

CONTENTS

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

HISTORY

Paper 0470/01

Paper 1

General comments

It is pleasing to note that the improvement in quality noted in recent examinations has been maintained. As noted twelve months ago, the number of candidates who are well prepared for the demands of the paper continues to increase, resulting in fewer vague, generalised responses that gain little credit.

Answers now tend to be carefully thought out by a large majority of the candidates with question **(a)** now attracting shorter responses that are clear, concise and to the point. This is the only part of the paper that demands factual recall. However, candidates must realise that credit will only be given if the points being made link directly to the question. On occasions it is possible to develop a point being made and extra credit can be gained for this. Answers to question **(b)** are mixed in quality. Many candidates now automatically attempt to explain the point they are making to show understanding. This approach will place a response in the top level of the mark scheme for that question. On the other hand, there are still significant numbers of candidates who are content with straightforward identification which can only gain limited credit.

The final part of the question, part **(c)**, contains a hypothesis which candidates can agree, or disagree with, by using their historical knowledge and understanding. It is not necessary to make a decision as to which side is to be supported at the beginning of the answer as this often leads to a one-sided approach. Candidates should put forward their arguments from one point of view and then challenge this view with opposing arguments, allowing them to come to an informed judgement at the end as to 'how far' or 'to what extent'.

At the present time candidates appear to make little use of the stimulus provided with the question. This material is carefully selected to help with one of the parts of the question and can often provide clues to the answer. An example of this was **Question 7** on the Iron Curtain, where the cartoon was rich in information for part **(a)** and yet was almost totally ignored.

Rubric errors were similar in total to previous examination sessions and were often as a result of candidates attempting both of the depth study questions. Time for the majority is not a problem although a number of Examiners did note that perhaps some candidates might have benefited from an increase in the time allocation.

Comments on specific questions

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

Section A

Question 1

There were very few responses to this question. Most knew what the National Workshops were but not what happened in them. Part **(b)** was well answered by many, showing knowledge of the corrupt, repressive regime and links to the economic climate. The quality of responses to **(c)** varied but many attempted to draw information from Austria/Hungary, Italy and Germany. Knowledge on France was weak. Most took the positive side, seeing long-term benefits.

Question 2

Mainly, responses stated that the North was abolitionist and gave examples of conflicts that arose rather than developing religious or moral perspectives. Answers to **(b)** tended to concentrate on the actions and dress of the Klan rather than reasons for its formation. Often the descriptions of violent action were overlong. Answers to part **(c)** overwhelmingly concentrated on the race issue, with little to say on the positive side. Often, candidates went well beyond the logical time-frame for reconstruction.

Question 3

Those candidates who attempted this question scored well on parts **(b)** and **(c)**, but often interpreted **(a)** as 'any features' and often ignored the Constitution.

Question 4

Answers to part **(a)** were generally good with many candidates able to describe in some detail the Alliance System as it existed before 1914. Some went back into the nineteenth century to develop their points. Many answers to **(b)** described the crises and German actions rather than explaining how tension increased with Britain. All too often in the answers to **(c)**, Belgium was totally ignored or was limited to the idea of Belgian neutrality; candidates then went to the other side where identification of reasons for war, rather than explanation, predominated.

Question 5

This was easily the most popular question in the core. Good candidates scored highly but surprisingly significant numbers did very well on **(a)** and **(b)** and then scored badly on **(c)**. Part **(a)** was often very well known with many producing accurate factual detail. A limited number strayed away from the question into other areas of the Treaty such as land. This wasted valuable time. Part **(b)** produced many good answers, particularly relating to Lloyd George and Clemenceau. Answers on Wilson were less strong and little was seen relating to the opinion of the American people and their influence. On occasions, candidates produced over long responses which concentrated on the differences rather than an explanation of why they existed. Whilst there were many good and very good answers that dealt with successes and failures, many candidates were content to identify success and/or failure without explaining why it might be labelled in a particular way. This particularly related to disputes such as the Aaland Islands and Corfu. Indeed, correct knowledge of the Corfu incident was sadly lacking in many scripts. A significant number of answers included events from the 1930s. This detail was irrelevant to the question and did not attract credit.

Question 6

Hitler's foreign policy produced accurate and precise detail from the vast majority of candidates who attempted this question. A small number did go on to describe his actions. This was not required by the question and credit was not given. The key word in all the **(b)** questions is 'why' and here the vast majority of candidates recognised that to a lesser or greater extent by explaining reasons for success and avoiding mere narrative. The impact of World War One and reparations figured largely in answers while the more astute looked at Hitler's willingness to gamble and take chances, giving appropriate examples such as the Rhineland. Despite this, weaker candidates fell into the trap of describing rather than explaining. Often with this type of answer, the candidate feels he or she should write as little as possible to answer the question, rather than take the opportunity to display what they knew and understood. Many struggled in **(c)** to link the Nazi-Soviet Pact to the outbreak of war and indeed what they wrote about the Pact was often inaccurate. Thus answers were often one-sided and limited to Level 3 marks which were awarded for other reasons for the outbreak of war. These were generally better known.

Question 7

A wide variety of quality existed in the responses to **(a)**. Some found it difficult to describe in words what the 'iron curtain' was and some confused it with the Berlin Wall, with others thinking it was some kind of physical barrier. On the other hand, those who were well-prepared for this period scored at least three or four marks. Although many answers to **(b)** progressed beyond identification and description; few scored highly in the top level. Explanation was often limited to the containment policy and benefits to US trade. Answers to questions on this period (part **(c)**) require a strong understanding of the cold war era and in many responses there was little evidence of this. Many answers were limited to the 'story' of the Blockade with candidates unable to link to the idea of possible war. Others, although fewer in number, produced very thoughtful responses that took the issues such as Stalin's motives, the background to the period and the US options and successfully produced arguments to support and challenge the question hypothesis.

Question 8

Candidates in **(a)** used the Bay of Pigs incident almost without exception but were less secure on other actions taken by the USA. Some strayed into 1962 and found themselves repeating the information again in **(b)**. Candidates used the source well for **(b)**, producing strong answers on proximity. Answers were less strong on sphere of influence and the balance of world power. Candidates know the story of the Crisis well but have to realise that just using narrative limits the marks they can achieve. Often, the seriousness of events was played down by candidates as they appear to lack a feel for the seriousness of the situation within the world at that time. This approach often resulted in full support for the hypothesis and little challenge.

Section B**Question 9**

There were good, strong answers to **(a)**, with candidates able to describe the events of 1920. Some did, however, confuse it with the Munich Putsch. In their responses to **(b)**, many were able to link the events of 1923 to the impact of the Treaty of Versailles and the French and Belgium occupation. The better candidates took their answers on from here to link into passive resistance and the decision of the government to print more money, producing good, well-explained answers. Part **(c)** answers varied in quality. For many the hypothesis was the only acceptable answer and this was argued in terms of the short-term impact. Those candidates who took a wider view were able to argue that as hyperinflation had done great political damage to the Weimar government, Stresemann had to take action. Here the more able linked the actions of Stresemann to improvements that were brought about.

Question 10

Most candidates were able to display a sound knowledge of the changes made by the Nazis to education, although at times the treatment of Jews predominated. In **(b)**, the term minority was generally understood, although not all candidates identified the minorities they were writing about. Doing this would have allowed explanation of the reason for the persecution of specific groups. Many candidates in **(c)** came down strongly on the side of believing that Nazi support was strong, through the Hitler Youth or to a lesser, the League of German Maidens. Less credence was given to the idea of lack of support, such as the need to make membership of the Hitler Youth compulsory or the indoctrination in schools. Many had obviously heard about the 'Swing' movement and the Edelweiss Pirates but failed to show knowledge of how these groups displayed a lack of support.

Question 11

Part **(a)** was generally well answered, with many candidates displaying sound historical knowledge of the events. Some did, however, think that the Tsar gave the order for the troops to open fire, whilst the casualty figure was often exaggerated. Many points made in response to **(b)** were about general conditions but where the more specific reasons were developed, good answers were produced although surprisingly few mentioned the Okhrana. Part **(c)** produced some thoughtful responses relating to the October Manifesto and how this helped to appease the middle classes. Others developed the value of the troops remaining loyal, putting their responses firmly into Level 4.

Question 12

There were many good answers to **(a)**. On occasions candidates did confuse NEP with War Communism. In **(b)**, many displayed good factual knowledge and used this to explain reasons for Trotsky's defeat. Most candidates acknowledged that the labour camps were important but often failed to develop their answers. References to other forms of control were made but not always substantiated. Some good answers were seen on the cult of personality and propaganda methods.

Question 13

Answers to **(a)** were often limited to over-production and low prices with little about the economic issues of loans and debt. There were many weak answers to **(b)**, where candidates tended to bring farmers in again. The issues of coal/oil, cotton/man-made fibres were identified rather than explained. Part **(c)** produced some good answers, explaining the contribution of new industries and methods but also appreciating the importance of hire purchase, marketing, advertising, confidence and optimism. Poorer answers tended to concentrate solely on mass-production.

Question 14

Many ignored the word 'social' in **(a)**, resorting to general economic points and then using the same information for **(b)**. Those who answered the question had few problems scoring highly. A small number in **(b)** wrote generally about economic conditions and the depression, whilst the majority were able to make a number of well-explained points relating to the reasons for the crash. There were many detailed comments made about buying on the margin. In **(c)**, a number of candidates misunderstood the question and spent much time on the implementation of the New Deal policies. Hoover's perceived failings were particularly well dealt with.

Question 15

For many there was little reference to the reform of 1950 in **(a)** and candidates were quite often happy to interchange, and treat as the same, collectives, co-operatives and communes. Answers to **(b)** often related to 'what was the Great Leap Forward' rather than 'why did Mao introduce it'. Often the answer was written without the fundamental reason totally ignoring the Five Year plan. In **(c)**, the word 'economically' was often ignored, resulting in more general and often one-sided answers on the impact of Mao.

Questions 16-25

Too few answers seen to make meaningful comments.

Paper 0470/02

Paper 2

General comments

The overall performance of candidates was similar to that of previous years. There were many good answers that demonstrated sound source skills and contextual knowledge. However, some candidates still struggle to write concise and relevant answers. It is not unusual to find the question ignored and candidates writing down everything they know about the topic. Other candidates produce long detailed descriptions of sources, while others found it necessary to evaluate every source even if this is not required by the question. Candidates should be reminded that the Examiner is interested in one thing – how well has the question been answered?

The key to helping candidates to do well in this paper is not to drill or coach them in prepared answers. It is not useful to provide candidates with a set of rules which they must follow in every answer. In fact, the opposite is required – to develop mental agility so that candidates can use their knowledge and skills to respond to questions both familiar and unfamiliar. Classroom exercises developing thinking skills are much more useful than drilling candidates. It was clear this year that some candidates lacked this mental agility and were unable to respond to the particular requirements of certain questions.

Many candidates demonstrated the ability to interpret and evaluate sources by using the content, provenance and context of sources in a thoughtful way. However, there were other candidates who only used the surface meaning of sources and failed to interpret the message of sources. Too many candidates still think that the purpose of a source is what it shows. A more careful consideration of who had produced the source and who the intended audience is, would bring better results.

Many candidates quite rightly cross-reference to their contextual knowledge in their answers. However, sometimes such cross-referencing is far too vague. It is not good enough to say, for example, this source is reliable because my own knowledge tells me that it is right. Candidates should use precise and explicit contextual knowledge to check particular claims made by sources.

Comments on specific questions***Option A: 19th Century topic*****Question 1**

This question was generally answered well. Most candidates managed to reach Level 4 in the mark scheme by interpreting both sources and comparing these interpretations. Source A suggests that Britain was not worried about the German navy in 1889 while Source B shows considerable concern. Better candidates produced more subtle interpretations, for example, the patronising attitude of Britain in Source A. A small minority of candidates failed to read the question properly and as a result did not write about British feelings towards Germany. Instead, they just wrote about Germany and its military strength. There was also evidence of a few candidates being over-drilled. They ignored the question completely and spent their time discussing the reliability of the sources. This, of course, was not the question.

Question 2

Many candidates had more problems with this question than any other question on the paper. They were asked to compare why these two cartoons were published. This should have involved considering the purpose behind publication which in turn involves considering the message of the cartoons and also the intended impact on the audience of the cartoons. A reasonable number of candidates managed to get as far as the purpose of the cartoons, for example, both show Germany to be aggressive, but few considered the intended impact on audiences. A good number of candidates fell well short of these answers and got no further than what the sources show. These candidates appeared to think that what a source shows is the same as the reason for its publication, for example, Source C was published to tell people that Germany thought the Entente Cordiale was 'rock'. This approach led to completely invalid interpretations of Source D, for example, that Germany was merely acting in self-defence. Interpreting a source involves using the content of the source, its provenance and the historical context. These candidates appear to have ignored the last two of these factors and as a result failed to understand that the cartoons are anti-German. A number of the weaker candidates even claimed that both cartoons are about the invasion of Belgium.

Question 3

Many candidates simply took Source E and certain phrases in it at face value and as evidence that Germany was determined to go to war. They used phrases from the source such as 'The fleet must prepare itself for the war against England'. Better candidates were able to recognise the reservations in the source, of which there are several, or argued that the whole discussion in Source E is of a provisional nature. To reach the top level candidates needed to use contextual knowledge to test parts of Source E. Only a few candidates did this, and when it was attempted the cross reference to knowledge tended to be rather vague.

Question 4

In answering this question many candidates carried out excellent evaluations of Source F, but took Source G at face value. For Source F, candidates considered purpose and audience in an informed way. Source G could have raised similar issues. However, a good number of candidates scored well on this question.

Question 5

Some candidates ignored the content of the sources and attempted to answer the question by provenance alone, for example, they can/cannot be trusted because they are German/British. Some candidates ignored Source J altogether and just compared H and I. Better candidates compared the claims made in Source J with those made in Sources H and I and then went on to consider how far the claims in Source J stand up to scrutiny.

Question 6

This question was answered reasonably well with a good number of candidates explaining how some sources support that view that Germany was to blame while others do not. It is important that candidates do explain this rather than assert it. Some candidates failed to get higher than halfway up the mark scheme because they only wrote about sources that support the view that Germany was to blame. The phrase 'convincing evidence' was added to the question this year to try and encourage more candidates to evaluate the sources in their answers. It had little effect and few candidates earned the bonus marks awarded for attempts at evaluation.

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

This question produced a wide range of responses. A minority, although not an insignificant minority, of candidates produced rambling answers that paraphrased the content of the two sources to no apparent purpose. However, the majority of candidates were able to reach Level 3 of the mark scheme by explaining how the two sources agree, for example, over the fate of Clemenceau, Lloyd George and Wilson. Better candidates went on to explain how the sources also disagree, for example, Source B is much more positive about the peace settlement.

Question 2

This was a tricky question but was answered well by an encouraging number of candidates. Most went beyond undeveloped references to provenance, or comparing the surface content of the sources, to consider the different circumstances in which the two sources were produced. There were some very insightful discussions of issues relating to private and public evidence, and to audience. Many of these answers were developed further by some excellent use of cross-reference to relevant contextual knowledge.

Question 3

Most candidates made a genuine effort to compare the reasons for publication but some were restricted to the lower levels of the mark scheme because they misinterpreted Source E. They argued that both sources were hostile to the Treaty of Versailles. This is true of Source F, but Source E is celebrating the Treaty and Germany's discomfort. Better candidates did explain the different messages of the two cartoons but often failed to consider the intended impact on their audiences.

Question 4

A small number of candidates struggled with this question but most produced excellent answers. The weaker candidates spent time explaining why they were not surprised by Source G (this was not the question). Others interpreted Source H but failed to explain whether or not they were surprised by it, while a number explained that they were surprised that an American cartoon was making fun of Wilson. The better candidates realised that Source H is showing Wilson as naive, and used their contextual knowledge to explain why this did not surprise them. The very best answers used their knowledge of attitudes in the USA at the time to explain that they were not surprised that an American was criticising Wilson.

Question 5

Questions based on three sources have caused difficulties for candidates in the past, but this question was answered well. A few candidates ignored Source I, or based their answers on simplistic use of the provenance of the sources. There were also some who misinterpreted Source I as being pro-German. However, many candidates used a systematic approach which worked effectively. These candidates first interpreted Source I as defending the reparations. They then compared this message with the messages of Sources J and K and explained how it supports Source K more than it supports Source J. The best candidates evaluated Source I before deciding how far it could be used to support Sources J or K.

Question 6

Too many candidates, and by no means weak candidates, fail to score the marks they should on this final question. Some ignored the sources and spent their time explaining their opinion of the Treaty of Versailles, while others just described the sources and failed to answer the question. A number of candidates simply asserted that certain sources support the view that the Treaty of Versailles was, or was not, fair. Candidates should be aware of two crucial points: they are being asked how far the sources support the hypothesis, so they must use the sources in their answers; and they must explain how individual sources support or do not support the hypothesis. This year, the words 'convincing evidence' were used in the wording of the question to encourage candidates to evaluate the sources. This had little effect and most candidates still make no attempt to score the bonus marks which are awarded for attempts at evaluation. Having said all this, many of the candidates scored 6 marks or more on this question.

Paper 0470/03**Coursework****General comments**

The number of Centres entering candidates for the coursework option continues to slowly grow. The Moderators continue to be impressed with the overall standard of the work submitted. Reading much of it is a pleasure. Centres are thanked for submitting well-organised packages of coursework which contain all the necessary information and are easy to find one's way around. Thanks must also go to those Centres that annotate candidates' work in detail and indicate where in an answer certain levels of the mark scheme have been reached. This is most helpful to the Moderators.

Nearly all Centres set their candidates appropriate assignments. This is essential if candidates are to be given a chance to show what they can do in relation to the assessment objectives. However, it is important to note that assignments must be set on one or two Depth Studies – they cannot be set on the Core Content (The Development of Modern Nation States, 1848-1914 and International Relations since 1919).

A few Centres set essays for Assignment 1, while others structure the task into two or three sub-questions which gradually test higher order conceptual understanding. Both approaches work, although essays work best with the more able candidates. It is important that candidates' abilities to select relevant examples and to deploy their information effectively are assessed alongside their conceptual understanding of, for example, causation. In a few Centres, candidates write at excessive length and as a result produce more description and narrative than analysis. The best work is often to be found in shorter answers which keep to the point of the question and consist of concise and relevant analysis. Most Centres set causation exercises for this assignment. This is entirely appropriate, but it is important that candidates are encouraged, in at least part of the task, to compare the importance of different causal factors. It should be remembered that this assignment must introduce the concept of significance. Comparing the importance of different causes is one way of doing this.

There was much good source analysis and evaluation in Assignment 2 answers and writing at excessive length seems to be less of a problem. Exemplar Assignment 2 exercises on a number of Depth Study topics can be obtained from CIE. Using one of these can save teachers a lot of work although it must be admitted that some of the most interesting work seen this year has come from assignments that Centres have set on topics local to the Centre.

A consensus over the interpretation of the assessment objectives, and over standards, has emerged over the years and the Moderators' task in this syllabus is a relatively straightforward one. Under half the Centres had their marks adjusted and all nearly all these adjustments were small ones. About the same number of Centres had their marks adjusted upwards as had their marks reduced. Nowhere were these adjustments necessary because of serious faults in the work, or in the marking. They were implemented to move Centres' marking gently into line with the general standard.

Centres are reminded that they can set their own assignments. However, it is recommended that these are closely modelled on the exemplar tasks referred to above. If Centres wish to develop their own tasks, or even write their own coursework Depth Studies, they should send these to CIE before using them with candidates.

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

As with previous seasons of examination, the Examiners for this paper have noticed an improvement in the general handling of questions, and an increase in the number of very good scripts where candidates have used information and ideas with confidence. Many candidates have shown considerable skill in examination technique, an awareness of the need for balanced argument and a thorough knowledge of their chosen depth study. Together, these have produced high quality answers. However, there are still areas that cause concern.

In previous reports, comment has been made on the need to use the sources and their content in answers to part (a) questions. Indeed, all three of these questions have references to the need to use the sources in their wording. This appears to have been understood by many but there were a number of candidates, small but significant, who answered some of these questions using contextual knowledge only. These answers were not only full of correct and thorough knowledge but also demonstrated that the candidate was extremely well informed. However, these answers made no reference to the sources and were not answering the question that had been set. Hence, the marks available to candidates for these answers were severely reduced. Also many of these answers were extremely long. Thus the candidates had lost marks and used up much valuable time. Less well-informed candidates also showed pressures on their time management and knowledge with a number failing to attempt any of the questions in part (b). Another small minority offered no answer or, at best, a brief comment on (b)(iv), which has the highest tariff in the whole paper.

In general, more candidates appear to be aware that parts (a)(ii), (a)(iii) and (b)(iv) require balanced answers, either by way of a balance of evidence for (a)(ii) and (a)(iii), or a balance of argument and supportive detail for part (b)(iv). The issues of utility and reliability (part (a)(iii)) will be dealt with below.

As ever, **Depth Study A: Germany 1918-45** remained the most popular topic for candidates. **Depth Study B: Russia 1905-41**, and **Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-41**, were almost equally popular with candidates. Other depth studies attracted far fewer candidates in this season of examination.

For the most part, the scripts were well set out and neatly presented. Many candidates had taken pride in their work and many answers showed enjoyment and command of the subject matter. Most candidates wrote in dark blue or black ink, but there were a few candidates who used other colours, pale blue and a very pale green being the most difficult to read.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: Germany 1918-45

Most candidates were able to draw valid inferences from Source A about the Nazi Party in their answer to (a)(i). However, there were a significant number of candidates who were seduced by the recognition of the name 'Hitler' to write out all they knew about the man and that period of German history. These efforts contained much correct detail but gained few marks as the question set had not been answered. A good number of candidates offered balanced answers to (a)(ii), finding information in Source B which showed that the Nazi Party could be described as the most powerful party in Germany at the time, but that this power was based on other things than popular support and democratic approval. Answers to (a)(iii) were most often found to contain comparisons of the contents of the sources rather than attempts to challenge their comparative utility and reliability.

Responses to (b)(i) showed that most candidates could name one president of the Weimar Republic (Ebert or Hindenburg), but it was not common to find a candidate who could name both presidents. Stresemann was the most common incorrect response, although a number of international statesmen of this and other periods were named also. The key features of the Weimar Constitution were either fully known and answered in great detail or were not understood or recognised by candidates. Many understood that the phrase 'after 1929' was very important in (b)(iii) and they gave good accounts of the developments of the Nazi Party after the onset of the Great Depression. Weaker candidates saw the question as an opportunity to give general descriptions of the progress of the Nazi Party from its foundation onwards. Weaker answers to (b)(iv) showed a brief and general acceptance of the proposition that the Reichstag Fire was the most important reason that Hitler was able to become dictator of Germany. Stronger answers contained reasoned and balanced arguments, showing that the Reichstag Fire was important within the narrow time frame between his appointment as Chancellor and the passing of the Enabling Act, but these events fitted into a wider context. The context of the Great Depression through to the Night of the Long Knives and the death of Hindenburg were all explained to show the gradual development towards full and complete dictatorship.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-41

Candidates found Source A accessible and were able to list a number of valid inferences about the nature of collectivisation for their answers to **(a)(i)**. While Source B was accepted by some as pictorial evidence that peasants supported Stalin's attack on the kulaks, many were able to use their contextual knowledge of Stalinist discipline, methods, and propaganda to challenge the photograph. Many commented on the wooden nature of the peasants' posture and the lack of animation in the protest. This evaluation of Source B also helped with answers to **(a)(iii)**. However, the status of the British reporter of Source A often led to assertions that 'he must be biased'. Better candidates, with greater knowledge of the period, were able to argue cases of utility and reliability cogently before coming to a reasoned conclusion.

Most candidates knew why Stalin disliked the NEP and gave a variety of valid reasons. However, **(b)(ii)** and **(b)(iii)** confused some candidates. **(b)(ii)** asked 'What was collectivisation?' and demanded a description of the system. There was no need to give reasons for its implementation here. These reasons were required for answers to **(b)(iii)**, 'Why did Stalin introduce collectivisation?' A number of candidates confused the two questions and offered material in one question which was more appropriate for the other. Although there were some outstanding answers to **(b)(iv)**, offering depth of knowledge, balance and reasoned argument, there was a significant number of candidates who wrote general answers about progress in the Soviet Union, combining both industrial data as well as a few comments on agriculture. These answers showed that the candidates had either missed the specific focus of agriculture or had not sufficient knowledge to tackle agriculture on its own.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-41

Source A again proved to be a means of candidates gaining good marks. Most were able to draw and support valid inferences from the source about unemployment by 1933. Again, the large majority of candidates were able to see that the Alphabet Agencies in Source B had benefited many Americans, but also saw that they were only intended to be short term solutions. Answers to **(a)(iii)**, regarding the usefulness of the two sources as evidence of Roosevelt's determination to solve the problem of unemployment, were often of the 'stock' variety, for example, for Source A – 'it must be true as he was there', and for Source B – 'the historian would have had time to check details' or 'it was an American book so it would be biased'. Better candidates used arguments of tone, purpose and context to evaluate Source A, and context cross-reference and purpose to evaluate Source B.

A majority of candidates were able to give the full names of two Alphabet Agencies, although 'Association' was often given erroneously for 'Administration' in some examples. The terms of the Social Security Act of 1935 were either fully known and given in great detail or they became the cause of much speculation and guesswork. There were many good answers to explain why the Supreme Court ruled against some of Roosevelt's measures. A few candidates wasted precious time by answering the question as if it required a full explanation of all the opponents to Roosevelt's measure. Answers to **(b)(iv)**, on how successful the Roosevelt government had been in dealing with unemployment by 1941, were often very supportive of Roosevelt's actions and gave one-sided answers with no other comment other than it was all a complete success. Better candidates offered the successes, the opposition, the Second New Deal, rising unemployment in the late 1930s and the outbreak of the Second World War as evidence of the variability of success throughout the period under consideration.

Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990

There were too few attempts at this depth study to make significant comment.

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

A few candidates attempted these questions with 'Uncle Paul' Kruger holding candidates' fascination in answers to **(a)(i)**. Answers to **(a)(ii)** tended to be side-tracked from the evidence in the cartoon to give the 'story of Cecil Rhodes', and answers to **(a)(iii)** continued in the same vein.

Candidates offered 'diamonds and trade' as reason for the British annexation of the Transvaal in 1877, but there was little substantial knowledge of the outcome for the Boers of the war of 1880-81. However, many understood the connection between the opening of the Witwatersrand goldfields and the urbanisation of Johannesburg. Sadly, few knew of or understood the Jameson Raid and so answers to **(b)(iv)** were invariably weak.

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

Again, a few candidates attempted the questions of this depth study. The statistics of Source A were understood and candidates were able to make valid inferences regarding the growing population of Palestine and the faster growing Jewish element of that population. Candidates acknowledged the League of Nations Mandate as the most important cause of bitterness in Palestine and better candidates that the threat to lives, livelihoods and culture was of equal importance. There was much 'stock' evaluation of the sources for **(a)(iii)**, with 'statistics being able to prove anything' (Source A) and 'it is a British book and therefore reliable/unreliable' (Source B).

Answers to **(b)(i)** and **(b)(iii)** were often full and showed understanding of the British Mandate and the reasons that the Jews migrated to Israel. The answers to **(b)(ii)**, on the part played by UNO in the events leading to the declaration of the state of Israel and **(b)(iv)**, on the extent of the influence of the USA in Israel's winning of the 1948-9 war, were less convincing. Most candidates did not have sufficient relevant knowledge to answer adequately.

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society

There were too few attempts at this to make significant comment.

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

There were too few attempts at this to make significant comment.