

HISTORY

Paper 0470/01

Paper 1

General comments

Overall performance on this Paper was slightly better this year. Candidates have a better grasp of the demands placed on them and continue to move away from the pure description that characterised many answers in the past. However, the key words of the question are not always noted and this results in candidates, who have considerable knowledge of the topics for which they have been prepared, being keen to demonstrate this to the Examiner. It is important, however, that they carry out a selection process before they put pen to paper and begin to write an answer. This will help to ensure that they are actually answering the question as set. Selection is an important assessment objective and whilst it does not attract specifically assigned marks the recall and selection process underpins other objectives tested on this paper.

When answering the Depth Study question it is anticipated that candidates will possess a detailed understanding of the content of that study that may well involve change and/or impact over a period of time. On occasions, candidates' knowledge and understanding is limited.

Presentation of the written scripts, particularly where loose sheets of paper are used, does cause problems as Examiners are often left to decide the order of the sheets of paper. Where ever possible, Centres should encourage candidates to order their answers correctly, number pages and tie them loosely but securely.

The allocation of 2 hours for the paper appears to be generally well used by the majority, with Examiners reporting very few failures to complete the paper. Rubric errors remain about the same. Usually the infringement is where the candidate answers more than one question from **Section B**.

Comments on specific questions

Section A – Core Content

Questions 1-4 failed to attract many responses and therefore comments from this limited number of candidates would not be helpful. The comments which follow do not imply that a question was answered badly. They are intended to help Centres in improving the preparation of their candidates. Comments are not made on every part of every question written about.

Question 5

This question was by far the most popular in **Section A**. A significant majority, in answering (a), were able to offer at least four military restrictions placed on Germany by the Treaty of Versailles. On occasions numbers of men, battleships and other machines of war were confused or wrong. Credit was not given in these instances. A significant minority also wrote about other punishments, usually reparations; as this was not required by the question, extra marks were not awarded. There were many good responses to (b), with Clemenceau being particularly well known. Often, least was known about Wilson whilst Lloyd George 'was in the middle'. If this type of question appears again more specific knowledge of the latter might be beneficial. Numerous candidates stated that Clemenceau wanted 'the Rhineland demilitarised'. This was not the case, it was a term of the Treaty. France actually wanted an independent Rhineland. Comments about the suffering of France were often general – 'all industry destroyed', 'devastation everywhere' – and as in (a) getting the number to a close approximation proved too difficult for many. Many candidates produced good answers to (c), looking at arguments on both sides. On occasions the 'at the time' part of the question was ignored, with answers straying up to 1923.

Question 6

Arguably the most disappointing of responses related to this question. **Part (a)** was not well done. Candidates would list and describe assembly, council, secretariat, and then, if they thought they had enough time, they might mention an agency. Otherwise they talked in general terms of the objectives of the League. Responses to (b) were generally good although some answers failed to explain an identified weakness. Opening out the time period in (c) seemed to affect some candidates although the majority did not experience any problems. Centres should discourage their candidates from making statements like "The League did nothing" (re Manchuria, Abyssinia). Candidates should be encouraged to consider the degree of success brought by a particular act of the League.

Question 7

Answers to (a) tended to be at the extremes. Either candidates knew the full detail of the Geneva Agreements or they did not provide an answer. Many answers to (b) showed greater focus on 'Why America became involved in Vietnam' and this gave scope for containment and the domino theory. **Part (c)** offered a different approach, relating to the success of America's containment policy. When this was realised by the candidate, often after much descriptive work on a variety of events, a number of explained reasons were offered. It was encouraging to note that many argued that Cuba could be regarded as both successful and a failure whilst many strong reasons were offered as to why Vietnam could not have been a success.

Question 8

A good set of responses from quite a few Centres. Candidates knew what they were writing about in (a), providing a detailed account of the events. Incorrectly, many thought Nagy was executed in November 1956. This actually took place in 1958. Also wide discrepancies existed over the numbers of Hungarians killed. As commonly used text books vary over this figure, any sensible answer was accepted. Answers to (c) referred to glasnost, perestroika and the ending of the Brezhnev doctrine and many found something to say about the resentment of USSR control stretching back years. Solidarity was known by many but its role was not always clearly developed into explanation.

