

# CONTENTS

---

<b>HISTORY</b> .....	<b>2</b>
Paper 0470/01 Paper 1 .....	2
Paper 0470/02 Paper 2 .....	5
Paper 0470/03 Coursework.....	8
Paper 0470/04 Alternative to Coursework.....	9

# HISTORY

---

Paper 0470/01

Paper 1

## General comments

The Examiners noted that the number of hazy, vague answers that have predominated in the past, have continued to decline. A significant majority of candidates were well prepared to meet the demands of the examination, showing ability beyond straightforward factual recall.

As in previous examinations the mark scheme for part (a) questions, which are designed to test recall, allows one mark to be given for each relevant point, but many responses contained additional detail which achieved credit. Perhaps one area that could be improved is the encouragement of candidates to limit the amount they write for four marks. This will free-up valuable time to be used elsewhere.

It was encouraging to note the continued development of candidates' ability to explain the reasons in part (b) answers. Even with this trend, some candidates still remain happy with straightforward identification, which can only gain limited credit.

For answers to part (c) questions to score the higher marks it is necessary to consider both sides of the argument. All too often candidates take what is given in the question and fail to develop other explained reasons that have contributed to the issue. Alternatively the information in the question is developed to the expense of other reasons. The best answers will in addition consider 'how far' or 'to what extent', although it is not necessary to agree with the question or even to make a decision in relation to one explained reason. A supported argument will gain credit.

Although relatively small, Examiners noted a slight increase in rubric errors. As in previous years this was often the attempt to answer both questions in the Depth Study section. The vast majority of candidates gave little evidence of being short of time, with answers being completed fully. Scripts were generally well presented although Examiners did comment on a small number where the quality of handwriting made it very difficult to read.

## Comments on specific questions

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

### **Core content**

#### **Question 1**

Only attempted by a small number of Centres and only by some candidates from one of those Centres. The majority found little difficulty with the role of Mazzini in part (a), but for many the reasons for Charles Albert's lack of success were less well known. In response to part (c), detail was given relating to Cavour and Napoleon III on the one side and Garibaldi, Mazzini and Victor Emmanuel on the other. This led to many responses gaining a mark within Level 4. Disappointingly, good candidates did not address 'how far'.

#### **Question 2**

Candidates produced some very good responses to both (a) and (b). Some in (a) drifted away from 'social changes' onto economic and political matters. This approach does not gain further credit and reduces the time available for other questions. Strong responses on the Samurai were seen in (b). In (c) most were strong on military reforms and foreign policy and less so on industrialisation.

**Question 3**

There were very few responses seen, with many being weak. In part **(b)**, the tendency to concentrate on economic factors limited marks. In part **(c)**, candidates were strong on explained detail to the issue of slave versus free states but were less convincing in relation to the election of Lincoln and the consequences.

**Question 4**

Whilst part **(a)** produced many full answers describing the Entente Cordiale, many wrote at length about the Triple Entente. Again **(b)** produced some very good answers, but many confused 1911 with the earlier Moroccan crisis. In part **(c)** it was disappointing that so few were able to explain why naval rivalry was significant, being limited to identification that it was a cause. It is important that not only are candidates able to recognise long or short-term causes, but that they are able to explain the impact. An example of this related to Austro-Russian rivalry in the Balkans where candidates failed to explain convincingly the significance of this rivalry.

**Question 5**

Many candidates did well in their answer to part **(a)** and restricted their answer to territorial losses. Those that just wrote about the terms of the Treaty failed to improve the quality of their answer. There existed some misconceptions, with Sudetenland, the Rhineland and Austria appearing as territory lost. In **(b)**, high marks were achieved by the well-prepared candidates who were able to take the terms of the peace treaty and explain why they caused dissatisfaction. Those candidates who merely listed the terms remained in Level 2. There were many good answers to part **(c)**, with candidates taking disputes such as the Aaland Islands, Upper Silesia and Corfu to explain 'how successful'. Others just gave general reasons for failure or described a dispute without giving the result. A common failure was to waste time writing about the League in the 1930s.

