still writing at too great a length. This happens more often in Assignment 1 than Assignment 2 and results in some of the work being descriptive or narrative in nature. Sometimes, whole sections of the work are not strictly relevant to the question. Candidates should be reminded that markers, and moderators, are not interested in how much they can write, or even how much they know, but how well the question has been answered. Skills such as selection and deciding what is relevant for a given purpose are central to coursework and their importance should be emphasised when candidates are being introduced to the coursework tasks.

When marking was a little generous it was nearly always because candidates had been given high marks in Assignment 1 for answers which, although showing much knowledge, failed to get to grips with the question. For example, when asked about short and long-term causes, it is not enough for candidates to describe a series of causal factors and then simply identify which are long-term and which are short-term. For high marks candidates should explain the different functions of short-term and long-term factors and illustrate these through the different causes. When asked to compare the importance of different causal factors, candidates should develop a reasoned argument why some are more important than others. In some centres, candidates are awarded high marks for merely asserting this.

There is much good work in response to Assignment 2 questions with candidates showing the ability to evaluate the content of sources using their knowledge and understanding of the historical context. However, it was surprising to find a number of candidates not basing their answers to the final question on the sources. It is important they understand what they are meant to do in this question because it is a similar type of question to that set at the end of Paper 2. In both instances, if the sources are not used high marks will not be achieved.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/04
Alternative to Coursework

General comments

As usual, Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945, remains overwhelmingly the most popular choice with candidates. However, substantial numbers prepared for and chose Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941, and Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941, while there were other centres that prepared candidates for Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990, Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century, and Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994. There were very few candidates who selected Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society, and Depth Study H: The Impact of Western Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century.

Once again, examiners saw the full range of achievement, although the general impression was that there were fewer candidates who achieved very low marks. There were, of course, many outstanding scripts which were a pleasure to read. The increasing number of candidates achieving an average mark showed that there had been progress in both learning and examination technique compared to previous years.

At the risk of repeating advice from previous reports, some candidates underachieved in **Questions (a) (ii)** and **(a) (iii)** because of incomplete knowledge of what the questions required in the answer or inadequate examination technique. In all **Questions (a) (ii)**, candidates should be aware that the sources will provide evidence to support more than one side of the argument. It is the candidate's responsibility to find this evidence and to relate it to the examiner in support of the arguments. Many candidates are finding one side of the argument or developing one side with source support, but are only asserting a second side, i.e. offering no evidence from the source.

It is pleasing to note that many candidates realise that to achieve the highest Level for **Question (a) (iii)**, they must test for the sources' reliability. There were a substantial number of candidates who offered 'stock' evaluations, e.g. 'He was there and so would know', or 'This evidence is from a book written much later so more research could have been done'. These comments will advance a candidate's cause very little. Whatever test of reliability the candidate chooses, be it by provenance, contextual knowledge, date, tone, balance, motive etc, he must show why his assertions make a difference to the amount of trust the source deserves. Examples will be given in the section on individual questions.

The vast majority of scripts were well and clearly written, and neatly presented so that examiners were easily able to access the information the candidates wished to convey and to judge accurately the quality of the answers. There were very few candidates who misjudged the time available to complete their answers, and it was pleasing to note even fewer rubric infringements in this season of examination.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945

Most candidates were able to draw valid inferences from Source A in answers to **Question (a) (i)**, and were able to indicate where, from within the source, evidence could be found to support their inferences. However, there were still examples of candidates who wanted to impress examiners with their knowledge and write long tracts on the negotiating positions of the leading personalities during the discussions in Paris. Candidates must appreciate that for source based questions, answers must involve references to the sources with which they are presented. Contextual knowledge is perfectly acceptable in answers but not as an alternative to reflections about the sources and their contents. This principle applies whatever Depth Study is chosen. In answers to **Question (a) (ii)**, candidates found it relatively easy to understand why Germans were justifiably angry. However, most saw no distinction in the evidence about the Treaty of Versailles, while a minority of candidates argued that the Germans were justified in being angry at their treatment by the victors and by the terms of the treaty, but that their anger in some areas should have been

