

HISTORY

Paper 0470/01

Paper 1

General comments

A number of the Depth Studies were barely attempted and, where they were, it was more by isolated candidates rather than by Centres.

Many of the comments below are on the same lines as previous years. It is still worrying that many candidates appear to be trained exclusively on past questions and always seek to reproduce material used in them to answer questions which may have some similarity, but **are different and require a different use of the material**. Only rarely will a question be reproduced exactly as it was in a previous examination and the candidates must always be ready to adapt their preparation to the wording of the question before them in the present examination.

In causal questions, invariably part **(b)**, candidates **must** concentrate on giving reasons/causes and there will be only limited marks for descriptions of events, even though they may be relevant. Candidates should also be aware that almost all causal questions demand the giving of a number of reasons, although some will be more important than others and should therefore be more fully developed or explained.

Part **(a)** questions are designed to test simple factual knowledge of part of the syllabus and require no analysis or explanations. However, in many cases, candidates like to display their knowledge by offering causes and/or results of the event/happening, and although they should guard against writing at length on these and leaving themselves short of time later on, they will usually get credit for them, although it would not be necessary to include them in order to gain full marks.

There were far fewer rubric infringements this year, although a minority of candidates still submit two Depth Study answers when only one is required. This nearly always works to the disadvantage of the candidate.

There was little sign, generally, of candidates being short of time or unduly hurried, but, of course, some individuals get themselves in a tangle on this.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Questions 1 – 3

There were almost no answers to these questions except by 'rogue' candidates, who scored very low marks on them.

Question 4

There were quite a number of attempts at this question, again largely by individuals rather than by whole Centres. Most were very poor.

- (a)** Most answers simply used the source or wrote about calling up men or making guns etc. Barely any candidates referred to alliances, military talks, military plans and such like.
- (b)** Most answers relied upon the fact that Germany 'was attacking' and so it was self-defence. The events preceding August were rarely mentioned and the issues of alliance obligations with other countries almost totally ignored.
- (c)** A few marks were scraped together by amplifying the source and by giving other alternative causes of war. Few candidates had anything to say about nationalism.

Question 5

This was the most popular question, as nearly all candidates were prepared for a question on the Versailles Treaty. The problem is that many had a very stereotyped knowledge, and failed to use it appropriately.

- (a) Those candidates who knew this generally did very well, and full marks were often awarded where candidates not only showed understanding, but also gave good examples.
- (b) Far too many candidates answered the question 'How was it severe?' or 'Was it severe?' The proper answer was to examine the *reasons* for its severity and this meant looking at the circumstance of the time, the effects of the war, the motives of the victors, past relationships and the pressures of public opinion. Those candidates who saw the thrust of the question usually scored very well on it.
- (c) Candidates had some difficulty getting to grips with this and certainly it was a question that had not been asked before. There were many creditable answers because candidates had to think how to answer it and could not rely upon some pre-planned answer. Inevitably, many simply showed that the Germans disliked the treaty, or parts of it, but that did not answer whether or not they accepted it. In a technical sense, of course, they had no option to accept because of the blockade and the fact that war could not be resumed, but signing the treaty did not mean that Germans accepted it in the sense of a negotiated settlement based on the 14 points of Wilson. Answers should have shown the expressions of discontent in Germany 1919–23, culminating in the non-payment of reparations and the passive resistance to the occupation of the Ruhr. Those who went on to say, briefly, that between 1924 and 1926 there were clear signs of acceptance through Locarno etc. received credit.

Question 6

This was another very popular question, and because candidates had a reasonable knowledge of events, some fairly good marks were earned.

- (a) Generally, this information was well known, but the sequence of events was often shaky and many candidates had Hitler invading Austria.
- (b) Answers were often too simplistic and not accurate. Much was written about 'appeasement' and the idea that Britain was frightened of Hitler (and France frightened to do anything without Britain). Better answers recognised that it was more a question of 'permit' rather than 'could not stop' and that Britain and France had some sympathy with what happened and still looked upon Germany as a bastion against the communist threat than as a threat itself at this stage.
- (c) Weaker answers described what happened with Austria and Czechoslovakia and said Hitler was successful because he obtained both territories (although few made a distinction between Sudetenland and Czechoslovakia). What the Examiners wanted was a clear statement of what Hitler's aims were – i.e. why did he want Austria and Czechoslovakia? – and then to see how far he achieved those aims and at what cost. It was pleasing that some candidates picked out that, although Hitler seemed to have done well up to the taking of Sudetenland, it could be said that the take-over of the rest of Czechoslovakia was a step too far as it caused Britain and France to offer guarantees to Poland, which they kept, thus causing a European war.