**Question 6**

The majority of candidates attempting this question were unable to provide more than the flimsiest of information relating to the Saar in 1935. This was continued into part **(b)** where many failed to put forward convincing arguments as to why Hitler wanted the Pact, often missing out important points such as the war on two fronts and the division of Poland. It was rare to find a candidate who did not produce a counter argument to part **(c)**, and the justification of appeasement. Some even referred to Hitler's apprehension over the re-militarising of the Rhineland. Justification of appeasement was particularly strong.

**Question 7**

The depth of knowledge in relation to part **(a)** was high. Very few failed to reach high marks with many giving information that was worthy of credit if marks had been available. A small number did confuse Yalta with Potsdam. Whilst many made a good attempt at answering **(b)**, even among the stronger candidates there was sometimes a failure to explain why the blockade would have checked the introduction of the new currency or resolved other worries of Stalin. Indeed, a number of Examiners commented on the lack of understanding relating to the introduction of a new currency. Many referred to the hope that the blockade would force the former allies out of West Berlin but did not link this to the fears of an emerging, powerful Germany. Some candidates thought the blockade was synonymous with the Wall. Many lost marks in their answers to part **(c)** as they thought the case against the USSR was so strong they did not bother with a counter argument. Often those who introduced the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan articulated Stalin's fears but not why. Some answers drifted away from the question into Cuba and Vietnam and this did not receive credit.

**Question 8**

There were very few answers to this question and the quality varied. Identification, rather than explanation, predominated in both **(b)** and **(c)**, resulting in superficial answers compared to those for **Questions 5, 6 and 7**. Typical responses to **(c)** were often limited to what Gorbachev wanted to achieve and the decision not to support Eastern European regimes with USSR troops.

### **Depth studies**

#### *Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-45*

##### **Question 9**

Candidates were often lacking in basic knowledge of the actual Putsch, for example, writing as though everything happened on the same day. Most concentrated on Hitler's arrest, trial and imprisonment rather than the actual event. This approach did not gain credit. In **(b)**, most candidates seized on the consequences for Germany of the Wall Street Crash and Hitler's approach to the unemployed. Many candidates referred to the attraction of extreme parties without going any further. Most candidates knew of Rohm in relation to part **(c)** and the threat he posed to Hitler. Very few wrote about the worries of the Army High Command. Only a minority were able to relate the significance of the Night of the Long Knives to the events of 1933-4. Getting the events into a chronological order was difficult for some.

##### **Question 10**

The forms of propaganda were almost universally known but the use of propaganda caused problems for many. The final two sections of this question produced many vague, general answers lacking in specific historically relevant material. In **(c)**, popularity was explained either through propaganda or coercion, rather than the reasons people were attracted to the regime. Too many wrote about the period pre-rise to power, i.e. why the Nazis became popular. The lack of popularity was rarely explored.

#### *Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-41*

##### **Question 11**

The main features of Tsarist rule were generally well known for part **(a)**, although some candidates did widen their answers to write about Russian society. The answer to part **(c)** required candidates to be aware of the different reasons for the collapse of Tsarist rule and to link these either to war or not. Many linked everything to war, resulting in a one-sided answer.

##### **Question 12**

Many answers in relation to the features of the first Five Year Plans lacked precise knowledge. Very little was related to targets. Most answers stated they were related to industry. Part **(b)** brought many good answers on the efficiency of farming and the removal of the kulaks. Part **(c)** brought many good answers, with the best taking a critical look at how far there was an impact and the human cost of change. This approach allowed high marks to be achieved.

#### *Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-41*

##### **Question 13**

There were many detailed responses to both part **(a)** and part **(b)**. However, in **(b)**, candidates were much better at identification than explanation. To gain the highest marks candidates need to take more care in ensuring that their response does not end up as a number of 'listed' points. It is important they demonstrate the ability to put their points into a context. Many candidates appeared not to read the question carefully for part **(c)**, as the word 'benefit' was often ignored, resulting in a lot of time being spent on what happened and very little on the benefit (impact).

##### **Question 14**

The Ku Klux Klan was well known and many scored high marks. Many candidates spent considerable time, judging by the length of their answers, on writing about 'Why Prohibition was introduced', rather than the question as set in part **(b)**. Often, the reasons for abandonment related to gangsters or corruption, which were generally explained and more general, unexplained, points about speakeasies and moonshine. Although candidates had much to say about the role of women, many scripts were top-heavy with description. When candidates identified those women for whom life did not change all that much, they were often unable to offer explanation.