directed at their own government which offered a lack of information, or practised disinformation. The government had not told the whole truth about the real military situation or the armistice arrangements. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** usually centred on a comparison of the content of the sources. There were some attempts to test for reliability as shown in the general comments section. Better candidates pointed out the language in Source A, showing the frustration of the person who took part, the sense of failure and the knowledge that the agreement would have a negative outcome. Some even said that the language used was extravagant and that it was unusual for a diplomat to comment on what his political masters had decided. Equally, better candidates saw Source B as showing an objective balance, making reference to its British origin with none of the jingoism of the immediate post-First World War period. They mentioned that, as a textbook, it should deliver a balance of information, that its date showed research could have been done over a long period, and that feelings of anger had lessened against Germany since the Second World War, let alone the First World War.

In Part **(b) Questions (i) and (ii)**, the powers of the German President under the Weimar Constitution, and the detail of the Spartacist Revolt were either fully known and clearly expressed, or little was known at all. It was rare to find marks awarded in the middle range for these questions. The worst answers showed no knowledge at all, and the best showed considerable command of the subject matter. Many candidates scored well in their answers to **Question (b) (iii)** and explanations were full on the reasons for hyperinflation in Germany in 1923. Weaker candidates saw this 'causal' question as requiring a descriptive answer and wrote about the impact of hyperinflation on the German public or, at best, mentioned the excessive printing of paper currency. In answers to **Question (b) (iv)**, the majority of candidates saw Stresemann as an unqualified hero in the period 1923 to 1929, offering evidence from both domestic and international events and arrangements. However, some candidates offered a more balanced assessment, commenting on opposition to internal events, the conservative element's dislike of social freedoms, and the concessions at Locarno and the joining of the League of Nations as tacit acceptance of the Treaty of Versailles. The short term nature of American aid was also developed. These candidates scored well.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941

Again, candidates were able to draw inferences about Trotsky's arrogance and lack of respect for Stalin from Source A. These were supported by evidence from the source. A small number of candidates over concentrated on the personal qualities of Stalin throughout his career to the detriment of their observations of what the source told them about Trotsky. In answers to **Question (a) (ii)**, candidates tended to concentrate on the strengths and weaknesses of Trotsky as listed by Lenin in the second paragraph. These answers had a general balance. However, better candidates realised that the negative comments made about Stalin improved the balance towards the choice of Trotsky. Some even argued that the source was limited and that Lenin could have wanted another, third candidate to support him. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** tended to compare and contrast the content of the sources. Some of the better tests for reliability were comments that the date of Source A was 1959, Stalin was dead and he had been denounced by Khrushchev in 1956. Hence, the author could say what he liked about Stalin. For Source B, some commented that, despite it being an extract from Lenin's Political Will, it was suppressed by Stalin and so had no impact on the struggle for the leadership whatsoever.

Answers to **Question (b) (i)** had a majority indicating that a gulag was a prison camp for the enemies of the state or Stalin, and that hard labour, intensely unfavourable conditions, and a short life expectancy were to be encountered. However, it must be stated that many candidates guessed at the answer here. This was also the case in many explanations of the meaning of 'Socialism in one country'. Weaker candidates saw this as an invitation to describe the tenets of equality, sharing and direction of activity by the state. Better informed candidates showed that it was Stalin's policy to establish socialism at home before exporting it abroad, and was in contrast to Trotsky's wish for worldwide revolution. **Question (b) (iii)** is always a 'causal' question, requiring explanations. Description is acceptable but the focus must be on causes. There were some full and impressive answers, with various aspects of Stalin's paranoia and policy of intimidation being explained and with good details of individuals and groups who suffered. These answers were awarded the maximum mark. **Question (b) (iv)** asked about the extent to which Stalin's rule was beneficial to the peoples of the USSR. Although examiners allowed some leeway for the assertion that the Five Year Plans had made the USSR industrially strong and thus the peoples had benefited, the focus of the question was about direct impact upon the peoples themselves. Many could give examples of the disadvantages of hard work, long hours, danger, purges, famine, few consumer goods etc, but few gave the benefits of improving harvests, low unemployment, free education, medical services etc. Nevertheless, there were some well balanced and supported arguments that led to logical conclusions on this subject.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941

