

CONTENTS

HISTORY	2
Paper 0470/01 Paper 1	2
Paper 0470/02 Paper 2	5
Paper 0470/03 Coursework.....	7
Paper 0470/04 Alternative to Coursework.....	8

HISTORY

Paper 0470/01

Paper 1

General comments

Factual knowledge demonstrated by the candidates continues to improve and this is particularly helpful to candidates when answering the **(a)** part of a question. This improvement has resulted in candidates scoring higher marks overall on the paper. However, it is important that, in addition to knowledge, candidates are able to explain that knowledge within the context of a part **(b)** or **(c)** question if they wish to achieve higher-level marks. Within these two parts of the question, 60% of the marks available are allocated to this skill. Whilst improvement in this area has taken place, all too often the Examiner is left thinking 'so?' after a clearly identified point is made, but not explained.

Candidates should be encouraged to read the question carefully, and take a little time to compose their thoughts, prior to committing their ideas to paper. Many opted for **Question 5** this year, yet managed to lose marks by not answering the questions as set. In this question, Wilson was brought into part **(a)**, part **(b)** was rewritten as 'what were the terms of the Treaty of Versailles', with the 'cause problems' often being ignored and part **(c)** answered as if the terms were to be judged rather than the Treaty as a whole. This attention to detail is important if candidates are to achieve their full potential.

Examiners noted an increase in rubric infringements this session compared to previous ones. This usually was the attempting of both questions from the depth study. Time did not appear to be a problem for a significant majority of candidates.

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 questions

Questions 1-3 failed to attract many responses and therefore comments from this limited number of candidates would not be very helpful.

Question 4

The nature and course of Anglo-German naval rivalry was generally well known, particularly about Dreadnoughts. The responses to part **(b)** indicated some knowledge of Plan 17 and the Schlieffen Plan, but often there was a lack of understanding of the chronology of events which did not help in the development of an answer. In general the causes of the First World War were well known, with many producing strong answers on the Balkans and Sarajevo. This enabled many to reach the top mark within Level 3. An understanding of the invasion of Belgium was less strong, although many linked this to Britain, gaining a mark within Level 4.

Question 5

This proved to be an extremely popular question, although the quality of responses varied considerably. In responses to part **(a)**, many were able to state in detail the demands of Clemenceau, with some giving details of demands he made that were not met. This approach allowed candidates to score up to four marks. Although less strong on Lloyd George, the detail known was still considerable for many. Those candidates who did not differentiate between the demands of the two individuals were limited to a mark of two. Those who used the terms of the Treaty often gave inaccurate answers such as 'Clemenceau wanted the Rhineland demilitarised'. Others brought Wilson into their answers; this made the responses over long and wasted time. In part **(b)**, candidates were well informed about the economic consequences of the Treaty, though some made inaccurate connections between the payment of reparations, inflation and hyperinflation, not recognising the significance of the Ruhr invasion. Many candidates developed the political problems of the young Republic but not all showed these problems were linked to Versailles. Many in answers to part **(c)** equated 'unfair' with 'harsh' and often listed the terms that they considered harsh. Others were able to argue from both sides in a clear manner and then support their argument with relevant examples.

Question 6

Many good responses were seen in relation to part **(a)** although some candidates did write more about what the League did rather than its aims. Part **(b)** proved to be challenging to many. There were many answers seen by Examiners which identified in some detail the successes of the League but then failed to explain why they were a success. There were a number of candidates who, incorrectly, thought Kellogg-Briand and Locarno were League successes. In gaining understanding of the League it is important that candidates' understand the reasons behind the achievements or as in part **(c)**, the failures of the League. Here there were many good answers that developed the rise of dictators, the Manchurian and Abyssinian crises and the role of Britain and France. Some did struggle to make links between the depression and the League, often limiting their argument in some way to the fact that the USA was not a member.

Question 7

Despite a number of responses that had the answer to part **(b)** within the answer to part **(a)**, answers overall to these two sections were reasonably strong. Responses to **(c)** were, overall, poor. Quite a number failed to show any understanding of Solidarity, often linking it in some way to Berlin. Knowledge of Gorbachev and the situation in Eastern Europe was limited and there were few references to perestroika or glasnost. These limitations nullified the good marks achieved in the first two parts.

Question 8

The course of relations between the USA and Cuba was quite well known. Most candidates wrote about the overthrow of Batista and the fear of Cuba becoming communist. Answers generally included some reference to the Bay of Pigs. Few referred to sugar or the breaking of diplomatic relations. A small number went beyond 1961 and wasted time. Responses to **(b)** were varied with some just describing the events of the Crisis to those who developed explanation around nearness to USA, the spread of communism, the sphere of influence and the fear of war. It was encouraging to note that some candidates were not prepared to accept the hypothesis of the question, and in some instances argue for the USA and in others, that neither side won. Some confusion did exist over the USA missiles in Turkey in relation to how, when and why these were removed.

Depth Studies

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-45

Question 9

Part **(a)** produced some good answers relating to the Nazi Party and the aims of Hitler. A small number did stray into the 1930s for the implementation but this did not gain credit. In the answers to part **(b)**, candidates were particularly strong on the Stresemann era and the fact that his success meant little opportunity for extremists. Only a few candidates looked at the Nazis themselves either at the time of the Putsch or its aftermath, or the fact that the Nazis were not successful in Bavaria, let alone Germany. Answers to part **(c)** were often disappointing. Candidates were better on the Wall Street Crash, linking unemployment with extremist parties, than on the failings of Weimar or the political activities of Von Papen and others.

Question 10

Part **(a)** produced many concise answers that were straight to the point. Conscription, rearmament and the building of autobahns were almost universally referred to in responses, with many receiving at least Level 2/3 or Level 2/4 marks. Many answers to part **(b)** were disappointing. Candidates often concentrated on the rewards women received for having babies, rather than answering the question. Some did refer to Hitler's alarm at the falling birth rate, whilst others gained credit for employment issues and men for the army. Part **(c)** produced many one sided responses that dealt almost entirely with the brutal control exercised by the Nazis over some groups and the use of propaganda. The detail produced about opposition by a limited number of candidates often lacked any explanation and little was seen about the Swing movement or the Edelweiss Pirates.

*Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-41***Question 11**

In response to part (a), most candidates were aware of war communism and why it was introduced. Some very good responses were seen to part (b), with candidates explaining a number of points as to why the Bolsheviks were successful. Others contented themselves with opposites of a small number of reasons. This approach only gained credit once as the opposite was not credited. Many in part (c) were able to explain why the NEP was a success, but beyond, 'it was not communist', very few were able to argue that it was not the success it was claimed to be.

Question 12

The majority of candidates who attempted this question did not demonstrate the depth of understanding that was required. Part (a) was answered better than the other two parts. Particularly disappointing was the lack of explanation as to why the Purges were carried out. The mark scheme allowed for 'purges' to be interpreted in its widest sense, but many answers were limited to a descriptive approach of 'what happened' rather than 'why' it happened. Answers to (c) were often superficial, such as 'he was economically good; humanely bad'.

*Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-41***Question 13**

Part (a) was generally well done. There were many candidates who knew about buying on the margin, the overvaluation of companies, and panic selling. Whilst a significant number of candidates scored reasonably well on their answers to part (b), this was often achieved through an accumulation of a number of identified points, rather than explanation of a few. An example of this was the phrase 'rugged individualism' which was often quoted but rarely explained. In (c), candidates accounted for Roosevelt's success by blaming everything on Hoover's failings, thus limiting their answer. Often Roosevelt's actions related to after the election rather than the promises he made prior and which secured his election to the Presidency.

Question 14

Candidates displayed good knowledge of Roosevelt's policy towards the banks. On the TVA, many candidates described the situation in the Tennessee Valley then referred to a number of reasons why the Authority was established, but did not link these points to those made in the description. For example, drought and flooding might be referred to, then, in the next paragraph the candidate would write about the construction of dams, mentioning that the work brought employment but failing to relate dams as a means of holding floodwater and irrigating land. Answers to part (c) were often brief, with a lack of developed points to score the higher level marks. An example of this related to the Alphabet Agencies – though often mentioned, examples of their effectiveness were rarely given.

Questions 15-19

These failed to attract many responses.

*Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c1994***Question 20**

A small number of answers were seen to this question and one Examiner commented that the candidates had been well prepared for the demands of the examination. Part (a) was well answered whilst in response to part (b), candidates were aware of three main reasons for Britain's actions and these were well explained. In (c), candidates found it easier to argue the case for the continuing problems but some did find counter arguments to put their answers into Level 4.

Questions 21-25

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

<p>Paper 0470/02</p>

<p>Paper 2</p>

General comments

The overall performance of the candidates was similar to that of last year. The entry for the nineteenth century was small but the performance of the candidates was similar to that of candidates entered for the twentieth century option. There were few examples of candidates not being able to understand the sources but rather more were unsure what some of the questions required them to do. It is important that candidates answer the question. Marks were thrown away for example in **Question 3** (nineteenth century) and in **Question 2** (twentieth century) by candidates failing to explain whether they were surprised or not. In questions requiring a comparison of sources, it is common to find the sources being interpreted but not compared.

It is also important that candidates support their answers with evidence from the sources. It is not enough to make assertions (even valid) about the sources. These must be illustrated by referring to details in the sources. One significant failing this year was to use the sources for surface information rather than as evidence of the opinions/attitudes of the author.

Some candidates are still unsure about how to use their contextual knowledge. They should be told that contextual knowledge should never be included in an answer for its own sake. All the questions in this paper are about the sources. Knowledge should only be used when it helps the candidates say something better about the source. This might involve using knowledge to interpret the source, make inferences from the source (e.g. about purpose) or to evaluate the sources for utility or reliability.

Comments on particular questions

Twentieth Century

Question 1

This question was generally answered well. Many candidates scored full marks by explaining how the source is sympathetic to one country (Russia was the usual choice, and the devastation caused by the war the most popular example) and unsympathetic to the other, or by explaining how it is sympathetic to both countries but qualifying this by giving an example of the source also being unsympathetic to one of them. These answers were supported by specific reference to the content of **Source A**. Some candidates scored fewer marks because although they were able to explain their reasons for choosing one country, they failed to explain examples of the source being unsympathetic to the other country.

A significant minority of candidates limited themselves to Level 2 of the mark scheme by, for example, choosing the Soviet Union but then only giving examples of the source being unsympathetic to the USA (the source's comments about Truman were usually referred to). It was encouraging to see only a few candidates paraphrasing or copying the source and failing to answer the question. The only common misunderstanding was that many candidates thought that the reference to the Soviet Union acting as a bully was anti-Soviet, whereas of course, it is really evidence of the US attitude towards the Soviets.

Question 2

The candidates had more problems with this question although there were some Centres where nearly all their candidates scored high marks. In 'Are you surprised' questions it is important to interpret the sources correctly, as well as check what they claim against contextual knowledge.

Some candidates produced poor answers because they concentrated on the surface content of **Sources B** and **C** (especially **B**), rather than using the sources as evidence of the attitudes of the country where the sources originated. For example, **Source B** provides us with evidence of US opinions about what the Soviets were doing in Germany. Many candidates, however, used it for surface information e.g. that the removals would lead to destruction of employment. The question was asking candidates to use their knowledge to explain whether they were surprised by the American attitudes in **Source B** or the Soviet attitudes shown in **Source C**.

Some candidates interpreted the sources but failed to answer the question by not explaining whether they were surprised or not. Other candidates were placed in low levels because they looked for internal contradictions within the sources, or they compared the two sources for differences.

At the top end of the mark scheme, some candidates understood what was required but only made vague references to the Cold War. The top level was reserved for candidates who used specific contextual knowledge to explain whether or not they were surprised by the attitudes or opinions demonstrated in the sources.

Question 3

In this question candidates are required to infer the purpose of the Soviets in publishing this cartoon by interpreting the message of the cartoon and by using their contextual knowledge to work out why the Soviets would want to publish such a message at that particular time.

Some candidates misinterpreted the cartoon. Some failed to recognise Hitler while others uncritically accepted the claims of the cartoon that Churchill had himself created the Iron Curtain to maintain British power. These candidates failed to use the cartoon as evidence of Soviet attitudes. Some candidates made valid, but unsupported, assertions e.g. that the Soviets hated Churchill or there was a Cold War at the time. However, on the whole, the question was answered well. Some candidates answered why it was published then by explaining the context of 1946 (many were able to make specific reference to Churchill's Iron Curtain speech). These candidates, however, failed to explain the message of the curtain and so did not explain why the Soviets wanted to publish that particular cartoon. Other candidates answered the question the other way round. They explained the message of the cartoon but failed to set it in its context. The top levels were reserved for answers that did both – interpreted the message of the cartoon and explained the context.

Question 4

Some candidates failed to evaluate the sources for utility. They simply claimed that the sources were unreliable. A common misunderstanding among other candidates was to assume that because the sources were biased, they could not be useful. However, a large number of candidates were able to go beyond this and explained how the sources are useful as evidence of the opinions of the US and the USSR. To achieve high marks candidates needed to use the two sources to explain what the opinions are. There were a few outstandingly good answers that suggested these source are particularly useful because they show us the kind of information that was being fed back to Moscow and Washington, thus explaining why these countries adopted policies such as the Truman Doctrine.

Question 5

This question produced a wide range of answers. Some candidates had difficulty in interpreting **Source G** and thought that it showed Russians facing the American advance. Other candidates interpreted both sources but failed to compare them. There are ways in which these two cartoons are making the same point. **Source G** is suggesting that America is paranoid, while **Source H** is suggesting the same about the Soviets. An acceptable alternative interpretation is that both countries are using excuses for their aggressive policies.

Question 6

There is still much scope for candidates to improve their marks in this question. The question is about the sources. Candidates are expected to test the statement against these sources and yet a significant minority of candidates still completely ignore the sources. These candidates write essays about the statement. Even when the sources are used, many candidates identify which ones do and do not support the statement but fail to give examples of how the sources do this. It was also common to find candidates thinking that they only had to find sources that showed the Soviets were responsible for the breakdown. They made no attempt to explain that some of the sources support the opposing view.

Nineteenth Century**Question 1**

This question was answered reasonably well with many candidates able to explain similarities e.g. the divisions amongst the revolutionaries. Candidates found the differences rather harder to find. Some candidates simply paraphrased the two sources and failed to make a comparison.

Question 2

Most candidates were able to identify surface differences but far fewer went on to compare the different impressions conveyed by the sources. **Source C** conveys a heroic impression of the revolutionaries while **Source D** shows them as ineffectual, underhand or scheming.

Question 3

This question produced a wide range of answers. Some candidates analysed the sources but failed to use their analysis to explain whether or not they were surprised. Others concentrated on surface differences and compared the fact that Frederick William appears to be on the side of the people in **Source E** but hostile to them in **Source G**. Better candidates considered the differences in purpose and audience of the various sources while the top level of the mark scheme was reserved for candidates who attempted to reconcile **Sources F** and **G** through close analysis of Frederick William's real message in **F**.

Question 4

This question also produced a good range of responses. Weaker candidates simply asserted that he had changed his mind between April and May. Others concentrated on the fact that he rejects the Crown in both sources, or that the reasons he gives for this rejection differ in the two sources. Better candidates realised that the sources need to be evaluated and considered issues such as purpose and audience, as well as using their contextual knowledge.

Question 5

This question was answered well. Nearly all candidates were able to compare the surface information of the two sources but many went further and used **Source K** as evidence of the contemporary perception that the Frankfurt Parliament was merely a talking shop and this is why it failed.

Question 6

Some candidates failed to use the sources and were awarded low marks. This question requires candidates to test the statement against the sources, not against their knowledge. However, a good number were able to explain how some of the sources support the statement while others suggest different reasons for the failure of the revolutionaries.

Paper 0470/03

Coursework

General comments

Coursework remains the chosen option for a small minority of Centres in the November entry for this syllabus. The majority of these Centres use appropriate assignments and mark the candidates' coursework to an appropriate standard. Few Centres have their marks adjusted by the Moderator and there were some examples of outstandingly good work by candidates. In **Assignment 1** it was encouraging to see some candidates comparing the importance of causes while in **Assignment 2** there was good source evaluation using the content and provenance of the source as well as relevant contextual knowledge.

Centres are reminded that the Moderator's copy of the mark sheet and a copy of the assignments and mark schemes should all be enclosed with the samples of work. It is helpful to the Moderator if Centres can show on candidates' work where in the answer a certain level in the mark scheme has been reached. Those Centres who annotated this year's coursework in this way made the task of the Moderator a straightforward one.

It is important to remember that the appropriate skills and conceptual understandings must be assessed in the assignments. In **Assignment 1** candidates should be set one, or several, questions which require them to analyse and explain events in the past. The most popular approach is to set questions about causation. Candidates are expected not just to explain causes but to reach judgements about them, for example, was one cause more important than another? In **Assignment 2** the questions must be set on a range (about 6-7) of historical sources on a particular topic. The questions should require candidates to show that they can interpret, evaluate and use these sources. A range of different types of sources should be used, for example, cartoons and photographs as well as written sources. Exemplar assignments on some topics can be obtained from CIE. These can be used as they are or can be used as models by Centres who wish to construct their own.

Paper 0470/04

Alternative to Coursework

General comments

As with previous sessions of the examination, there was evidence that candidates have become more comfortable with the demands of this paper. More candidates appeared to appreciate the special demands of each individual question, and have attempted to meet those demands. Examiners have reported their pleasure in seeing many high scoring scripts where knowledge, skill and sound examination technique have been displayed. These candidates demonstrated both confidence and enjoyment in their answers. Equally, Examiners have reported that they have noticed fewer very poor scripts where, in the past, candidates have had neither the knowledge nor the skill to answer the questions appropriately or effectively. Whilst all the above is very encouraging, there were still a number of questions which posed problems for some candidates. Individual examples of these problems will be fully discussed in the below, but these difficulties can be generally described as follows:

- (a)(i) Some candidates recognised a name or event in Source A and then wrote all they knew about that person or event. Thus, they did not answer the question that had been set. All (a)(i) questions require candidates to draw valid inferences from the source and then show where, within the source, they found evidence to support their inferences.
- (iii) While more candidates appreciated that sources should be tested for reliability, there were a significant number of these attempts that were incomplete. To assert that, 'It is from an autobiography of a person who lived through hyperinflation, so it must be reliable' is insufficient. The candidate must argue how and why this attribution could make the source reliable. Indeed, one could make a valid counter argument to this. Some candidates have evaluated by saying that information within the source 'Agrees with my own knowledge'. Again, this is insufficient. To evaluate using contextual knowledge, the candidate must provide relevant detail and argument to confirm information in the source. Simple assertions of knowing the information to be true will gain no reward.
- (b)(iii) This question asks for reasons. Many candidates lost marks because they largely ignored the word 'Why?' in the question. They wrote long narratives about events without addressing the focus of the questions. Sadly, much of the detail in their narratives was detailed and correct but they were not answering the question that had been set.

As ever, *Depth Study A: Germany, 1918 – 1945* remained the most popular with candidates, while both *Depth Study B: Russia, 1905 – 1941*, and *Depth Study C: The USA, 1919 – 1941* had substantial numbers of candidates choosing them. In general, the scripts were clearly written and well set out, making all that the candidates wished to convey accessible to the Examiners. There were very few rubric infringements, and there was only a small minority of candidates who showed evidence of difficulties with time management.

Comments on specific questions*Depth Study A: Germany, 1918 – 1945*

Most candidates were able to draw inferences from Source A about the impact of hyperinflation on the German people. However, there was a significant minority that was seduced by the sight of the word 'hyperinflation' to give long, detailed and, often, correct descriptions of hyperinflation that ignored the source altogether. Ubiquitous wheelbarrows full of worthless currency abounded but these candidates had not answered the set question. Candidates should understand that all part **(a)** questions require them to use evidence found in the sources. Other illustrative material can be useful but the main focus must be the sources' evidence. Most candidates found sufficient evidence in Source B to show that the Weimar government was to blame for hyperinflation. However, fewer were able to find evidence that the Weimar government was not totally to blame by showing that 'the causes were complicated', 'the Germans did not see it that way' and that 'many middle-class Germans never forgave...', which implies that not all felt that way. All Sources for **(a)(ii)** will have a balance of evidence in them and the candidates must find and use this evidence to give their own answers some balance. Many candidates asserted that the Weimar government was not totally to blame but supported their answers by contextual knowledge alone and, thus, could not score as well as answers supported from the source. In answer to **(a)(iii)**, most candidates compared the content of both sources to show which source was more useful about hyperinflation. There were some confident attempts at evaluation, questioning how much the judgement of the author of Source A might be affected by the parlous state of Aunt Louise and finally supporting the evidence in the source by quoting other evidence of similar and relevant situations. As mentioned previously, to assert that the author lived through the period and, thus, is reliable is insufficient to convince an Examiner. With regard to Source B, some concentrated on the date of the British textbook and showed how the passing of time would allow research, objectivity and general agreement. One candidate discussed the motives of the author in writing a textbook and the process by which teachers selected textbooks for their candidates. All this was in direct contrast to one candidate who decided that as Britain had opposed Germany in two world wars, the author must be biased against Germany.

It was unusual to find candidates who did not know some detail about reparations to answer **(b)(i)** and most were able to achieve a maximum mark. Whilst many candidates scored well on how Stresemann brought the 1923 crisis to an end, some did not appreciate that the focus of the question was the '1923 crisis', and they went on to give full descriptions of all of Stresemann's achievement to his death in 1929. The candidates were rewarded for what was relevant to the question but some candidates wasted considerable time on post-crisis issues. One of the most disappointing aspects of answers to questions in this paper was the response of many candidates to **(b)(iii)**. Although better candidates appreciated that they had to give reasons for the staging of Munich Putsch in 1923, many began with a reason but this was often the introduction to a long narrative and detailed description of the course of the putsch and its outcomes. These candidates had failed to explain why the Nazis had staged the putsch, why in Munich and why in 1923. There were some very competent and well rewarded answers to **(b)(iv)**. These addressed the comparative impact of American loans and Stesemann's policies in enabling Germany to recover from the disasters of 1923. These had detailed evidence to support their assertions and arguments. The most noticeable failing in some answers was that candidates argued, often succinctly, that both elements depended heavily upon one another, but failed to use evidence to support their credible arguments.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905 – 1941

Candidates made many relevant inferences concerning the difficulties that the workers found at Magnitogorsk. They supported their comments on hardship and conditions from Source A. They also commented on the variety of nationalities and most appeared to be fascinated by Khaibulin, the Tartar, and his limited experience before arriving at Magnitogorsk. Most candidates asserted that the statistics from Source B showed that the Five Year Plans (1928 – 1941) were successful. Others offered a more balanced approach by also doubting some or all the figures as they were based on 'information collected by the Soviet government'. They questioned the pressures on the managers who had to supply production figures and/or the purpose to which these figures would be put. Fewer commented on the limited examples of heavy industries and the number of years quoted. It was, therefore, somewhat strange to discover that many candidates who had used strong evaluative arguments to this question, did not use them or refer back to their previous answer when tackling **(a)(iii)**. Here, obvious doubts about Soviet government statistics were very relevant. Also, some attempts to test the reliability of Source A went no further than 'He was there so he would know what happened', and 'He was American so he would not say good things about the USSR'. Even if the candidates did not know the background of John Scott, they should surely have asked themselves why an American was working in the USSR and in such awful conditions. A few decided he must be an American adviser, fewer decided he was a volunteer and one decided he was a captured spy sent to work in a labour camp. All of these candidates adjusted their views on the reliability of the source according to their conclusions.

It was encouraging to see how many candidates understood the establishment and purpose of Gosplan, although one candidate decided it was a religious initiative. The answers to **(b)(ii)**, often commented on the more positive methods on encouragement to achieve targets and increase production. Stakhanov was well known. Fewer dealt with the more negative and more threatening inducements to work harder. However, the question was answered well. Candidates often knew many reasons for the introduction of the Five Year Plans for industry and scored well, but the question asked for elements that were relevant to 'industry' and, as with **(b)(iv)**, which referred to 'modern, industrialised state', the main focus was industry. While it was legitimate to introduce the impact of collectivisation to develop the industrial argument, the questions did not ask candidates to dwell mainly on agricultural matters as many candidates did. Another failing of some candidates was to write general answers, asserting the success of the Five Year Plans in making the USSR strong and industrialised without giving much supporting detail as evidence. Nevertheless, Examiners found some very competent answers which supported Stalin's achievements by way of the Source B statistics, placement of industries and the survival of the state against the German invasion. Against these elements they commented on the existence few consumer goods, false accounting, the impact of the purges and the lack of political freedom.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919 – 1941

Many candidates appeared to enjoy Source A, the Anti-Saloon League poster, and drew many valid inferences and demonstrated where, within the source, they had found supporting evidence. However, there was a small minority who saw the poster as an anti-prohibition vehicle. The arguments in support of this assertion were unconvincing. Most candidates found that Source B showed that there was support for prohibition and a substantial number used the provenance to suggest that all the source showed was that the Federal Council of Churches supported prohibition. Some said that the phrase in the source 'problems of enforcement' showed that some of the American public must have opposed prohibition. Disappointingly, the majority of candidates used only the content of the sources to discuss why the government had introduced prohibition. It should have been possible for the candidates to infer from the provenances of the sources that these organisations would offer their own anti-alcohol and pro-prohibition views. They could then have gone on to discuss whether the contents demonstrated bias or a more even handed treatment. Nevertheless, there were some excellent answers to this question, which tested for reliability and handled the content of the source with skill and neat perception.

Part **(b)(i)**, asking candidates to give two terms of the Eighteenth Amendment to the American Constitution, was understood by some candidates and they scored well. However, some candidates had not appreciated that the Eighteenth Amendment ratified the introduction of prohibition nor, on a more mundane level, had they made the link between the Eighteenth Amendment and the source material and questions which were about prohibition. Candidates often scored well on **(b)(ii)** on the ways that the government tried to enforce prohibition, but the answers were often more intense, detailed and enjoyed when showing how it was possible to evade the prohibition laws. Answers to **(b)(iv)** often agreed that it was the growth in crime that was the main cause for ending prohibition and offered much detail of the gangster culture, corruption and atrocities surrounding the illegal production and sale of alcohol. More balanced answers gave evidence of the general evasion of the prohibition laws, the undermining of law by that general evasion. Roosevelt's coming to office and taxed alcohol would not only satisfy most of the American public, but it would also bring in tax revenue to help finance the New Deal.

Depth Study D: China, 1945 – c.1990

The small number of candidates who attempted the questions set for this depth study fell into two categories. The first category had knowledge and had prepared specifically for questions on China. The second group was made up of candidates trying to find a depth study where they thought they recognised the subject matter of these questions. The answers of this latter group showed little evidence of preparation, technique or knowledge. In **(a)(i)**, prepared candidates were able to draw valid and supported inferences from the Source A regarding landlords, their previous actions and their current plight. Weaker candidates tended to copy out or paraphrase the source. For **(a)(ii)**, better candidates often supported the suggestion that Mao wanted justice for all Chinese people, and used the source content as evidence. However, it was rare to find a candidate who addressed the prompt in the question of 'How far?' Again, weaker candidates copied or paraphrased the source. For **(a)(iii)**, it was a general rule that all candidates used the content of the sources to decide which of them might be more useful as evidence about land reform. Prepared candidates' arguments were more sophisticated.

In part **(b)** answers, the previous trend continued. In answers to **(b)(i)** and **(b)(ii)**, prepared candidates knew something about collective farms and could describe, in outline, the organisation of a commune. Candidates emphasised the comparative size of the units. Weaker candidates had little knowledge of these two initiatives in China and scored poorly. For **(b)(iii)**, stronger candidates were able to sustain an explanation of peasant support for the Communists' take-over of China, using the land issue, comparing GMD and CCP treatment of the peasants during the civil war, hope for the future etc. Some weaker candidates made the land issue their answer. In answers to **(b)(iv)**, almost all candidates decided that the Communist reforms in the period 1949 – 1957 had been very successful. Weaker candidates used land as the issue and usually commented on how 'now everyone was happy'. Stronger candidates developed land reforms, but also commented on social reforms in both educational and health fields. A few mentioned a number of reforms that improved the life of women. Matters of concern regarding knowledge and examination technique were that candidates did not appear to be confident in knowing which reforms fell within the end dates given in the question. Also, it was rare to find even the smallest reference to the possibility that the reforms had failed or been misdirected. It is important that candidates understand that **(b)(iv)** questions require a balanced answer, supported by relevant evidence and detail.

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

Examiners reported that a larger number of candidates selected this depth study than in previous seasons of examination, and that a larger number had prepared specifically for this option. Scripts by these candidates were often of a much higher quality than in previous seasons. Candidates were able to draw many valid inferences from Source A about Nelson Mandela and had appreciated that they had to show where the evidence was to be found in the source. Most candidates felt that the evidence contained in Source B showed that the South African government was successful in dealing with opposition in the 1960s. However, some showed awareness that the extensions of power for the security police and the increasing length of detention of detainees, without court appearances, showed that the South African government had not solved the problem. Candidates dealt with **(a)(iii)** by contrasting the content of the sources to show which source was the more useful as evidence about black opposition to apartheid in the 1960s. There was barely a hint of a test for reliability.

(b)(i) proved difficult for some candidates but most of the prepared candidates could name Mandela here – the Rivonia Trials of 1964 were not well known by the majority. Part **(b)(ii)** often defeated candidates who only made references to 'demonstrations' and 'the UNO'. The international aspects of **(b)(iii)** also proved difficult for most candidates and it was rare to find references to opposition by countries inside Africa or further beyond. A few well prepared candidates understood the focus of **(b)(iv)** on the 'homelands policy' and linked it to apartheid, but almost all the candidates offered a one sided argument when a balanced answer is required.

Some candidates chose this option with little useful knowledge. Many appeared to have been attracted by the name of Nelson Mandela in Source A. These candidates either re-wrote the source or gave a potted biography of Mandela. Neither approach answered the set question effectively. Other part **(a)** questions were answered by copying out the sources or guessing. Answers to part **(b)** questions by this group of candidates showed little perception or comprehension of the thrust of the questions. Each question was answered either by a short, irrelevant statement or referred back to the content of Source A and Mandela. These candidates scored very poorly.

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

This depth study retains the loyalty of a small but significant number of Centres. There were few attempts at this set of questions by candidates who were not prepared for the topic. Answers to **(a)(i)** showed that most candidates could draw valid inferences about the Palestinian refugees' status in Arab countries and their need to act clandestinely as a resistance movement. Candidates scored well here, as they did on **(a)(ii)** where most were able to produce balanced answers regarding Palestinian success or failure. Candidates pointed to the contrast between 'freedom fighters' and 'agents of murder and sabotage', and the 'spread of terror' and the 'lack of military victory'. Answers to **(a)(iii)** mostly contrasted the content of the sources to decide which was the more useful source as evidence about attitudes towards Palestinians. A few tested for reliability through comments on the 'obvious frustration and personal experience' affecting the views of the Palestinian refugee in Source A and the 'balanced explanation of both sides by an outsider' in the British textbook (Source B).

Part **(b)** answers were less convincing. Some candidates knew at least two aims of the PLO in the 1970s, while others struggled to gain a mark with longer, less focused answers. Many of the candidates interpreted **(b)(ii)** on 'international recognition of the PLO in the 1970s and 1980s' to mean that a list of actions that achieved international publicity were required. These focused on elements of terrorism, with considerable concentration on the Munich Olympic killings of 1972. The question required information on states that gradually recognised the PLO's right to speak on behalf of the Palestinian people. Candidates, thus, scored poorly here. Answers to **(b)(iii)** were often narratives of Arafat's life and work, with reasons for his becoming leader being made either by implication or by way of an aside. Part **(b)(iv)** was rarely answered effectively. Candidates knew some of the acts of terror but were extremely limited in their knowledge of 'appeals to the United Nations Organisation'. In truth, most of the answers were general comments about acts of terror. The difference between the marks gained on part **(a)** and part **(b)** questions was significant – candidates' ability to use sources was well in advance of their knowledge.

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

In this season of examinations, there were too few genuine attempts at these questions to be able to offer relevant and meaningful comment.

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

Again there were too few genuine attempts to be able to offer helpful observations and/or criticism.