*Depth Study D: China, 1945 – c.1990*

Candidates were well prepared to meet the demands of the examination. In both questions, well developed responses attracted high marks within part **(c)**. As with earlier questions the responses to part **(b)** did not always develop into explanation. Some candidates did confuse the Second World War and the Civil War.

**Questions 15 – 23**

These failed to attract many responses and therefore comments would not be particularly helpful.

*Depth Study H: The Impact of Western Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century.***Question 24**

Many candidates in response to part **(a)** resorted to describing trade or treating the natives as slaves. Relatively few were able to describe indirect rule. In part **(c)**, many were unable to argue that China was not under British/European control.

**Question 25**

This question was answered by a minority of candidates, many of whom had chosen nineteenth century core topics in the earlier part of the paper. Most candidates were able to distinguish between French and Belgium treatment of colonial peoples, with Belgium probably known better than France. A small number thought that the treatment was the same from both countries. Detail about the Berlin Conference (part **(b)**) seemed to centre around ending slavery and the scramble for Africa.

<p><b>Paper 0470/02</b></p>
-----------------------------

<p><b>Paper 2</b></p>
-----------------------

**General comments**

The overall performance of candidates was strong and showed a slight improvement on previous years. The majority of candidates were well prepared both in terms of contextual knowledge and, more importantly, in source skills. Sources were often interpreted and evaluated through the use of contextual knowledge, there was some excellent cross-referencing between sources, and there were many interesting, thoughtful and original answers. The main areas where there is still some room for improvement are explained below. These comments refer to only a minority of the candidates. However, these candidates can often be found in a small number of Centres where preparation for the demands of this paper appear to be less than adequate.

Some candidates still struggle to write concise answers directed at the question set. They prefer, instead, to tell the Examiner everything they know about the topic and to describe and explore every detail of the sources. As a result, the point of the question often gets lost. Many answers are far too long and the longer they become, the more they drift from the point of the question. It should be explained to candidates that Examiners are not at all impressed by the knowledge of the candidates for its own sake. The only thing the Examiner is interested in is how well the question has been answered. The best answers are often the shortest because they focus on the question and on nothing else.

Some candidates are wasting much time by telling the Examiner what written sources say and by describing cartoons. Again, this deflects the answer away from the question and some answers never recover from such a start. Sources need to be interpreted, not paraphrased or described.

Many candidates taking this paper appear to have impressive contextual knowledge. It is, however, not always put to effective use. Such knowledge should be used to interpret or evaluate sources. This can be done by a concise reference to such knowledge, rather than a lengthy diversion into everything the candidates knows about the topic.

Candidates must answer the question set. It is not uncommon to find candidates writing much that is sensible and that could be made relevant to the question. However, this last step is never made and the question is never answered. Examples of such answers can be found in response to **Question 2** in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century option where candidates compared Sources A and B but never explained whether or not they were surprised.

Finally, in answering **Question 6** candidates fall into two clear groups: those that have been prepared for this type of question and those who have not. Candidates need to be made aware of how to approach this question.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### ***Option A: 19th Century topic***

##### **Question 1**

This question was answered well and got most candidates off to a comfortable start. Many reached Level 3 of the mark scheme (4-5 marks) by finding differences between the two sources, for example, in Source A people are afraid of Radetzky, while in Source B Radetzky is the victim. Similarities were harder for candidates to identify although they were there, for example, both sources show violence and disturbances in Milan. It was encouraging to see that only a few candidates paraphrased the sources and failed to make direct comparisons between the sources.

##### **Question 2**

There was scope for candidates to find reasons for being both surprised and not surprised but only the very best candidates were able to do this and reach the top level in the mark scheme. Unfortunately, a few candidates misread Source D and thought the Pope was urging the Princes into war against the Austrians. However, most argued that they were surprised because Source C shows him as a liberal whereas Source D shows the opposite. Some of these candidates were awarded the lower mark in the level because they failed to make explicit reference to Source C. Better candidates used their contextual knowledge of the Pope's relations with Austria to explain why they were not surprised by what he says in Source D. Many of these were excellent answers, demonstrating the ability to make concise and relevant use of contextual knowledge.