Question 7

- (a) Answers to this question were disappointing in that very few candidates knew any details of either. Most just said that Soviet troops occupied, as they drove Germans out and then stayed there and 'rigged' elections. This was usually given for both countries. The few candidates who did know about the London and Lublin Poles or about the post-war coalitions and the coup of 1948 in Czechoslovakia, for example, soon reached high marks.
- (b) Most candidates wrote something on ideology and sometimes disagreements arising from the conferences. A few made something of the changes in leaders, atomic weapons and mistrust. Surprisingly, not many mentioned the move from fighting a common enemy. Poor answers got tied up with the Berlin Blockade or, even worse, the Berlin Wall.

- (c) Reasonable descriptions of relevant policies were given, but candidates found it harder to judge 'successful'. This was, perhaps, because they did not state what each side was trying to achieve and then assess how far they attained their aims. Most conclusions tended to be either the USSR because of the Eastern bloc, or the USA because communism did not spread to the West. There were many Level 3 answers but few level 4 ones.

Question 8

This was the least popular of the modern period questions, but many of those candidates who did choose it were quite well prepared and there were some good marks, especially for part (a) and, to a lesser extent, part (c).

- (a) Either candidates knew it or they did not. Some confused it with 'Perestroika'. There were plenty of 4 mark answers, and some 5 mark answers.
- (b) Answers were a bit thin on why in 1980, but the general reasons were quite well known. There was a tendency to go on to describe the progress of Solidarity in the 1980s, which did not earn much credit unless it was directed to reinforce earlier point about reasons for it. Lech Walesa should have been dealt with in rather more detail than the passing reference given by some.
- (c) Most answers concentrated on giving the reasons for the fall of communism and then tried to show the part in those of Gorbachev's reforms. They often failed to get across his effect on changing attitudes outside the USSR, even though the source was a help there. Not many, therefore, got to grips with assessing 'how far?', and Level 4 answers were very scarce.

Section B – Depth studies

Germany 1918-45

This was the most popular section, accounting for probably half the answers. Knowledge was quite sound on **Question 9** but **Question 10** seemed to expose gaps. Candidates must realise that this depth study topic goes on to 1945, and does *not* end in 1939.

Question 9

This was the more popular question of the two, and candidates scored better marks on it.

- (a) Most candidates scored at least 3 or 4 marks here. Even those whose knowledge of actual events in Munich were a bit shaky could still find enough accurate material to get them a good mark.
- (b) Most candidates interpreted this as 'Was it a success?', whereas they should have been finding reasons why it was successful, which was somewhat more searching. They should have been looking for the changing attitudes in the former victors and in Germany, the willingness of the USA to become involved economically, and the agreements at Locarno paving the way for the acceptance of Germany in the League. Again, those who saw the demands of the question often did very well.
- (c) The failing here was that not many candidates showed clearly what the problems had been. The nearest was usually to comment on hyperinflation and then the financial reforms. The lack of stability in government and the threats from extreme parties was more often ignored, although there was occasionally a reference to the apparent strength of Weimar whilst Stresemann was there. Better answers usually went on to show that the 'recovery' might have been illusory as much of it came crashing down after 1930, i.e. world Depression, drying up of US loans and rise of Nazi party.

Question 10

This seemed to attract a few candidates who had not studied the topic but thought that they knew something about the 'Final Solution'.

- (a) Almost all candidates scored some marks on this, with many giving examples of inmates and how the idea of the camps changed as time went on.

- (b) This part was not well done. Few candidates really knew about the coming of the 'Final Solution' policy and assumed it was there all the time and that Jews were exterminated in numbers from day 1 of the camps. A few had good knowledge and detail, with examples of the worst or most efficient of the camps and how the policy accelerated as the war became worse for Germany, and these comfortably scored 6 or 7 marks.
- (c) Very few candidates had much idea on this and turned it into a question on pre-war opposition and this got little credit. A few really knew about the small opposition groups which tried to make protests, e.g. White Rose, but few had any knowledge of the plots against Hitler and especially the bomb plot which came near to success. The attitude of military leaders as the war sank towards defeat, with Hitler's unpredictable ideas overruling them in vital aspects, hardly surfaced at all.