The cartoon in Source A drew a number of interpretations regarding the identification of persons involved in this representation of the clash between the Supreme Court and Roosevelt. However, the majority were able to draw valid inferences from the figures and the hints in writing on the wall, luggage labels and on the bodies to reveal that there was considerable antipathy in the relationship. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)** reflected the balance of information in the source that, on the one hand, Long gained substantial support from the poor over his policies regarding transport, education and pensions but, on the other hand, this was countered by comments about 'dictatorship' and 'shrinking the fortunes of the rich'.

Again, candidates compared and contrasted the content of the sources in their answers to **Question (a) (iii)** and often rewrote the same information that had been used in the previous two answers. Better candidates often used contextual knowledge to test these sources for reliability. Several offered evidence of the serious constitutional problems that were posed by Roosevelt's Supreme Court Packing Plan and compared that to the treatment of the issue, both comical and serious, in the cartoon to decide whether the cartoon reflected accurately the antipathy of the relationship and the gravity of the issues. Also, for Source B, some candidates offered more details of Huey Long and his policies and activities to show how far he could have become a serious rival to Roosevelt for the support of the Democratic Party. Some even referred to Long's assassination to judge whether he might have been a serious rival or whether his populist and dictatorial activities would have been exposed to drive him into a political wilderness.

The phenomenon of knowing everything or nothing in **Questions (b) (i)** and **(b) (ii)**, continued in this Depth Study. In answers to **Question (b) (ii)**, there were some very full answers that scored well, but other candidates often knew about the Packing Plan and its aims but forgot to comment upon the outcomes required by the question. The best answers to **Question (b) (iii)** focused on the year 1937 and showed Roosevelt bowing to the pressures of Big Business, fearing the increasing costs of relief, and arguing that, as manufacturing output was up and unemployment was down, cuts could be made. There were some astute arguments over the pull and push factors involved here and how much of this change of policy was voluntary, a compromise or forced on Roosevelt. Weaker candidates saw the question as an opportunity to write generally about the New Deal or even about the first 'Hundred Days' in office. **Question (b) (iv)** brought some well argued answers on whether the New Deal was an attack on freedom, balancing the accusations of the Supreme Court, the state governments, employers and tax payers against the general good achieved by this set of short term policies. Weaker candidates tended to write one sided answers or wrote in general terms about whether Roosevelt's ideas were 'a good thing' or 'a bad thing'.

Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990

Candidates easily found valid inferences in Source A to show that the peasants willingly assisted the Red Army against the forces of the KMT. In answers to **Question (a) (ii)**, candidates also found evidence that the Nationalist government said that it was committed to defend Shanghai but that the population wished to avoid a bloody conflagration and, in any case, members of the government had left the city already. As with other Depth Studies, the majority of candidates chose to compare the content of the sources in their answers to **Question (a) (iii)**. Some attempted to test for reliability by voicing their doubts about how far the American writer could be trusted in Source A and whether the British newspaper was capable of reporting fairly in Source B. More confident and successful candidates pointed out that the evidence of hostility to the KMT shown in Source A was consistent with current, received opinion that peasants were far more likely to trust the forces of the CCP than those of the KMT. They insisted that the tone of the British newspaper in its report in Source B was even-handed, when it was clear from the evidence in the report that, despite government protestations, the city was about to fall.