##### **Question 3**

This question produced many good answers. There was a general understanding that the cartoon was showing the Pope as two-faced and deceitful. Candidates were able to refer to details of the cartoon to explain their answers, although the weakest candidates could only assert that it shows the Pope as two-faced. Better candidates understood the importance of the date of the cartoon and put their answers into context. The top level in the mark scheme required candidates to go further and to explain, in context, the impact the artist wished to have on the attitudes or actions of other people - far fewer candidates were able to go this far. This is an area (i.e. the purpose of sources) where there is still some room for improvement. This cartoon was not simply produced to show that the Pope was two-faced. It aimed at influencing the views and attitudes of others.

##### **Question 4**

Many candidates avoided the obvious comparisons between the sources and wrote very good answers by explaining that G and H cannot prove that F is wrong because they are about different places and different claims. Many understood that Sicily (Source H) was not ruled by the Austrians while Milan (Source F) was. Others explained how F and G are about different things, for example, F is about middle class concerns while G is about concerns of the peasants. Another type of answer that gained good marks was to be found with those candidates who knew about Mazzini and were able to explain the possible bias of Source G. Weaker candidates were able to gain some marks by ignoring all of these issues and making surface comparisons, for example, people are content in Source F but unhappy in Sources G and H.

##### **Question 5**

There were many thoughtful and well informed answers to this question. A few of the weaker candidates misunderstood and explained why Charles Albert changed his mind before 1848, i.e. before Source I. Some concentrated on the surface differences between the sources and used these as evidence that he had changed his mind. Many, however, dug deeper and explained either that Source I was not necessarily reflecting Charles Albert's views, or more commonly, how in Source J his concerns were about Garibaldi in particular and not about the struggle against Austria in general. Much good relevant knowledge of Garibaldi was demonstrated. Some candidates were even able to use their knowledge of events after July 1848 to explain how far Charles Albert had/had not changed his mind.

**Question 6**

It is important in this final question that candidates do not only identify which sources agree or disagree with the hypothesis, but also explain how they agree or disagree. The hypothesis was about the causes of the revolutions. Some candidates wrote about the sources but failed to explain how they related to causes. Several sources were rejected by candidates as being irrelevant, while a more careful reading would have led candidates to understand their relevance to the issue of causes. Many candidates scored well in this question but it was perhaps not answered quite as well as in previous years. Very few candidates attempted any evaluation of the sources and as a result few were awarded the bonus marks that are available.

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

This served as a useful 'warm-up' question for most candidates who got straight to the point. Many understood that the source places more blame on the USA than on the USSR, although a few thought it was the other way round. Some candidates thought they were being equally blamed. Answers were well supported by references to the sources. There was a small minority of candidates who simply paraphrased the sources without answering the question, or who wasted time by writing about the provenance and bias of the sources.

**Question 2**

This question produced a wide range of answers, although there were very few answers based on unsupported assertions. The weakest candidates tended to state that they were not surprised by Stalin's attitude in Source B, either because of the general Cold War context or because Stalin was by nature a suspicious person. Unfortunately, contextual knowledge was not used to develop the points being made about Stalin or the Cold War. Many candidates used Source A and found similarities and/or disagreements with Source B. A few of these candidates forgot to complete their answers by explaining whether they were surprised or not. Candidates should be reminded that they must produce an answer to the question set. There were an encouraging number of answers based on contextual knowledge, for example, Yalta/Potsdam and these scored high marks.

**Question 3**

Although many candidates ended up by achieving high marks on this question, they took an unnecessarily long time to do so. Many failed to go straight to the obvious points and wrote extensive accounts of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, before coming back to the sources and answering the question. Both Source D and Source E are claiming that the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan are basically the same. Source C also states this in its first sentence. Candidates needed to identify and explain this similarity. Many did, but only after writing several pages of irrelevant material. There were many excellent interpretations of the cartoon.

**Question 4**

This question was not answered as well as cartoon questions in previous years. There was a tendency to describe what was happening in Source F, rather than to interpret the message. Many candidates who did produce an interpretation tended to concentrate on sections of the cartoon, for example, US fear that the house will collapse on their new greenhouse, rather than interpreting the cartoon as a whole. However, there were still many candidates who understood the cartoon as pro-American and were able to make a comparison with Source G which was interpreted more successfully.