Russia 1905 – 41

This was a fairly popular topic, with rather more answers to **Question 12** than to **Question 11**. Marks generally ran higher on the collectivisation question.

Question 11

- (a) This part produced fair answers, although many of them were not specifically about **political** grievances. The dreadful social and economic conditions prevailing for much of the population could be brought in but received best credit if linked to lack of political influence. The hatred of the Okhrana, which should have been prompted by the source picture, was rarely mentioned.
- (b) This information was quite well known, although many candidates interpreted the question narrowly as 'reasons why it failed in 1905'. Best answers went on to show that not only did the risings of 1905 fail, but that it never stood much chance of achieving anything for reasons outlined.
- (c) Candidates found this a bit awkward and some thought that it implied comment on ability to wage war in 1914. There should have been some discussion and analysis of what went on in Russia between 1905 and 1914. This could apply to the position of the Czar and the 'government', the feelings of revolution which were there in 1905 and the call for revolution and the social/economic position (Stolypin). It would have been sensible to have finished by briefly looking forward to 1917 and the ills befalling Russia between 1914 and the revolution, but this only as a 'run out' to the question.

Question 12

- (a) There was obviously some overlap with part (b), because candidates generally found it necessary to say something about why collectivisation was introduced in order to answer 'what was collectivisation?' However, the Examiners were looking for some description of how it worked and what the principles behind it were, rather than why it was introduced and so there was little credit for reasons here. The results were also often given and there were some marks available for those.
- (b) This question was well known, although some aspects were given insufficient attention, e.g. part of communist philosophy, brought peasantry under direct control of Party. Some candidates gave too much attention to Stalin's desire to get rid of the kulaks although it was, of course, relevant.
- (c) The main problem here was finding something to judge 'successfully' by. Many candidates just vaguely talked about production being increased or not increased, but few had any hard facts to give on this or were prepared to show that there was an official version of events and a 'real' version. Answers should have gone back to part (b) to answer this, for by taking the reasons for collectivisation they could have determined whether or not these, or some of them, were achieved in whole or part. Candidates must recognise that to assess 'success' they must have yardsticks.

The USA 1919 – 41

Answers were well divided between the two questions; marks awarded tended to be higher for **Question 13**.

Question 13

- (a) Most candidates scored well on this, and certainly better than on the previous occasion it was tested on the Paper.

- (b) There were many good answers to this, with many candidates dealing with the immediate and practical reasons why it did not work and also the inherent problems of a society which was increasingly urban. The source was used to good effect by many.
- (c) These were often not well-organised arguments; indeed sometimes it was difficult to tell whether the writer was showing tolerance or intolerance. Many candidates resorted to listing things like the KKK as examples of intolerance without really looking at examples of tolerance, and so no comparison could be made and no effective judgement on 'to what extent?' There were many who wanted to answer an earlier year's question on lawlessness and followed part (b) on prohibition with long accounts of gangsterism and crime.

Better answers picked up on the legal cases against immigrants and anarchists, the fundamentalism of some rural areas (rejection of Darwinism) and the improvements in status for women and the relaxation of convention in ways of life. There was plenty of material here but careful thought was needed to organise it effectively.

Question 14

- (a) Answers to this part were generally sound, with most linking it to speculation and the stock market.
- (b) The source gave a good lead in here but many chose to ignore it. Answers, on the whole, were thin in material and most said little beyond it 'would provide employment'. The example, the control and the variety of project which would ensue were, to a large extent, not mentioned or only received a passing reference. Some candidates used the question as a route for unloading all they knew about the 'New Deal' and about the alphabet agencies in particular, and candidates must realise that this thoughtless repetition or description of events will gain little credit in a causal question unless linked specifically to causes.
- (c) As in some previous questions, the problem for many was that they provided no means of measuring 'success'. Just to describe what Roosevelt did and then to say at the end that it brought more employment or that it did not solve the unemployment problem is only likely to be a marginal Level 3 answer. Candidates should also be aware that they need to place events into the historical context and show that, even though something may not have been totally successful, it could still be categorised as successful because of the circumstances prevailing at the time.

There were so few answers to any of the other Depth Studies that general comment is not appropriate.

Paper 0470/02

Paper 2

General comments

The overall performance of candidates was about the same as in previous years with the same strengths and weaknesses evident. Sources (especially cartoons) were interpreted effectively and written sources were investigated in detail. However, some candidates displayed poor technique when asked to compare sources and evaluation of sources was again a general weakness. It was also noticeable that a number of candidates showed themselves well able to interpret and even evaluate sources, but failed to use their conclusions to address the question set. This was particularly the case with questions about the issues of proof and utility. It is important that candidates do actually answer the question set.

A small number of candidates answered questions on the 19th Century topic when they had clearly been prepared for the 20th Century topic. They might have done this because the 19th Century Topic appears first. It is important to remind candidates to answer the questions for which they have been prepared. Although there were many good answers to the 19th Century questions, there were also a number where the candidates displayed total ignorance of the topic and did very badly.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: 19th Century Topic

Question 1

Most candidates were able to explain ways in which the source does justify the South's decision to leave the Union but failed to qualify their answers by explaining ways in which the source does not justify the decision. As a consequence, many candidates scored reasonable marks, but few scored very good marks.

Question 2

Answers to this question were divided between those that only used the surface information from the poster and those that were able to make inferences. The best answers explained how the poster tells us something about the attitude of northerners towards slavery, because of the fact that they are trying to help slaves avoid recapture. A few candidates failed to use their contextual knowledge, misunderstood the poster, and claimed that it was issued to encourage people to catch slaves.

Question 3

This question was answered well. Most candidates were able to use their contextual knowledge to produce valid answers. For example, 'the creation of the heroic image of John Brown means that it must have come from the North and could not have come from the South because...' There were a few candidates who displayed no contextual knowledge and got the sources the wrong way round.

Question 4

A small number of candidates simply repeated the information in the poster, while a few stated that it was published then because there was an election and no further explanation was offered. Better candidates identified a valid purpose and then explained, in context, why some people wanted to stop Lincoln being elected. The best candidates, and there were a reasonable number, placed their answers in the context of 1860.

Question 5

This question was answered well. Many candidates were able to compare Sources F and G on the one hand, with Source H. However, those candidates who simply assumed that Source F and G are saying the same thing failed to reach the top level. A careful reading of these two sources shows agreements, but it will also reveal differences.

Question 6

There were many interesting answers to this question. A few candidates simply claimed that he must have been lying because of the differences between the two sources. Better candidates used their contextual knowledge to explore the purpose of Lincoln at the time of Source I and his different purpose at the time of Source J.

Question 7

A few candidates wrote essays with no reference to the sources. These answers will always receive low marks. However, the majority of candidates were able to show how some sources support the view that Lincoln was to blame, and how other sources support the view that other factors were responsible. There was little attempt to evaluate the sources and so even the best candidates failed to gain full marks.

Option B: 20th Century Topic

Question 1

This question proved to be more demanding than similar questions in past years. This was due to the fact that finding agreements and disagreements was not straightforward. A number of candidates simply paraphrased each source and made no attempt to make matches. It cannot be stressed enough that candidates should always be encouraged to compare sources point by point, rather than by writing about

each source in turn. However, better candidates were able to find some matches, e.g. the leaking of the Pact to the newspapers, the desire of Britain and France not to upset Mussolini. Disagreements include: Source A says that oil was banned Source B says it was not, Source A says Mussolini may have accepted the Pact, Source B says he was ready to accept it. Only a few candidates identified agreements and disagreements, and only a handful of candidates reached the top level of the mark scheme by comparing the overall message of each source, i.e. Source B is more hostile towards Britain and France. Candidates who compare the overall messages of sources will always score more highly than those who restrict their answers to comparisons of detail.

Question 2

This question produced a wide range of answers. Weaker candidates simply described the surface features of the cartoon. A number of better candidates wrongly thought that the cartoonist was suggesting that Britain and France were genuinely doing their best to restrain Mussolini. However, a good number of candidates used their contextual knowledge to reach a more satisfactory interpretation of the cartoon. They were able to see that Low was suggesting that Britain and France were not really trying to restrain Mussolini. Many of the candidates referred to the roller skates in support of their answer. The top level was reserved for those candidates, and there was an encouraging number of them, who made explicit use of details in the cartoon and of their contextual knowledge to support their answers. Many made reference to Britain and France's fear of Germany being a reason why they did not want to upset Mussolini.

Question 3

This question produced many good answers. Weaker candidates simply described, or even interpreted, each source separately and failed to answer the question. Many candidates were able to explain that both sources show him to be worried about oil, and an encouraging number went on to add that there are, however, aspects of Source D that he would not have agreed with, e.g. being called a 'madman'. The top level in the mark scheme was reserved for candidates who realised that Source E had to be evaluated. This could be done by using other sources or contextual knowledge. Few candidates attempted this.

Question 4

Some candidates produced good evaluations of Source F but failed to relate this to the question – does Source F prove that E was wrong? Other candidates compared the content of the two sources and found similarities/differences, but again failed to address the issue of proof. There were, however, a good number of candidates who did consider proof, either by comparing the sources or by evaluating them. The latter led to better marks.

Question 5

This question produced a wide variety of answers. Weaker candidates accepted Source H at face value or argued that members of the League would be upset by what Haile Selassie says about them in Source G. Better candidates used their contextual knowledge and understanding to explore how likely it might be that the League would have agreed more with one than the other. Some of these answers went further and argued that different members of the League would have reacted differently, e.g. small and large nations.

Question 6

Some candidates produced a valid interpretation of the cartoon but failed to address the issue of utility. However, there were many good answers with an encouraging number of candidates explaining how the cartoon is useful as evidence of the German perspective at the time.

Question 7

This final question was not answered as well as in previous years. Candidates had no problems in using the sources to show how Britain and France were to blame, but many failed to show how other sources show how Italy (or the League) was to blame. This restricted many answers to Level 2 of the mark scheme. Candidates are still reluctant to attempt evaluation of the sources in this question. As previous reports have made clear, extra marks are awarded for doing this.

Paper 0470/03

Coursework

General comments

Very few Centres enter candidates for the coursework option in the November examination. For detailed feedback on coursework, Centres are advised to read the coursework report for the summer examination.

The overall quality was high, although not quite as high as in previous years. The assignments were appropriate and enabled candidates to show what they could do in relation to the assessment objectives. Generally speaking, the quality of work was higher on the source work (Objective 3), where candidates displayed the ability to interpret and evaluate sources in context. In the assignments testing Objectives 1 and 2, there was a tendency for some candidates to write lengthy narratives instead of causal explanations.

Most Centres provided useful annotation to candidates' work, showing where and why marks were awarded. The marking was generally accurate but a little harsh, especially on the work testing source skills. Most Centres had small upwards adjustments made to their marks.

Paper 0470/04

Alternative to Coursework

General comments

There were some outstanding examples of high quality answers found in this season's scripts, and there were a larger number of candidates who impressed the Examiners with their knowledge and technique. Equally, there was a perception that many of the middle range candidates performed better, as did some of those whose area record have previously shown lower average scores. All these candidates must be congratulated on their efforts and performance.

However, there were still far too many candidates who under achieved as a result of poor technique or ignorance of what was expected in their responses. In the Principal Examiner's Report on the November 2000 examination, comment was made on these same aspects. In Part **(a)** questions, some candidates still did not appreciate that all answers must reflect information gleaned from the sources given in the question paper. Comment and inference must be based on the source in order for the question to be answered and marks to be gained. In Question **(a)(i)**, the prompt "What can you tell from this source about...", was often ignored. Candidates wrote "All I know about X" type answers about a key word or name they had identified in the source of the question. It is impossible to award any marks for answers that do not answer the question that has been set, and the candidates will have wasted much time and effort. Even more frustrating is the fact that often much of these irrelevant answers contain correct information. In Question **(a)(ii)** the "How far?" prompt suggests the need for a balanced answer, giving both sides of the argument. Many weaker candidates offered only one-sided arguments or descriptions to satisfy an imagined question. Also, in **(a)(iii)** questions, a balance is also required in the argument and, although candidates often compared the content of the sources, only superior candidates challenged reliability of one or both sources to come to a reasoned conclusion.

Part **(b)** questions demand answers based much more on knowledge and information. However, Question **(b)(iv)** still requires a balanced answer. Successful candidates offered this balance, couched in persuasive arguments. Weaker candidates wrote brief, one-sided efforts that often contained little information and no argument.

Despite the above criticism, there was much for the Examiners to applaud in the quality of many scripts. Also, the attempts to keep answer papers clearly labelled and clearly written again helped to ensure that the full meaning and thrust of candidates' answers were readily obvious. There was a slight increase in the number of rubric offences this session, but not a substantial one.

Comments on specific Depth Studies

Germany was by far the most popular Depth Study with the candidates, and a very large majority chose it. Russia, America and Southern Africa were the next most popular in this season of examinations. Other Depth Studies were chosen by candidates from a few Centres that had prepared for the subject matter. Sometimes they were chosen by individual candidates desperate to find any question that they could recognise.

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918 – 45

In answers to **Question (a)(i)**, many good candidates were able to draw clear inferences from the source and demonstrate where, within the source, the evidence was to be found that supported the inferences. Weaker candidates wrote general appreciations of Hitler's life story or copied out the source. As with all **(a)(i)** questions, the difference in the quality of answers was considerable. In **(a)(ii)** answers, the difference in quality was underlined by good candidates offering a contrast between the methods used by the Nazi Party shown in Source B with other methods not mentioned in the source. Some of these explanations were full and clear.

Some weaker candidates showed how important the SA and SS were to the Nazi Party, whilst others recounted the rivalry between the two groups and made detailed reference to the Night of the Long Knives. Many candidates omitted to mention the very same information when answering **Question (b)(iii)** on the Night of the Long Knives.

In answer to **Question (a)(iii)**, most candidates were able to offer some kind of comparison between the sources, usually their content. However, there were still many candidates who chose to see the question as an invitation to select one of the sources and write about it, rather than appreciate that they were being invited to compare the qualities and limitations of both sources. Candidates tested the reliability of Source B by reference to the Social Democrat provenance, but few referred to the tone or contradictions between the speech and ideas contained in *Mein Kampf*, for example. Some candidates had, however, alleged in their answers to **Question (a)(i)** that Hitler was lying.

For many candidates, **Questions (b)(i), (b)(ii) and (b)(iii)** held few terrors, and they were familiar with the subject matter. The best candidates offered balanced and thoughtful answers to **Question (b)(iv)** and showed that terror was only one aspect of the methods used by the Nazi Party to remain in power. As already stated, weaker candidates did not recognise that they needed to provide information that they had previously recorded in answer to earlier questions, or they became confused by personalities or events that required recall in Part **(b)**.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905 – 41

Both sources appeared to be accessible to most candidates, and they were able to draw inferences regarding coercion from Source A, although there were a substantial number of candidates who copied out the source in part or in total. This added little to their answers or their marks. Source B (**Question (a)(ii)**) proved to have sufficient information to candidates for them to offer evidence of Trotsky's importance in the Civil War. Indeed, most answers argued that the source only demonstrated Trotsky's importance. Few commented that the source did not demonstrate that Trotsky's promises were kept, or that there were other equally important aspects to his importance. Weaker candidates drifted from the thrust of the question to give general histories of Trotsky's achievements. Some candidates confused Lenin, Trotsky and Stalin. This happened in answers to other questions as well.

Good candidates saw the limitations in the reliability of both sources in their provenances, and they argued their cases with skill and sophistication. Some questioned the veracity of Source B by showing what happened to those whose loyalty was under suspicion in Source A. Several candidates asserted, rather endearingly, that as Source A was "from a British report", it was trustworthy. The majority of candidates contrasted the content of the two sources and added background information. Most candidates found ways of gaining some marks from their answers.

Although a substantial number of candidates understood why other countries sent troops to support the Whites in the Civil War, many were confused by the term "War Communism". Common offerings in answers to this question were descriptions of Communism versus Capitalism, the NEP, general guesses or the sources copied. It was rare to find answers where the candidate had a command of the required information. More candidates were able to give reasons for the Bolshevik victory, but the extent that the NEP brought changes in Russia after 1921 was often answered in the affirmative only. Again, there were examples of confusion between the NEP, War Communism and, indeed, the Five Year Plans.

Despite the above comments, it must be said that candidates from a number of Centres had excellent knowledge, technique and had prepared well for this Depth Study. Their scripts were among the very best seen in this season of examinations.

Depth Study C: The United States of America, 1919 – 41

Many candidates saw the words “impact on the USA” in Question **(a)(i)** and wrote general essays about the New Deal, listing Roosevelt’s achievements. Some argued that the list of suggestions of what the workers might do to assist in the recovery was compelling evidence that, with so many options, the recovery must be complete. Although there were some fluent answers, many found difficulty in defining for themselves what the source was trying to say. Most candidates felt that the cartoon (Source B) was completely against Roosevelt and the New Deal, listing many details to support the theory. A few candidates felt that the cartoon wholly supported Roosevelt, but it was unusual to find scripts where both sides of the argument were explored. The expression on Roosevelt’s face fascinated many and it was variously described as “self-satisfied”, “confident” and even “manic”.

The answers to Question **(a)(iii)** showed that some candidates could only repeat what they had said in previous answers. Reliability for Source A was asserted as it was from a factory owner (often critics of Roosevelt), asking his workers to support the New Deal, and there was much speculation regarding possible sponsors for the cartoon.

Candidates found little difficulty in identifying valid reasons for the introduction of the Civilian Conservation Corps, or in describing the work of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Candidates from many Centres showed that their learning of these elements had been good, enjoyable and that the material was well understood. Question **(b)(iii)** caused problems for many; some confused the reference to “trade unions” with “trade” and wrote about improved international commerce. Other candidates guessed as to the meaning of the question incorrectly, while others left the answer paper blank. However, it must also be said that some candidates gave full answers to this question, commenting on the anti-union atmosphere during Republican presidencies, the opposition of “big business” and the various agencies and law introduced by Roosevelt that sponsored or encouraged membership of a union. Most who answered the charge that Roosevelt was trying to establish a dictatorship, wrote strongly in his defence, but used little by way of detail to support their arguments. These were emotional responses. Much more detail was made available by those who could list groups or individuals who accused Roosevelt, and these candidates were always more likely to offer balanced answers.

Depth Study D: China, 1945 – c.1990

Very few Centres had prepared for this Depth Study but their candidates, and the few looking for something recognisable to answer, found the photograph in Source A provocative. Their answers to Questions **(a)(i)** and **(a)(iii)** were dominated by this image. Source B appeared less attractive and provoked little by way of comment.

The first three questions in Part **(b)** proved straightforward for most candidates, although Question **(b)(iv)** was found to be more difficult. Candidates answered with general comments on agricultural improvements, and the date of 1962 in the question appeared not to be helpful to candidates or of much importance in their answers.

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

In Question **(a)(i)**, for those candidates who did not copy out the whole source, there were many opportunities to draw valid inferences. There was a strong contrast between the results of those who understood what was required by the question and those who did not. Indeed, weaker candidates often answered the question on “poor whites” (Source B) by continuing to comment on the treatment of black Africans, or contrasting the treatment of both, or copying out the source. It was uncommon to find candidates who attempted the specific question that had been set or offered some balance in their arguments. Answers to Question **(a)(iii)** usually concentrated on Source A, sometimes compared the content of both, but rarely tested for reliability.

Equally, the answers to Part **(b)** questions were disappointing. They infrequently addressed the main thrust of the questions, and whatever date was given in the questions, the answers were often made in the context of the post-1980 period. Thus, few marks could be gained.

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

Very few candidates attempted this Depth Study. Examiners commented on the need of candidates in Part **(a)** answers to concentrate on the actual content of the sources. Often they created answers in a general context of the conflict described. For those that had prepared for this option, Part **(b)** recall answers enabled candidates to register scores. Examiners did not comment on outstanding scripts.

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

There were a small number of attempts at this Depth Study, and again some candidates had prepared whilst others tried to find a question to answer. For whatever reason, Part **(a)** answers were better than Part **(b)** answers. Candidates found it easier to work with the concrete evidence of the sources in front of them, rather than produce specific knowledge to support assertions in answer to Part **(b)** questions.

Depth Study H: the Impact of Western Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century

This was the least popular Depth Study in this season of examination. There were very few attempts and Examiners recorded no outstanding scripts or issues.

Conclusion

The general standard continues to rise gradually each year. There were some outstanding scripts from some Centres and good improvement by some candidates from areas that had struggled in the past. However, even greater improvements in the overall standard could be made if candidates addressed the specific sources and their content, and the specific questions asked in Part **(a)** of the question paper. Also, candidates must attempt a balance in their answers and arguments to questions where prompts such as “How far?” “How useful?”, and “To what extent?” are used.