Most candidates were able to offer two ways in which the USA supported the Nationalists after 1945 and many maximum scores were awarded. Equally, candidates, who had prepared for this Depth Study, could show the importance of Formosa (Taiwan) to the Nationalists, both at the end of the Chinese Civil War and on to the present day. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** on the reasons why the Nationalists lost the support of the Chinese people after the Second World War were well known and often placed in a context that began well before the war. Many candidates scored well here. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** often confirmed that land was the most important issue facing the new Chinese Communist Government in 1949. Some offered other factors like war damage and loss of life but only a few went on to offer an argued and balanced answer with detail of so many areas of damage, decay and neglect that needed attention.

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

Candidates were alert to the evidence in Source A that it was far cheaper to compensate black workers in the mines than white workers. They drew many inferences, sometimes emotionally, that black workers were far more expendable than white workers.

Also in answers to **Question (a) (ii)** candidates found a balance in Source B to show that, however powerful the Mine Workers Union was in calling strikes and paralysing the Rand, it would have to succumb in the end with deaths from fighting and with hangings of its leaders as retribution from the stronger authorities. They saw that opposition to the replacement of white workers by cheaper black workers had been futile. As usual, most candidates attempted to compare and contrast the content of both sources in their answers to **Question (a) (iii)**, but some showed that both sources had supporting evidence that in 1921 black workers were cheaper to employ and compensate than white workers. Issues surrounding Source A being from a British textbook and Source B being memories from a South African at a much later date, were dismissed as irrelevant as the sources supported one another and was consistent with other contextual information supplied by the candidates.

The recent phenomenon of candidates knowing all or nothing about the detail required to answer **Questions (b) (i)** and **(b) (ii)** continued here. There were many guesses at the names of the major political parties in South Africa in the 1920s but few were accurate. Answers to **Question (b)** were often scant or not attempted at all. However, a significant minority knew of the Afrikaner organisation, its aims and composition. Both **Questions (b) (iii)** and **(b) (iv)** required time limits to be respected. Candidates must appreciate that these time limits are important and material offered outside the given dates will attract little reward. Whilst there were good and accurate attempts at both questions, many wrote very general answers offering trends or evidence across the whole of the twentieth century with little attention paid to the limits or dates given in the questions.

Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians

The number of Centres that are attracted to this Depth Study continues to grow and the quality of the answers continues to improve with each season of examination. Candidates were able to draw a number of inferences from Source A to show that Sadat was willing to risk the wrath of his Arab neighbours in order to secure a deal with Israel – either because he believed that this was the correct course of action or that his own national interests would be best served by peace. **Question (a) (ii)** was answered in a variety of ways. Some thought that the cartoon showed that everyone pictured was happy with the Camp David Agreement, some believed that the depictions showed that the agreement would fall apart sooner rather than later, and some felt the cartoon showed three leaders happy, but for different reasons. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** followed the general trend of comparisons on the content of the sources. Better tests of reliability showed that, despite Source A being from a British journalist in 1990 and Source B being taken from the newspaper 'Free Palestine' in 1978, both showed that relations between Israelis and other Middle East states were often carried out in a duplicitous fashion. Sadat was betraying Arab states in Source A and Begin's 'bubble' in Source B showed he would betray Sadat and Carter in the near future. Candidates offered further examples of lack of trust and breaking of agreements to support this. These candidates had achieved a good test for reliability by way of cross-reference and relevant contextual knowledge.

Some candidates knew what Camp David was (**Question (b) (i)**) and some knew the terms of the Camp David Agreement (**Question (b) (ii)**) but these answers were not overly impressive despite some full answers that achieved maximum marks. By contrast, there were many good answers to **Question (b) (iii)** where the internal and external pressures on Sadat to make peace were fully explained. Equally, there were some outstanding and balanced answers on whether the USA's involvement in the Middle East in the 1970s and 1980s reduced the prospects for peace. Usually the answers concluded that the USA with its Jewish lobby and thirst for oil prevented peace, but better candidates did offer arguments suggesting that Arab intransigence might have an influence on the question as well.

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

Some candidates chose this Depth Study but far too few to make general and useful comments.

Depth Study H: The impact of Western Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century

Some candidates chose this Depth Study but far too few to make general and useful comments.