**Question 5**

This proved to be a difficult question and although a surprising number were able to score good marks, it was very difficult for the weaker candidates who failed to see any connection between the two sources. Source H gives a clear account of US attitudes towards the Soviet Union. Such attitudes do raise doubt about some of the claims made by Marshall in Source I, for example, that US policy is not directed against any country or doctrine. Some candidates used this as a reason for claiming that Marshall was lying. The best candidates made a more subtle reading of Source I and used references to, for example, the supporting of free institutions, as evidence that Marshall was actually saying something that fitted in perfectly with the attitudes in Source H.

**Question 6**

This question was generally answered well. Only few candidates ignored the sources and wrote an essay on the Marshall Plan and most were able to identify sources on each side of the argument. However, many answers were far too long and as a result, sometimes lost sight of the question. All that is needed is a concise explanation of how some sources support the hypothesis and others do not. Candidates should be encouraged to group the sources rather than writing about them in the order in which they appear in the paper. Some candidates still lose marks by paraphrasing, at some length, each source but then simply asserting that the source does or does not support the hypothesis. In other words, they do everything except explain how the source supports/disagrees with the hypothesis. Few candidates attempted proper evaluation of the sources although there were some who simply claimed they were biased because they were US or Soviet sources. A small minority of Centres appeared to have not prepared their candidates for this question. They had little idea what to do and as a result many marks were lost. The final question on this paper is always of this type.

<p><b>Paper 0470/03</b></p>
-----------------------------

<p><b>Coursework</b></p>
--------------------------

**General comments**

The moderation of coursework proceeded smoothly, with no major problems. Centres despatched samples of their candidates work on time, including details of the tasks set and the mark schemes used. Most of the coursework schemes were well organised and easy for Moderators to follow.

Most Centres used the CIE approved tasks. This ensures that candidates attempt tasks that give them full opportunity to meet the requirements of the assessment objectives. However, it is possible for Centres to devise their own tasks and these can be sent to CIE for approval before they are used with the candidates. The small number of Centres who devised their own tasks this year did so with skill and they worked well. In Assignment 1 it is important to give candidates opportunities to produce explanations, analyses and substantiated arguments. Most assignments investigate historical causation. These must, at least in part, include questions that require candidates to evaluate the comparative importance of different types of causal factors. This assignment can be in the form of an essay or structured questions. It is strongly recommended that Assignment 2 is in the form of structured questions. This allows a range of skills to be targeted: interpretation of sources, cross-referencing between sources, evaluation of sources for reliability and utility, and finally the ability to reach a conclusion about an historical issue based on the critical use of a range of sources. If Centres plan to devise their own assignments it is recommended that they use the CIE approved assignments as models.

Many Centres provide full, relevant and useful annotation of their candidates' work. Moderators found this annotation most useful, particularly when it indicated where and why a certain level in the marking scheme had been awarded.

The general standard of work was similar to previous years. However, rather more Centres had downward adjustments made to their marks. This was due to the large number of candidates who were awarded marks in the high 30s. Coursework is marked out of 40 and the threshold mark for a Grade A is 31. This means that work has to be outstandingly good to merit a mark in the high 30s. Some of this work did indeed merit such marks but there were examples where these marks were too generous. This was usually the case with the marking of Assignment 1, where to gain very high marks, candidates would normally be expected to compare and evaluate the relative importance of a number of causal factors. It is not uncommon to find candidates merely explaining the importance of each causal factor separately and failing to compare their significance. In assignments dealing with short and long term factors one would expect, for high marks, candidates not just to explain the role of examples of such factors but also to explain the difference in function between short and long term factors.

The standard of work in Assignment 2 was impressive. It was particularly noted how well many candidates inform their interpretation and evaluation of source material by use of relevant knowledge and understanding of the historical context.



**Paper 0470/04**  
**Alternative to Coursework**

### General comments

Germany was again the most popular Depth Study. Russia and the USA were also popular, and there were increased numbers of candidates who chose China and the Israeli and Palestinian depth studies.