Section B – Depth Studies**Question 9**

Whilst many knew there was hyperinflation in Germany, and were clear about the actions that took place, many were unable to link the two to explain why hyperinflation happened. Candidates need to be aware that too few goods were being produced to sustain the value of the currency and then following the strike even fewer goods were being produced. If they do know this, everything else falls into place. Many indicated that money was being printed to pay reparations, even when in 9(a) they have stated that the Germans had stopped paying reparations, hence the invasion of French and Belgian troops. Very few mentioned that the strikers had to be paid or, if they did, made nothing of it. In answer to (c), candidates were able to show the recovery but often not that the recovery was temporary.

Question 10

Disappointingly, very few candidates knew about the Night of the Long Knives or knew anything more than the SS killed ('all', 'some of') the SA. Many were confused between the SS and the SA. Answers to (b) again reflected a lack of knowledge relating to Rohm and his aims. The format of **Question (c)** gave candidates clear leads to work on, though they were marginally better on propaganda than on the SS and Gestapo. The real problem was that many were unable to relate the two to 'control'.

Question 11

Few candidates were able to write meaningfully about Stolypin. Invariably there were references to carrot and stick, followed by exemplification usually in the most general of ways. Answers to (b) were much better. Candidates referred to the role of the army and the October Manifesto and a few others brought in lack of coordination amongst the opposition. Some spent time writing about the reasons for the Revolution before getting down to answering the question. Answers to (c) varied considerably with a number focusing on the November Revolution.

Question 12

Collectivisation was generally well-known and a majority scored well on (a). Good explanation was seen in relation to (b), although fewer included Stalin's hatred of the kulaks as a reason. Candidates know quite a lot about Stalin's modernisation of industry but find it easier to describe than explain, especially when writing about the downside.

Question 13

Part (a) posed few problems to the well-prepared, with many gaining 4 or 5 marks. Success with (b) hinged on knowing something about Hoover's political and moral philosophy and applying it to the question. Many offered 'prosperity being just around the corner, and rugged individualism' but few mentioned what he actually did or its limited success. **Part (c)** was done reasonably well with most candidates getting into L4. Interestingly the weaker argument was usually the argument with candidates doing little more than repeating all or part of their response to (a). Counter-arguments tended to dwell on overproduction and the depression in agriculture. Some candidates were unclear in their own minds between the Wall Street Crash and the Great Depression, often considering them the same or that the Great Depression was something that happened on a particular day in 1929.

Question 14

Some answers to (a) made reference to Blue Eagles but most failed to develop their answers despite the stimulus material. Most in (b) knew what Roosevelt did, and grasping the idea of confidence, developed an answer going on to the importance of banks having money to lend to help business and industry revive. Candidates in (c) demonstrated a good knowledge of the success of the New Deal. The limited success in some areas was also well-developed, showing an awareness of the short-term nature of some areas, the need for a second attempt and the failure to reduce unemployment.

Questions 15-25 failed to attract many responses and therefore comments from this limited number of candidates would not be helpful.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/02

Paper 2

General comments

The overall performance of candidates was in line with previous years. There were many good, thoughtful and intelligent answers with candidates genuinely thinking through historical problems. The twentieth century option remains by far the more popular although there was a noticeable increase in the number of candidates attempting the nineteenth century option.

The detail and accuracy of candidates' contextual knowledge is always impressive but some candidates still struggle over how to use this knowledge in a way that will help them to answer the questions. Some candidates seem to think they will get high marks by showing the Examiner how much they know about the topic. This is not the case. Examiners are interested in how well the candidates can answer the questions. They do not want to read pages of introductory material with the candidate turning to the question in the last few lines of the answer. Contextual knowledge does often have an important part to play in reaching the higher levels in the mark scheme but it needs to be used relevantly. This knowledge can be used to explain the interpretation of a source. It is often very useful in helping to explain the message and purpose of sources. It can also be used in conjunction with the provenance of a source. If a candidate knows something about the interests, views or aims of whoever has produced the source, they can produce a much better answer about, for example, reliability, usefulness or purpose. Knowledge can also be used to check the claims being made by a source. The candidates need to be able to decide which of these strategies is most relevant to particular questions.

Creeping back into a number of answers this year was the practice of spending the larger part of answers summarising sources at length. When there are two or three sources referred to in a question this can lead to a page or more of pointless writing. Candidates should be encouraged to directly address the question in the first sentence of an answer. This will help focus the candidate's mind. For example, if a question asks 'What is the message of this source?' the answer should begin 'The message of this source is...' Candidates should always start their answers with examining the source(s) in a way demanded by the question. Contextual knowledge should then be used to develop, support and explain their answers.

Some candidates still use sources uncritically. They use sources for their surface information - they focus on what sources say or show rather than on what sources mean. Candidates should be encouraged to ask about every source, what does the author/artist mean, what point are they trying to make, why are they saying this - what is their purpose? Answering these questions involves making inferences about sources and this is often best done by reading the source as a whole rather than by focusing on details within a source. The ability to infer the overall attitude, meaning, message or purpose of a source is an important one. This is particularly important when using cartoons as they often contain several sub-messages but there will be one big point that the cartoonist wants to make - the reason why they have gone to the trouble of drawing the cartoon. However, these points are not just relevant to cartoons. Written sources often work in the same way - they should be read and interpreted as a whole.

It is worth pointing out to candidates that questions that ask 'How far do sources agree?' will nearly always be looking for agreements and disagreements. Candidates should not stop once they have found, for example, an agreement. They should then look for disagreements. It may well be that one will be as result of points of detail but the others rest on the overall message of each source.

Many candidates score a lot of marks on **Question 6** but every year there are candidates who appear to have no idea of how to tackle this question and throw away a lot of marks. It is worth repeating what was said in last year's report about this question.

- The question is about the sources, answers must be based on the sources.

- There will always be some sources that support the statement and other sources that disagree with statement. The key is to explain how some sources support the statement and how other sources disagree with it. It is not enough to assert this, it must be explained.
- Sources have to be interpreted and sometimes the relationship between a source and the statement has to be inferred.
- Sometimes a source can be interpreted in different ways and can be used both for and against the statement.
- It is not necessary to use all the sources. Sometimes there might be a source that does not have a bearing on the statement. The quality of the explanation is as important as the number of sources used.
- Candidates can simply go through the sources in the order in which they appear in the paper, explaining whether each one supports or disagrees with the statement.
- There are extra marks awarded for evaluation of the sources.

Option A: 19th Century topic

Question 1

Most candidates did well with this question. Only a small minority paraphrased Source A and failed to focus on attitudes. Most were able to infer valid attitudes from the source and the better candidates differentiated between the government and the Reichstag. The best candidates realised that the source is useful because it shows us that the Germans were not united in their views. A large number of candidates wrote far more than they needed to because they insisted, in addition to answering the question, on writing a mini essay on German foreign policy during the final decades of the nineteenth century.

Question 2

The majority of candidates reached Level 2 in the mark scheme by explaining that all three sources support the idea of German intervention in Morocco. The sources, however, then give different reasons for such intervention and far fewer candidates explained this. It was almost as if once they had found the agreement, they thought there was no more to find. It is well worth reminding candidates that questions about how far sources agree nearly always involve both agreements and disagreements.

Question 3

There was a wide range of answers to this question. The weakest candidates simply accepted the source for all the information it provided, while others dismissed it because it was written by a German. Better answers analysed the language or the tone of the source and explained how these show that it is biased and unbalanced. The best candidates, and there were quite a number, used their impressive contextual knowledge either to explain why the Germans would want to create the impression of the visit that is created by the source or to test the claims made by the author. Some candidates' answers were undermined by confusing the two Moroccan Crises or by claiming that the Algeciras conference had taken place or was even being described by the source.

Question 4

This question was generally answered well although a minority of candidates read the question as asking 'which cartoon is about the British and which is about the Germans'. A number got the provenance of the sources the wrong way round but still offered valid interpretations of the sources, for example, F shows Germany as being over-aggressive so it is British, G makes an excuse for Germany not breaking the Entente Cordiale so it is German. However, a good number of candidates were able to explain that Source F is German because it is showing how strong and decisive Germany was in the Second Moroccan Crisis, while Source G must be British because it is mocking Germany for failing to break the Entente. The sound contextual knowledge of the candidates enabled them to reach these conclusions.

Question 5

Some candidates spent most of their answers paraphrasing the sources and only turned to the question in the last few lines of their answers. Most candidates, however, did base their answers around whether they were surprised or not. A number of candidates looked at the internal content of Sources I or J and simply stated whether they were surprised by it or compared I and J. Better candidates brought Source H into their answers and compared it with I and J. The best answers, and there were a number of these, cross-

referenced to their contextual knowledge or to other sources to explain whether or not they were surprised by I and/or J.

Question 6

A minority of candidates appeared to be totally unprepared for this question. They ignored the sources and wrote an essay, often very long and detailed, about German foreign policy. These candidates tended to come from the same Centres. A number of other candidates wrote one-sided answers, usually explaining how the sources support the view that German foreign policy was aggressive. However, there were still many candidates who knew exactly what to do with this question and who scored high marks. A few did not obtain as many marks as they could have done because in parts of their answers they asserted that a source either supported or disagreed with the hypothesis and then simply paraphrased the source. This is not enough - candidates must explain how a source supports or disagrees with the hypothesis.

Option B: 20th Century topic

Question 1

Some candidates simply paraphrased each source and then asserted that the two sources agree or disagree. However, most candidates were able to find one agreement - they both wanted peace. Candidates who could get no further were held back by their focus on what the sources say rather than what they mean. Understanding the latter involves reading each source as a whole and making inferences. For example, it is reasonable to infer from both sources that the authors support appeasement although this is not stated explicitly. Only the better candidates were able to infer disagreements e.g. Source A does not expect a war but Source B is worried there will be war, Source A likes Hitler, Source B does not. It is important that candidates are encouraged to go beyond the surface of sources and make inferences as well as reading sources as a whole and going beyond points of detail.

Question 2

A few candidates struggled with Source C. It reports what Goebbels thought a French prime minister should have said but these candidates either thought that the source was written by a French prime minister or thought that what was attributed to a French prime minister were the views of Goebbels. Another weakness on the part of a minority of candidates was a failure to address the issue of surprise even after writing good analyses of the sources. When a question asks candidates to, for example, explain if one source makes another surprising, they will always be placed in the bottom level of the marks if they fail to do what is asked - no matter how good the rest of the answer is. It can help candidates if they are encouraged to directly address the question in the first line of their answers. A good number of candidates were able to compare the content of Sources B and C and to use this to support either surprising or not surprising - both were acceptable and candidates scored higher marks for arguing both. For example, what Goebbels says makes Chamberlain's hope in Source B that a war could be avoided very surprising but on the other hand, it is not surprising because the Germans were trying to leave the enemy in the dark. The best candidates developed their answers by using their knowledge of the period to support their arguments about surprising or not surprising.

Question 3

A number of candidates described the source in great detail and then proceeded to tell the Examiner everything they knew about the re-militarisation of the Rhineland, leaving the question unanswered. Candidates should be encouraged to directly address the question in the first sentence of their answer, for example. 'The cartoonist drew this cartoon to ...' Indeed, the best answers have clearly reached a high level in the mark scheme after a few lines. Weaker candidates who did attempt to address purpose suggested that it was drawn to show people that the 'duck was trampling on Locarno', or even 'the duck wanted peace'. Candidates need to move away from thinking about cartoons show. They need to focus on what is it that the cartoonist wants to say. It is important that candidates distinguish between the sub-messages of a cartoon and the cartoonist's big point. A sub-message is that the cartoon says that Germany is strong but this is not the main point the cartoonist wants to make. This is more about criticising what Germany is doing, criticising the Allies for doing nothing about it or criticising appeasement. Cartoons are drawn for a purpose and candidates reach the top level by being able to explain a legitimate purpose, for example, to warn people that Germany will not stop with the re-militarisation of the Rhineland. A reasonable number of candidates suggested a valid message and a smaller number got to purpose.

Question 4

Far too many candidates spent pages summarising what the sources said and left addressing the question directly until the end of their answers. In most cases, the first three quarters of the answers could have been left out without a single mark being lost. Weaker candidates simply dismissed Source G because it is American and therefore biased, while a few candidates thought it was Austrian in origin. Most candidates were able to compare what Source G said with Sources E and F. They realised that Source G claimed that Germany was a dangerous threat, while both Sources E and F claimed that Germany was not as strong as she appeared. These two sources, however, do agree that Germany had the ambition and aggressiveness mentioned by Source G - the better candidates realised this and were able to write about agreements and disagreements. The best candidates were able to add their contextual knowledge of the situation to their analyses and make a more convincing evaluation of Source G.

Question 5

There was a wide range of different answers to this question. Most candidates made a genuine attempt to compare the messages of the cartoons but some were unable to interpret both. For Source H, most candidates were able to get as far as suggesting that Hitler was shown as a threat and even that the western countries were unaware of how dangerous he could be, but a much smaller number realised that the cartoon is a Soviet one and was therefore criticising the western powers for their encouraging of Hitler and their hopes that he could be used against the USSR. More candidates were able to interpret Source I successfully, although some did think that it agreed with H because in both Hitler was out of control. There was a level in the mark scheme for candidates who compared reasonable interpretations of the cartoons but were unable to reach full interpretations of both.

Question 6

A number of candidates threw away marks because they lost sight of the hypothesis given to them and instead tested a different one - 'Hitler was a threat'. Despite this, most candidates clearly knew what they had to do in this question and produced balanced answers and scored high marks. There was still a minority who appeared to be totally unprepared for this question. They ignored the sources and wrote an essay on whether anyone understood how dangerous Hitler was. A weakness to be found in some good answers was a tendency to assert that a source either supports or disagrees with the hypothesis and then simply to paraphrase the source. This is not enough - candidates must explain how a source supports or disagrees with the hypothesis.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03

Coursework

The overall standard of coursework submitted by candidates remains high and it was a pleasure to read so much good work. No centres used inappropriate assignments although a few had assignments that need slight amendments. These Centres have been advised of suggested changes in the reports to individual centres. However, the overwhelming majority of Centres used assignments that were challenging, tested a range of skills and led to impressive work being produced. Centres starting coursework for the first time should be aware that assignments ready for use can be obtained from CIE.

The marking of coursework by centres was clearly carried out with care and expertise. Although adjustments were made to the marks of some Centres, these were minor and were carried out to bring marks into line with the overall standard. Overall, the work was marked at, or very close to, the required standard. The moderators found the detailed comments on candidates' work indicating where candidates were displaying certain skills and understandings, and reaching particular levels in the mark scheme, very useful.

The moderators are also grateful for the well-organised nature of the packages of coursework that were sent to them. These packages were carefully organised and it was easy for moderators to find their way around all the materials included in them. Centres sent samples consisting of the correct number of pieces of work and covering a range of marks. Where there was more than one teacher, internal moderation had been carried out effectively and the different teaching sets were represented in the sample. Centres also enclosed all the necessary documentation including mark sheets, assignments and mark schemes.

Over the years the length of the work produced by candidates has been an issue. It is pleasing to report that many Centres have made efforts to address this. With the exception of just a couple of centres the work submitted this year was much closer to the recommended number of words. The result was work that was more focused and relevant. Candidates should be reminded that teachers and moderators are looking for quality not quantity, and that the ability to select material that is relevant and leave out material that is not, is one of the skills being assessed.

In Assignment 1 candidates should be given the opportunity to write about a range of causal factors. For high marks they must demonstrate the ability to explain links between the factors and how they interacted with each. They should also be able to compare their relative importance. This should include explaining reasons why some factors were more important than others. Candidates who just assert that causal factors are linked or that one is more important than another should not be given high marks.

In Assignment 2 candidates need to demonstrate that they can interpret, evaluate and use a range of different types of source material. For high marks they must be able to relate the sources to their historical context. This should involve the candidates' knowledge and understanding of the historical context being used to analyse and evaluate the sources. Some of the marking of Assignment 2s was a little generous. There was a tendency to award high marks to rather thin answers. Candidates need to analyse the content of sources in detail and consider issues such as purpose and audience. Some answers could be improved by explicit use of knowledge and understanding of the historical context to interpret and evaluate sources.

However, overall the standard of the candidates' work was high and candidates can be justly proud of their achievements.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/04

Alternative to Coursework

General comments

As ever, this season of examinations produced scripts that ranged across the whole spectrum of ability. However, it is fair to say that Examiners regularly reported on the increasing number of high quality scripts that demonstrated considerable knowledge, skill and good examination technique. Most of the scripts were well organised and neatly presented although, it must be added, there were a few scripts which severely taxed Examiners' deciphering skills. There were very few rubric infringements, but there was evidence of poor time management when candidates spent so much time on their **Part (a)** answers that they could not do full justice to their **Part (b)** answers, especially **Question (b) (iv)** which carries the highest mark tariff for the whole paper.

It was also pleasing to note that there was an increased interest and attempts to test the reliability of sources in **Question (a) (iii)**. However, many of these attempts offered 'stock' or incomplete evaluations e.g. 'He was the leader so he would know', or 'The historian would have had a long time to do his research'. These comments were often at the expense of the provision of little or no detail from the sources themselves. Comments and tests for reliability will appear in several of the comments on specific questions below.

As ever, Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945, remained the most popular choice for candidates. Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941, and Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941, attracted approximately the same number of candidates. Some Centres had prepared to attempt the questions set for Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990, Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century, and Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994. However, although some individual candidates attempted Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society and Depth Study H: The Impact of Western Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century, there were either too few legitimate attempts to make general comment or they answered the questions with information that bore little or no resemblance to that listed in the syllabus.

Comments on specific questions.

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945.

Part (a) Questions.

Candidates were almost always able to draw valid inferences from Source A about the Hitler Youth Movement, and support their inferences with evidence taken from within the source. However, there were still candidates who chose to use the sources as a spur to write all they knew about the Hitler Youth Movement, often ignoring all of the source material. Contextual knowledge can be used in addition to references to the source but **Part (a)** questions are set to test how candidates use source material, not to test contextual knowledge. In answers to **Question (a) (ii)**, candidates very often found enough evidence in Source B to provide balanced answers. Tests for reliability in answers to **Question (a) (iii)** often failed because they did not delve sufficiently deeply into the provenance or the detail. Many candidates offered 'stock' assertions that 'The SDP did not like the Nazis' or 'A Hitler Youth member would know what happened'. Better candidates commented on Source A in relation to the SDP being in exile and quoted valid contextual knowledge of hostility between the SDP and the Nazi Party, and events surrounding the Enabling Act, March 1933. These were firm foundations for explaining why there might be some bias in **Source A**. Equally, these candidates also touched on the balance of evidence in **Source B** and its dislike of 'absolute obedience', showing the link by cross-reference to Source A's reference to 'state control'. They commented that the agreement between two ostensibly opposing sources showed there was some truth to be found here.

Part (b) Questions.

Almost all candidates understood what the Enabling Act was in terms of allowing Hitler to rule by decree without reference to the Reichstag but few developed their answers beyond that. Answers to **Question (b) (ii)** on Nazi policies towards women were often full and informative, and many scored maximum marks. Needless to say, that some of the details offered were dramatic, colourful and often peripheral to the thrust of the question. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** on the Nazi curriculum in German Schools either gave general accounts of Hitler's need to indoctrinate children as 'they were the future', or better answers that concentrated on new subjects in the curriculum, the redirection of old subjects, with detailed comments on what each of these was trying to achieve. There were some excellent answers to **Question (b) (iv)** on the Nazi Government's ability to control German society after 1933. Weaker candidates tended to offer one-sided answers showing the instruments of maintaining control and ignored the many and varied areas of opposition. Balance of argument is very important here to achieve marks at the highest Level. Sadly, there were still many answers that lacked detail, and showed only a general comprehension.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941.**Part (a) Questions.**

Most candidates attempting **Question (a) (i)** were able to draw inferences from Source A about the urgency to create an army while fighting at the same time, recruiting appropriate troops and the need to bring supplies to those troops. Equally, most candidates saw that Source B showed in equal measure that the members of the Red Army were 'willing to serve' and there were many 'volunteers', as well as Trotsky needing to use 'conscription', 'harsh discipline' and 'party members' to ensure the loyalty of all of the troops. In answers to **Question (a) (iii)**, there were attempts at 'stock' evaluations trying to test for reliability. For Source A, it was often the assertion that Trotsky 'was the commander' or 'he was there' that was said to prove the source to be reliable. Also, for Source B, candidates asserted that the source could be trusted 'because the historian had had plenty of time to complete his research' or 'historians do not lie'. In both cases, the reliability could have been proven by the use of relevant contextual knowledge about the early days of the Red Army, and the numbers available to seize control in Petrograd in 1917. Also, the sources do support one another on the issues of the number of troops and the need for ardent Communist volunteers.

Part (b) Questions.

Almost all candidates were able to supply valid examples of countries that sent troops to fight against the Bolsheviks in the Russian Civil War. Answers to **Question (b) (ii)** on the terms of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk were either very general – 'Russia lost land, population and resources' – or very particular, with candidates able to list the areas of land and offer percentages for the losses of population and resources. There were some impressive answers to **Question (b) (iii)** on the reasons for the introduction of War Communism. Candidates knew the reasons, the background, areas of impact and outcomes well. There were very long and full answers to **Question (b) (iv)** on the extent to which the Bolshevik victory in the Russian Civil War was due to Trotsky's leadership. However, many candidates concentrated more on other reasons for that victory than they did on Trotsky's impact. Candidates should remember that the very highest marks for this question require a balanced argument and a reasoned conclusion.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941.**Part (a) Questions.**

Source A created something of a problem for a number of candidates in their answers to **Question (a) (i)** in that they were able to draw general inferences about the amounts of alcohol consumed between 1918 and 1929 but did not provide specific detail from the source as evidence. They asserted that there was a decline in consumption immediately after the introduction of Prohibition and often commented that consumption quickly increased beyond pre-Prohibition levels. However, the details of the years concerned and the detail of the amounts consumed did not appear in these answers. Most candidates were able to produce evidence from Source B to show that, whilst Prohibition was effective in some areas, it was generally ignored in others. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)**, often suggested that a New York University 'would not lie' in its research and that an American Church would be biased as Churches supported Prohibition. Candidates would have been better advised to identify the balance in Source B (which they just did in answer to the previous question) and also to reflect how Source B largely supported the statistical evidence in Source A.

Part (b) Questions.

Most candidates were able to identify at least one area from which alcohol was smuggled into the USA during Prohibition, and they were also able to identify the broad definitions of speakeasies. However, there were many full and detailed answers regarding why some Americans supported Prohibition, ranging from religious groups to employers, to wives and families, impact of the First World War and hostility to German brewers etc. Above that, there were also many full, detailed, well argued and balanced answers to **Question (b) (iv)** on whether all Americans benefited from the Roaring Twenties. The knowledge and delivery of these arguments was good to see and good to read.

Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990.**Part (a) Questions.**

A few Centres had prepared for this depth study and some had success. Candidates were able to draw a variety of valid inferences about communes in answers to **Question (a) (i)** and supported them from the detail from Source A. **Question (a) (ii)** was often well answered, and with a degree of enjoyment, regarding the success of the Great Leap Forward and the descriptions in Source B of a huge tomato and a giant pig. However, it may have been the fascination with these descriptions that produced answers to **Question (a) (iii)** that commented on the content of the sources rather than test for their reliability.

Part (b) Questions.

Candidates often suggested that 'barefoot doctors' were 'first aiders' but rarely developed their answers beyond that. