

# 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 a significant majority of candidates were well prepared to meet the demands of the examination showing ability beyond straightforward factual recall. This approach reduced significantly the number of hazy, vague answers than have predominated in the past.

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. When writing answers to part (a) questions it is important that candidates do not produce over long answers that take up valuable time that can be used more beneficially on the other two parts of the question.

It was encouraging to note the increased level of explanation in relation to part (b) questions, with many candidates writing Level 3 answers from the outset. Here, it is expected that the answers will show a deeper understanding of the points being made through identification and explanation.

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. 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. An example of challenging the question was seen in a number of responses in relation to **Question 8 (c)**, on the Cuban Missile Crisis.

Poor responses were often characterised by a lack of thought and planning. The question became a vague generality in response to which the candidate was going to write down all they had learned. This often resulted in lengthy answers that gained little reward.

There were only a small number of rubric errors, the most common being to 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 responses 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.

### **Section A**

#### **Question 4**

- (a) The Moroccan Crisis was generally well known with answers indicating knowledge of the Kaiser, the role of the Entente Cordiale and the outcome of the Conference.
- (b) It was disappointing that not enough significance was given to Russia's decision to support the Serbs.
- (c) The focus of the responses was, quite naturally, on Germany. Other factors remained undeveloped or not mentioned.

**Question 5**

- (a) There were many good answers with economic sanctions, collective security and the application of force being predominant. Sometimes the answer related to the application of 'sanctions' and did not distinguish between the different types. Some answers became over long as they wrote about some of the actions taken by the League rather than concentrating on the question which said 'hope'. This approach did not gain any credit. Many incorrectly stated that the troops of the League would be deployed.
- (b) The emphasis for many answers was on the causes of Japanese aggression and the invasion of Manchuria. Reasons for the League's failure were often limited to identification and lacked explanation.
- (c) Too many tried to turn the question into 'Why did the League of Nations fail?' Others wrote at length, looking at specific events to draw examples of success or failure. However, description often got the better of analysis. References, for example, to the Aaland Islands or Abyssinia were left at no more than that, resulting in a Level 2 approach. Occasionally a candidate thought appeasement was League policy.

**Question 6**

- (a) Here was an example where a significant number of candidates failed to grasp that the question related to what Hitler *hoped* to achieve not what he did.
- (b) This produced some very strong answers that started with the failure of appeasement. Others wasted far too much time by going back over events since 1934. A small number took the question to mean that Britain went to war against Poland and thus failed to gain credit.
- (c) Although many were to make reference to the harshness of the Treaty, some were less secure in relating the Treaty to the outbreak of war. Many of the better answers recognised the links between the Treaty and Hitler's foreign policy and Hitler and the failure of appeasement, and in these instances produced well-argued responses that gave high level marks.

**Question 7**

- (b) In response to this question the obvious answer, the Red Army, was often ignored, whilst greater emphasis was placed on the impact, i.e. the sphere of influence.
- (c) Generally responses were weak. Given how much was known of Yalta (part (a)), it was surprising how little of this information was drawn on to answer this question. There were occasional references to Potsdam but again candidates failed to use their knowledge to good effect. The challenge to the question hypothesis was limited. It was acceptable for candidates to question if Stalin had achieved what he wanted or indeed whether the Allies had. The Berlin Blockade was seen as more relevant than the events of the immediate post war period.

**Question 8**

- (a) Responses to this question were mixed. Some candidates knew the detail well and scored highly. Others just did not know it and thought it was the placing of missiles on Cuba. Others incorrectly referred to an invasion of US troops.
- (b) Examiners noted some very good responses where detail was well explained.
- (c) Many responses challenged the hypothesis and this produced well explained but one-sided arguments. A number introduced as significant the introduction of the Hot Line and even the Test Ban Treaty. Credit was given for this approach.

**Section B****Question 9**

- (b) Good points were made about the French needing to meet their financial obligations and to further weaken and humiliate Germany. Beyond this there was little explanation, thus many answers remained at Level 3, with 5 marks.

- (c) There were many good responses that related Stresemann to prosperity and a significant number made the point strongly that prosperity was tied up with loans. A number wrote descriptively about the arts in relation to pride, but failed to fully secure the explanation as to impact.

#### Question 10

- (a) The responses to this part were probably the weakest of the most popular questions. Few were able to recall detail relating to the Law, with many considering it legislation against the Jews.
- (b) This brought few responses that went beyond 'control of minds', whilst others were limited to propaganda. Where a number of points were made they often remained unexplained, thus limiting the mark to a Level 2.
- (c) Some good efforts were made to show the support Hitler's policies received and where there was opposition. Others were limited to a description of what Hitler achieved, particularly in relation to foreign policy, with the limit of marks being within Level 2.

#### Question 11

- (a) Generally well known.
- (b) For many, knowledge was a strength when answering this question. Here lots of reasons were given although some did not carry out that bit of development to explain the point they were making. Those that did, had little problem in securing high marks.
- (c) Many answers were purely descriptive of the New Economic Policy. Arguments about a 'communist state' were limited. Those that attempted the argument were often stuck with the idea that it was temporary and therefore did not show failure.

#### Question 12

A lack of knowledge characterised answers to both parts (a) and (b) of this question with often only limited reference to the Kulaks.

There was generally good knowledge of Stalin's economic policies but in the explanation for the higher levels it is expected that candidates will go further than 'yes he did increase productivity... although by not as much as he expected ...but millions died so it couldn't be successful.'

#### Question 13

- (a) Although this produced a number of good answers, many candidates wrote generally, rather than linking their answer to an easier life as required by the question.
- (b) Responses varied considerably. Some even failed to mention the value of the production line, others just wanted to write about women, whilst the better answers were wide ranging, dealing with disposable income, cheap, readily available credit, advertising and automation.
- (c) Few candidates came to terms with 'ignorance and greed'. Too many just wrote about why the 'boom' came to an end. Where there was a link then greed and ignorance were usually applied to speculation, the profits made and the ignorance of the fact that it all might go wrong. There were, however, candidates who did understand the underlying problems of the American economy and who touched on overproduction and the Republican ethos.

#### Question 14

- (b) On occasions candidates did not realise that the election in 1936 related to Roosevelt's second term of office resulting in an impoverished mark.
- (c) The majority who tackled this question had plenty of information about what Roosevelt did as a President, but few took the question fully on board, choosing to ignore the 'outstanding' aspect.

**Question 20**

- (a) Much time, and effort, was wasted by a significant number of candidates in their answers to both (a) and (b), by going back in history rather than dealing with the question as set. Whilst teachers, to gain understanding, might make this reference, it was not required to answer the question.
- (c) There were many good responses with the majority successfully challenging the hypothesis. This approach was made easier for those candidates who clearly stated the Israeli aims at the start of their response.

**Question 21**

Generally, knowledge and explanation of the refugee camps and the reasons why they housed so many Palestinians was good. Many responses to part (c) went off the question by writing at length about the problems of the Israelis.

**Paper 0470/02**

**Paper 2**

**General comments**

The overall standard was similar to that in previous years. There was much evidence of candidates using historical sources in an informed and intelligent way. Examiners were pleased to note many examples of high level and original thinking. However, there were a few areas where there is some room for improvement.

This paper is designed to test the ability to interpret, evaluate and use historical sources. Every question is about the sources, not about the historical events themselves. Contextual knowledge is required but only to enable candidates to make better use of the sources. This year a number of candidates, particularly in answers to **Questions 3, 5 and 7**, ignored the sources and wrote essays based purely on their knowledge of the events. These answers scored no, or very few, marks. It is important to stress to candidates that they must base every answer on the sources. They can bring in their knowledge only to help their interpretation and evaluation of the sources.

The candidates who sat this paper can be generally divided into two groups: those who just use the content of the sources and those who use the content and the provenance and audience of the sources. The latter are essential if sources are to be interpreted and evaluated at the highest levels.

Evaluation of sources remains the weakest area for many candidates. Some do bring contextual knowledge into their answers but fail to use it in an explicit way to check the claims being made by sources. Another way of evaluating sources that is often neglected is to consider the purpose of the author or the artist of the sources in context.

Generally speaking the contextual knowledge of candidates is strong. However, there were two important lapses in answers to the twentieth century questions: some candidates could not recognise Chamberlain (in Source F) and many appeared to have little knowledge of Churchill (Source J).

One final weakness noted by Examiners was the tendency of some candidates to ignore the specific wording of the questions and to write generally about appeasement and their views about it. These candidates often knew a lot but marks are not awarded unless candidates attempt to answer the question set. What is being tested is here, is how well candidates use what they know to answer the questions. The entry for the 19<sup>th</sup> century topic was small. Some of the candidates appeared to answer the questions in this option by mistake and did very badly; however those candidates who had been prepared for it achieved a range of marks similar to that achieved in the twentieth century option.

Unfortunately, the twentieth century questions contained a misprint. What should have been **Questions 5 and 6** were both numbered as **Question 5**. However, this led to only a handful of candidates not answering one of these questions. The performance, marks and grades of these candidates were looked at carefully to ensure they had not been disadvantaged.

**Comments on specific questions**

*Twentieth century topic*

**Question 1**

This question got many candidates off to a good start. It was generally well answered although some candidates failed to go beyond the surface information in Source A. They assumed that Hitler's purpose was to take Czechoslovakia or to tell people how badly the German Czechs were being treated. Most candidates thought about the source and the context more carefully and took into account the date and the audience of the speech as well as the content. They realised that Hitler was trying to justify, or looking for an excuse, for Germany taking over the Sudetenland. Some candidates suggested that although Hitler was speaking to a rally of the Nazi Party he may also have had a wider audience in mind, for example, Britain and France. There was much good use of contextual knowledge to explain these points, although in a minority of Centres candidates included knowledge in their responses without using it to develop their answer to the question. The best answers concentrated on the date of the speech and explained why the speech was being made then. Most did this by pointing out that it took place just a couple of weeks before Munich. One common mistake in the scripts of the weaker candidates was the claim that the Sudetenland belonged to Germany before the Treaty of Versailles.

**Question 2**

Answers to this question tended to be bunched in the middle levels of the mark scheme. There were few very poor answers but also few very good ones. Most candidates were able to find ways in which Sources B and C agree and disagree. In both sources Chamberlain is making it clear that Britain will not help Czechoslovakia, although in Source B he is suggesting that this was because of the practical difficulties. He speaks about Czechoslovakia being 'overrun by the Germans', implying he does not approve. In Source C, on the other hand, he appears to approve of Germany taking over the Sudetenland by suggesting that Hitler needs to protect the Germans there. There were a few incorrect interpretations of the sources, the most common being the claim that in Source C Chamberlain was actively preparing to go to war because he was digging trenches.

Most candidates were able to use these agreements and disagreement to explain that he was either not lying or lying. The better candidates also made use of the provenance of the sources and compared Chamberlain writing in a private diary where he had no reason to lie, to making a public speech where he had to justify to the British people what amounted to a defeat at the hands of Hitler. It is important to emphasise that these answers were only awarded high marks if they were explained in context. Answers that merely asserted that diaries tell that truth while politicians lie in public speeches, were placed in a much lower level in the mark scheme. Only a few candidates reached the top level by making use of their contextual knowledge to suggest that the circumstances had changed so much between March and September that it was quite possible for Chamberlain to have changed his mind.

**Question 3**

A number of candidates lost marks on this question by ignoring the sources and writing their own views about whether Hitler had the moral right to unify all Germans. Those candidates who did use the sources found it easier to interpret Source D than Source E. They understood that Source D is criticising the fact that minorities like the German one had to live under Czech rule. A significant minority, however, took Source E at face value and thought the cartoon was supporting Hitler's claims to unify all Germans.

There were still many candidates who made valid interpretations of the two cartoons and who explained how they disagree. Far fewer went on to evaluate the cartoons. This was confined to a small number of Centres where most of the candidates reached the top levels. Both cartoons had a purpose and it is possible to evaluate both on the basis of who drew or published them and what they were trying to persuade people to believe.

The questions did ask how far the cartoons 'prove' it was right for Hitler to demand all Germans should be united. The word 'prove' should have been the signal to candidates that evaluation of the sources is expected.

**Question 4**

A significant minority of candidates did not recognise Chamberlain in Source F; they thought he was Hitler. It is important that during preparation in class for this examination candidates are given opportunities to study photographs of the main individuals such as Chamberlain, Hitler and Churchill. Another area of weakness in some answers was a failure to use the details in Source F to explain interpretations of the cartoon. However, there were many candidates who did carry out some careful analysis of Source F. Some realised that it can be interpreted either way - that he is going to be successful in avoiding the war or that he is about to fail or that it is still in the balance. Such an understanding allowed these candidates to explain ways in which Sources F and G agree and disagree. There were some very well explained answers on agreement along the lines that both sources praise Chamberlain for doing his best.

The top level in the mark scheme was reserved for those candidates who, in addition to explaining how the sources agree and/or disagree, went on to explain the significance of the dates of the two sources. Source F is before the Munich Agreement, while Source G is after. A few candidates explained that if the cartoonist of Source F had drawn another cartoon on 30 September, he might have changed his opinion. It is always a delight to see such high level thinking.

**Question 5**

Some candidates were confused by Source I and who wanted to go to war in 1938, but Source H presented few problems with many candidates explaining how there is evidence support both sides of the argument. A few candidates ignored the sources and wrote essays on whether Britain should have gone to war and a disappointing number cross-referenced to other sources or to contextual knowledge. There were a few very interesting answers from the very best candidates, who explored the fact that Hitler was using hindsight when he made the judgement in Source I.

**Question 6**

This question was not answered well. A significant minority of candidates clearly had no idea who Churchill was, while others failed to read the question carefully and wrote about Chamberlain. Others assumed that Churchill had the same views as Chamberlain and this led them into misinterpretations of Source J. Some candidates were able make valid comparisons between Sources J and K, but their lack of knowledge of Churchill and his views meant that their answers were not informed by contextual knowledge, and so the top two levels in the mark scheme were rarely achieved.

**Question 7**

Examiners are surprised by the number of candidates who still do not understand that this final question requires them to use the sources. A number of candidates had to be placed in Level 1 of the mark scheme (maximum mark being 2) because they made no explicit reference to the sources. It may be of help to Centres if part of the mark scheme for this question is repeated here.

Source use in Levels 2 and 3 must consist of reference to sources by letter, provenance or quote. There must be an explanation of how the source content supports/rejects the hypothesis.

The question is about how far the sources support a certain point of view and answers must be about the sources, not about whether candidates think that appeasement was justified.

Those candidates who did use the sources often scored high marks. Both explained how some sources support appeasement while others do not. It is not enough to identify which sources do or do not support the statement; the content of the sources must be used to explain how they do this.

A small number of Centres appear to have explained to their candidates that extra marks are awarded in this question for attempts at evaluating the sources. These candidates achieved these marks easily. Most candidates, however, make no attempt at any evaluation.

*Nineteenth century topic***Question 1**

Many candidates were only able to write about the differences between these two sources. They failed to understand that both writers are actually supporting modernisation. It is important that candidates explain how sources agree or disagree. A number of candidates asserted differences or similarities, but did not explain them through reference to the content of the sources.

**Question 2**

This question was generally answered well, with candidates able to interpret both sources to make inferences about modernisation. A few simply described the sources.

**Question 3**

Many candidates simply explained what the sources tell us without evaluating them. The assumption seemed to be that the sources are reliable because they tell us a lot. To reach the higher levels in the mark scheme, candidates needed to either cross-reference to other sources or to contextual knowledge to evaluate Sources E and F, or to consider the possible purpose of the artist in each case.

**Question 4**

There were many good answers to this question. Even the weaker candidates were able to make inferences about wanting to show how strong Japan was. Better candidates developed their answers by excellent use of knowledge of the war with China (although some did get confused with the twentieth century Chinese invasion of Manchuria). A few of the best candidates went even further and explained how the cartoon was a warning to western countries about the potential danger from a strong Japan.

**Question 5**

Many candidates struggled with this question. A few got as far as finding similarities and/or differences between the two accounts, but there was a general lack of understanding of how historians use a range of other sources.

**Question 6**

This question produced many good answers. Candidates were able to cross-reference to other sources to express surprise that they were getting rid of the foreigners, and better candidates in addition cross-referenced to explain reasons for not being surprised.

**Question 7**

Please see the comments for **Question 7** of the twentieth century topic.

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

**General comments**

Only ten Centres entered candidates for the coursework option this year and consequently this report is brief. For more detailed feedback on coursework, Centres should refer to the report issued for the May examination.

The assignments used by Centres were generally appropriate and the marking was detailed and accurate. Some Centres annotated candidates work showing where and how certain levels in the mark scheme had been reached. This was very helpful information for the Moderator. Half the Centres had their marks adjusted by the Moderator. All of these adjustments were upwards.

The overall standard of work was similar to previous years, although some candidates did struggle with the assignment, testing their ability to describe, explain and analyse. These candidates wrote too much description and not enough explanation and analysis. Some appeared to think that if they wrote a narrative of what happened they were explaining why the events happened - unfortunately they were not. There was also a tendency to describe causal factors without explaining how the factors actually had a causal effect. However, there was also some excellent work with candidates able to write multi-causal explanations and to provide evidence to support their own judgements.

The assignment testing candidates' abilities in using historical sources was generally better done. Most of the adjustments to candidates marks were made in this assignment. Particularly impressive was the candidates' ability to use the provenance of sources, as well as their knowledge of the context to evaluate sources.



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

### General comments

Once again, **Depth Study A: Germany, 1919-45**, was the most popular choice by an overwhelming majority. There were also a substantial number of candidates who attempted **Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-41**, and **Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-41**. A few Centres had prepared candidates for **Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century**, and **Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994**. Other depth studies were attempted but not in sufficient numbers to draw significant conclusions.

Examiners again reported improvements in the answers to part (a) questions. As ever, there were outstanding answers from many superior candidates showing understanding, technical skills and knowledge. However, improvements were noted in many Centres where candidates had previously struggled with source based questions. Sadly, there are still some candidates who find questions in both parts of the paper very difficult to understand and answer. These often copy out the sources in answer to part (a) questions and use them as a basis for their part (b) answers.

Whilst it is not common to deal specific question problems in this section, it may benefit the candidate to understand more about all (a)(ii) questions, where many candidates, often very good candidates, lost valuable marks by presenting a one-sided argument. Question setters are charged to present source(s) which have information and evidence in the source and its provenance, which will allow candidates to offer some balance in their answers. The prompt phrase of 'How far?' in the question should help candidates appreciate this fact.

As most candidates chose **Depth Study A**, it might help to look at **Question (a)(ii)** from that depth study and comment upon some of the answers that were given. The generic mark scheme for all (a)(ii) questions is given below, followed by the specific source, and the specific question.

### **Mark Scheme**

- |   |               |
|---|---------------|
| Level 1 Agrees OR disagrees with the statement, no support from the source.                                   | (1 – 2 marks) |
| Level 2 Agrees OR disagrees with the statement, supported from the source.                                    | (3 – 5 marks) |
| Level 3 Agrees AND disagrees with the statement, supported from the source. Addresses the issue of 'How far?' | (6 – 7 marks) |

### **Source B**

The discipline in the Hitler youth is declining in the western part of Germany. Many young people no longer want to be forced to join, but instead wish to do as they like. Usually only a third of the whole group attends meetings. They are even threatened with expulsion from the Hitler Youth for staying away. Those who do attend sing soldiers' songs and make a lot of noise without doing any constructive work.

From 'Germany Today', a British magazine published in May 1938.

### **Question (a)(i)**

*Study Source B. How far does this source show that the Hitler Youth was not an effective movement? Explain your answer.*

There were very few candidates who were not able to comment on the effectiveness of the Hitler Youth from evidence in the source, although those that merely copied out the source received scant reward. The vast majority of candidates decided that the Hitler youth was ineffective because 'it was declining', young people preferred to do other things, only 'a third attended meetings', 'did no constructive work' etc. Those gaining marks at Level 3 gave balanced answers and also commented that the source referred only to 'western Germany', that meetings still existed and that those who attended appeared to enjoy themselves.

There was a significant number who gave evidence of the ineffectiveness of the Hitler Youth but then tried to give a counter argument based solely on the possible bias or unreliability of the source as a British magazine published in May 1938. Given that the source is specially chosen to allow candidates to find evidence in support of both sides of the argument, the above strategy is invalid. The candidate must understand that to criticise and discard evidence in support of one side of the argument also invalidates the evidence in support of the counter argument. The provenance of the source, however, is very useful when addressing the extent of the effectiveness of the Hitler Youth movement, but only after offering a balanced argument and balanced evidence from the source.

The vast majority of scripts were set out neatly and in an ordered fashion. The handwriting was usually clear and legible. There appeared to be a small increase in the number of rubric infringements. Some candidates attempted more than one depth study, some attempted all depth studies, while others attempted individual questions from several depth studies. Many candidates performed better on part **(a)** than on part **(b)** of the paper – their skill in dealing with source based questions surpassing their knowledge. There were a number who appeared to under perform because of poor time management, evidenced by the brevity of their answers to **Question (b)(iv)** – this question carries the highest tariff in the paper.

### Comments on specific questions

#### **Depth Study A**

##### *Germany, 1919 – 1945*

On the whole, part **(a)** questions were answered well and most candidates scored at least half marks. In response to question **(a)(i)**, most candidates were able to draw inferences from the source regarding Nazi attitudes to young people, and show where, within the source, they had found evidence to support their inferences. However, a significant number of candidates, enough for all Examiners to comment, thought that the Hitler Youth camp referred to in the source was a ‘concentration camp’ (also spelt ‘concentrated’, ‘conservation’ and ‘conversation’). This misunderstanding had a serious impact on their interpretation of the activities described in the source. Another group did not answer the question and wrote extensively, and with no little knowledge, about the Hitler Youth movement. Others, as has previously been mentioned, copied out the source. These last two responses attracted few marks. In answer to **Questions (a)(i)** and **(a)(ii)**, candidates often tried to show their knowledge of detail by writing at length about the Edelweiss Pirates and the Swing Movement, for example. Whilst this enthusiasm to display knowledge must not be discouraged, candidates must appreciate that part **(a)** questions are set to find out how well they can use source material. Contextual observations and knowledge are only useful as an addition to a relevant answer, not as a replacement for it. Most candidates compared the content of both sources in their answers to **Question (a)(iii)**, but there were also some excellent responses that tested fully for reliability. Some candidates had noticed that the provenance of both sources was an issue in testing for reliability, but they went no further than stating that Source A was ‘a private letter’ and that Source B was ‘from a British Magazine’. Candidates must explain fully why these two facts have significance.

Most candidates could offer ways in which teaching in schools was controlled (**Question (b)(i)**). Some ignored the key words of ‘teaching’ and ‘controlled’, and their answers lost focus. For **Question (b)(ii)**, many candidates were able to list a number of ideas that the Nazis had about women’s role in society, and usually scored well. However, answers to **Question (b)(iii)** about family life’s importance to Nazi beliefs were often vague. Most mentioned the production of children to become the soldiers of the future, and some saw the family as a means of Nazi control. Few went beyond this to deal with ideals, employment, contentment breeding support for the party etc. The answers to **Question (b)(iv)** showed that the term ‘racial issues’ used in the question was not understood by some, even though the same candidates had referred to issues surrounding race in previous questions. Clearly, the candidates had been taught this aspect of Nazi history but were not able to identify the thrust of the question. Despite the fact that there were many very brief answers, there were also some that were long, detailed and, most importantly, balanced ones too. These latter efforts were rewarded with high marks. The majority of candidates answered that race was the only issue in Nazi policies. This was shown by their argument and evidence in one-sided answers.

**Depth Study B***Russia, 1905 – 1941*

Candidates found evidence readily accessible in Source A to support their inference that the Russian army was ill prepared to go to war. Most scored well and drew substantiated inferences in their answers to **Question (a)(i)**. Many candidates decided that the brief sources, B and C, demonstrated that Russian troops were no longer willing to fight and, in their answers to **Question (a)(ii)**, pointed to hunger, poor morale and an urgent need to get away, as evidence. Those with more balanced answers made these observations too, but added that the soldier in Source B was still at his post, despite his hunger and low morale, and that officers in Source C tried to prevent soldiers leaving the front. Thus, they were able to point out that not all soldiers were unwilling to fight any longer. As with **Question (a)(iii)** in other depth studies, candidates often compared the content of the sources to decide which was the more useful in explaining why Russia lost the war. Superior candidates tested the sources for reliability, and noted and discussed the different dates of the sources, the difference in status of the men providing the information, and significance of the difference in the public or private provenance of the evidence.

The vast majority of candidates quoted Tsarina Alexandra's German origin and her apparent slavishness to Rasputin as reasons for her unpopularity in Russia. Answers to **Question (b)(ii)** were usually poor and few were able to identify the 'July Days' of 1917. However, where candidates did recognise this area, the answers were full, detailed and showed command of the subject. The general causes of the unpopularity of the Provisional Government in 1917 were well known and most were able to demonstrate knowledge. Good candidates were able to show not only the issues of war, land, lack of elections etc., but also the increasing disenchantment of various groups in Russia with the Provisional Government, all set in a context of increasing Bolshevik agitation and propaganda. Again, as with answers to **Question (b)(iv)** in other depth studies, many candidates argued that it was the First World War that destroyed Tsarist rule in Russia. Some of these answers were very detailed and scored well within the relevant Level. Nevertheless, the highest marks were awarded to those who achieved the highest Level by offering a detailed and balanced argument, suggesting that it may well have been the war that sparked the revolution but there were many, named issues that had undermined Tsarist rule well before 1914.

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

Source A aroused much interest and a variety of interpretations, although many candidates did well here, supporting sound inference with detail from the source. There was a genuine enthusiasm in the delivery of the answers of many of the candidates. However, there were some misinterpretations that included 'black people enjoying life' because 'they were swinging in the trees'. The great majority felt that racism was acceptable in the USA and that the president was expressing the popular view. Other candidates, in response to **Question (a)(ii)**, pointed out the audience being in Alabama as significant, and also commented on the different views expressed by the Universal Negro Improvement Association and the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People. In answers to **Question (a)(iii)**, most agreed that black Americans had little chance to improve their lives in the 1920s and 1930s, and they drew on the content of both sources to support their arguments. Some better candidates pointed to the success of Billie Holliday as evidence of 'opportunity', but it was rare to find examples where candidates had fully tested for reliability.

The 'Jim Crow' laws in the Southern states were either well known, and abundantly well known, or were the subject of guesswork. Responses to **Question (b)(ii)** on the aims and methods of the Ku Klux Klan were often full and well informed, although the explanations of why the Klan drew most of its membership from the Southern states (**Question (b)(iii)**), were less clear. Candidates appreciated the heritage of slavery and the large black population in the area, but few developed their explanations beyond these factors. Candidates generally agreed that society in the USA was intolerant in the 1920s (**Question (b)(iv)**). A few scored highly by offering balanced answers which included discussion of the different tolerances the North and the South, the changes in the status of women, Prohibition, Communism and the different treatments of immigrant minorities – many had good knowledge of the Sacco-Vanzetti case.

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

There were insufficient genuine attempts by candidates at questions set for this depth study, in this session of examinations, to offer comment or advice of any significance or merit.

**Depth Study E***Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century*

There were a number of Centres that had prepared candidates specifically for this depth study, but there were also a number of attempts by candidates who had found nothing else recognisable in other depth studies. In answer to **Question (a)(i)**, most gained marks by drawing sound inferences regarding British attitudes towards the Boers, although many wasted time and effort by writing long answers, full of interesting but irrelevant contextual knowledge, which would have been better used in later answers. The responses to **Question (a)(ii)** saw the vast majority of candidates agreeing that the railway network shown in Source B was a definite threat to the Transvaal. It was rare to find candidates who quoted non-threatening elements regarding the railway, or offering other factors that frightened the Boers. Almost invariably, answers to **Question (a)(iii)** followed the pattern of candidates comparing the content of the sources. It was extremely rare to find any candidate who tested the reliability of the sources.

Very few candidates were able to name a gold company (**Question (b)(i)**), but the descriptions of the Jameson Raid were full, and the detail was known and understood. Equally, well-prepared candidates were able to explain why the issue of votes for Uitlanders was so important (**Question (b)(iii)**), and most scored well here with good knowledge and succinct explanation. Many of the answers to **Question (b)(iv)** were brief – in some cases, the result of spending too much time on **Question (a)(i)**. However, of the better answers, many decided to blame Kruger or Rhodes, with a rare candidate offering a more balanced approach.

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

In this season of examinations, there were few candidates who had been specifically prepared by their Centres to attempt the questions on this depth study. Both Source A and B were equally accessible to the candidates. They were able to draw good inferences from Source A regarding the creation of culture of national and international significance (**Question (a)(i)**). Also, they and were able to explain from Source B why the Jews had a right to land in Palestine (**Question (a)(ii)**), and some candidates were able to effect a more balanced answer than seen in other depth studies. In answer to **Question (a)(iii)**, candidates again compared the content of the sources rather than tested for reliability.

The Zionist organisations that fought against the British mandate were well known, although answers to **Question (b)(ii)** were often vague and lacking details of the opposition to the creation of the state of Israel in 1948. Answers to **Question (b)(iii)**, on why the new state of Israel encouraged immigration, were often bold and broad statements with little explanation to clarify the arguments. **Question (b)(iv)** tended to evoke responses that followed the trend of one-sided answers, with the UN partition plan often seen as the only reason why there was a failure to find a settlement between Jews and Palestinians in 1947.

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

There were insufficient genuine attempts by candidates at questions set for this depth study, in this session of examinations, to offer comment or advice of any significance or merit.

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

There were insufficient genuine attempts by candidates at questions set for this depth study, in this session of examinations, to offer comment or advice of any significance or merit.