Examiners commented throughout the marking season on the quality of argument used by the very best candidates. This quality was a combination of their command of language and vocabulary, historical skills and the clarity of the balanced arguments produced. However, there were still many candidates who under-achieved because they had not responded to the prompts in the questions, which required candidates to provide some balance in their answers. This problem, which is seen in **Questions (a)(ii), (a)(iii) and (b)(iv)**, has been commented upon before in previous reports. A further problem applies to **Question (a)(i)** where candidates are asked 'What does the source tell you about....? Support your answer with reference to the source'. Most candidates appreciate that they will be expected to demonstrate that they can draw a number of inferences from the source and show where, from within the source, the supporting evidence can be found. The most common errors for this question are best shown by reference to **Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-45**. Here, candidates were asked to show what Source A told them about the Treaty of Versailles. Some answered by forgetting about the question and the source, and wrote full and developed answers of all they knew about the Treaty of Versailles. Often these answers contained much correct detail, but they did not answer the question that had been asked. A less impressive treatment by some candidates was to copy out the source, word for word.

Most candidates presented their scripts neatly and in an organised fashion, allowing Examiners clear access to their thinking. There were few rubric offences and there was little evidence that candidates suffered from time pressures.

### Comments on specific questions

#### **Depth Study A**

##### *Germany 1918 – 1945*

**Question (a)(i)** has been dealt with above. In **Question (a)(ii)**, candidates often found it difficult to provide a balanced answer. They appreciated that the source suggested that it was the Allies' severe punishment that provoked the desire for revenge, but did not always use the acknowledgement in the source that 'Germans were prepared to make reparations'. Answers to **Question (a)(iii)** were affected by any weaknesses shown in the answers to the previous two questions. It was disappointing to observe how few candidates managed to demonstrate the reliability of each specific source. Many offered stock generalities on bias, but did not apply them to the specific content or provenance of each source.

In answer to **Question (b)(i)**, most knew who the November Criminals were. Sometimes candidates offered the 'stab in the back' development, while others offered correct names. A few variously alluded to the November Criminals as being 'those who committed the murders on the Night of the Long Knives', and as thieves, robbers etc. **Question (b)(ii)** was sometimes misunderstood and answers on the Spartacist Revolt were given, or some spoke about the Munich Putsch, while others gave a combination of both with some of the detail of the Kapp Putsch used as well. However, the large majority answered this question well, had excellent knowledge of the Kapp Putsch and maximum marks were often awarded. The best candidates answered **Question (b)(iii)** with a mixture of developed reasons for the Weimar government being under threat, linked with specific extremists and their followers. There were some very creditable answers to this question. **Question (b)(iv)**, about the lack of Nazi success in the 1920s, had answers that were often one-sided. Also, candidates did not use all of the 1920s, and tended to concentrate on Stresemann's Golden Years to show why the Nazis remained a small party. Some made reference to the 'Great Depression raging in Germany in 1929'. Needless to say, there were some well-informed, well-argued and balanced answers, but they were not as common as usual for this question in this Depth Study.

**Depth Study B***Russia, 1905–1941*

Candidates were easily able to infer from Source A that foreign interference had probably prolonged the Civil War, as well as uniting Russians into fighting a Patriotic War. Several Examiners reported that some candidates alleged that the foreign powers were supporting the Bolshevik cause. Candidates often answered **Question (a)(ii)** using simple mathematics – ‘If 70 per cent supported the Bolsheviks, then up to 30 per cent did not’. Others dwelt upon whether ‘lack of hostility’ was support, and even whether peasants would continue to support the Bolsheviks if the land issue was not solved to their satisfaction – ‘After all, that is why the provisional government lost peasant support’. Perhaps the most disappointing aspect in answers to **Question (a)(iii)** was that some candidates suggested that as both sources were British, they would both be against the Bolsheviks and, thus, could not be trusted. However, better candidates evaluated Source A by the issues of hindsight, purpose, balance and their own contextual knowledge, while Source B evoked the response that the British agent would not be thanked by his government for providing inaccurate information.

**Question (b)(i)** was answered very well by most, although some believed that Germany was among the countries that interfered in the Russian Civil War. Most knew what the Cheka was, but were often limited in the knowledge of its role. They understood that its members were ‘Lenin enforcers’ but, apart from some lengthy and detailed descriptions of the tortures it used, they did not develop other, well-known aspects. Answers to **Question (b)(iii)** linked War Communism to the need to feed the Red Army, but the answers were not developed beyond this. Candidates either moved on to the next question or wrote about events before War Communism or its replacement by the NEP. Many answered **Question (b)(iv)** with one-sided arguments that Trotsky was the single reason for the Bolshevik victory in the Civil War. Better candidates showed how other personalities on both sides, geographical issues, motivation and foreign interference all had a bearing on the outcome.

**Depth Study C***The USA, 1919 – 1941*

Most candidates drew inferences from Source A, and made comments regarding the angry tone of the author’s language. In answer to **Question (a)(ii)**, most candidates could see that there was some balance in the Big Six bankers’ behaviour in, firstly, trying to rally the market, but later selling quietly in their own interests. However, one-sided answers tended to show that the bankers were the villains of the piece and this attitude was mirrored, to an extent, in balanced answers. In answer to **Question (a)(iii)**, candidates were often able to show how the author of Source A might be affected in his judgement because he had lost so much money. Source B was ‘evaluated’ by some by, ‘the writer was not American so he would have told the truth’, or the writer ‘gives so many statistics that it must be right’. It would have been better to show the sheer scale of the losses quoted in the source to answer the question of ‘why so many people were ruined’.

All Examiners experienced answers to **Questions (b)(i)** and **(b)(ii)** that showed that candidates either completely understood the questions or answered them fully, or they gave vague explanations (guesses even). Many confused ‘buying on the margin’ with Hire Purchase. Answers to **Question (b)(iii)** were far more impressive. The problems of farmers and blacks were well known, placed into context and well explained. Some candidates went on to deal with other immigrant groups and minorities. Answers of this type were full, detailed and impressive. There were also some sophisticated answers to **Question (b)(iv)**, where candidates, at times, almost discounted the Wall Street Crash as an important cause of the Great Depression, by explaining all the weaknesses of the US economy that had developed with the boom after the First World War. Weaker candidates tended to dwell upon the causes and story of the Wall Street Crash – often well informed – but these responses did not answer the focus of the set question.

**Depth Study D***China, 1945 – c.1990*

There were a small number of Centres that had prepared for this Depth Study. All candidates were able to find inferences in Source A regarding the Cultural Revolution. Answers to **Question (a)(ii)** varied a great deal. Some, despite the brevity of the source, were able to develop lengthy and balanced answers regarding the regret the Red Guard might have for involvement in the Cultural Revolution. Others responded with a basic ‘It is only one Guard. We do not know what the rest felt’ type answers. In answer to **Question (a)(iii)**, a good deal of relevant knowledge of the Cultural Revolution was shown by some candidates, who were able to give the sources a context, show how the content was narrow by comparison with the whole Cultural Revolution and, thus, they dismissed the sources as of little value.

Almost all candidates knew the significance of Mao's Little Red Book, and also knew good detail of the Red Guards' role in the Cultural Revolution – although some did over concentrate on the more harrowing aspects of the Guards brutal treatment of other Chinese people. There were some astute answers to **Question (b)(iii)**, regarding a range of reasons for Mao's introduction of the Cultural Revolution. These exposed Mao's personal ambitions to restore his own position and his exploitation of the young to generate impetus. Equally, some of the answers to **Question (b)(iv)** were of the highest quality. On face value, it would be hard to argue that the Cultural Revolution was anything else but a mistake, given the deaths and other disastrous outcomes. However, candidates balanced the obvious and well-known negatives against a personal restoration of Mao's fortunes, through a quicker than expected recovery of the Chinese economy, to the emergence of Deng Xiaoping and the new Chinese economy.

### **Depth Study E**

#### *Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century*

A few Centres had prepared to answer questions on this depth study. Also, some individual candidates from other Centres selected this topic. Where preparation and teaching specifically for this Depth Study had taken place, there were good to high quality answers. Where no specific preparation had taken place, answers were vague and sometimes unrelated to the questions. In **Question (a)(i)**, candidates found many inferences which they were able to support from within the source. A few placed the whole in a relevant context and this enhanced their answers. Equally, balanced information was found in the text of Source B to allow even-handed answers to **Question (a)(ii)**. Answers to **Question (a)(iii)** were sometimes limited by lack of knowledge regarding the South African Party (some believed it was the British government), and few attempted to use the provenance to test reliability. Most accepted the content of the sources at face value.

Answers to part **(b)** questions showed an improvement on previous examination seasons. Candidates often had enough knowledge of the Land Act (1913), and of its impact on black farmers, to score very well in **Questions (b)(i)** and **(b)(ii)**. Equally, there were sophisticated answers regarding **Question (b)(iii)**, where candidates appreciated that the British and the Boers shared similar white supremacy views, and balanced this against the strategic importance of the area for Britain, given the rivalries being played out in Europe, which would lead to the First World War. Despite there being some good answers to **Question (b)(iv)**, some candidates did not notice the date limitations of the question and swept very quickly to the apartheid measures of post Second World War South Africa.

### **Depth Study F**

#### *Israelis and Palestinians, 1945 – c.1994*

This depth study showed an increase in popularity on previous seasons. Candidates easily found enough support in Source A to draw inferences about President Sadat's attitude towards Israel as one of change, friendship and peace. The majority of candidates were able to show that there was balance in the cartoon (Source B). The rolling up of the carpet by armed men was a clear message, as were the smiles of Sadat and Begin, but there were a variety of interpretations of what was meant by Begin's hand being behind his back. Most of the answers to **Question (a)(iii)** used the change of policy and the tone of the speech to test for reliability in Source A, but the candidates found more difficulty with Source B. There were attempts to test for reliability by way of contextual knowledge and by way of the British provenance, but these were often under developed and incomplete, thus unconvincing.

Almost invariably, candidates knew the terms of the Camp David Agreement and could list benefits for both countries from the agreement. Answers to **Question (b)(iii)** ranged from the simplistic – 'He was seen as a traitor' – to an assessment of how Sadat's initiative was variously received in different Arab countries, based on self-interest, proximity to Israel etc. Both short and long term issues were explored. Several of the answers to **Question (b)(iv)** were of the highest quality. The evidence presented and the balanced argument were admirable. The USA was not seen as the main impetus for peace in the Middle East as it was a prisoner of its own Jewish lobby in the USA, and it needed oil. Also, it was argued that the USA merely hosted talks, whereas the real work was done by Israeli and Arab diplomats. Beyond this, individual initiatives and recognition, by Jordan for instance, had helped, whereas the European Union had applied pressure and encouragement. The importance of the Norwegian initiative and the Oslo Accords were seen as of the highest value.

**Depth Study G***The Creation of Modern Industrial Society*

A few candidates attempted this depth study. Many inferences, based upon improving the lives of British citizens, were drawn from Source A. However, the majority of candidates saw evidence in Source B of the need to progress the nation by the coming of the railways. Only a few saw the passing of the quiet, rural life as sufficiently valuable to mention it. Answers to **Question (a)(iii)** were almost invariably a balance between benefits and dangers, by listing evidence from the sources at face value. It was highly unusual to find any attempt to test for reliability.

A few candidates were able to name two early railway engineers, but the objections to the building of railways was better understood and relevant reasons were offered. **Question (b)(iii)** proved more difficult, with answers being more general reflections than detailed explanation. In **Question (b)(iv)**, the railways were seen, almost universally, as beneficial to working class people as they provided jobs, transport and a measure of freedom.

**Depth Study H***The Impact of Western Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century*

Clear inferences regarding the different styles of dress, different customs, attitudes and cultures were given in answer to **Question (a)(i)**. Many found that the Boxer poster showed that there was interest in the town for Boxer recruitment, and very few were able to comment on the small crowd and the social atmosphere which offered a counter view. Answers to **Question (a)(iii)** were largely judgements on the content of the sources, and rarely was there an attempt to test the sources' reliability.

**Questions (b)(i)** and **(b)(ii)** were often answered well and with impressive detail. Rather surprisingly, answers to **Question (b)(iii)** showed limited knowledge of why the Boxer Rising failed. Many wrote brief, undeveloped answers or gave a long introduction to explain who the Boxers were. Again, with **Question (b)(iv)**, answers tended to be one-sided and in agreement with the proposition in the question.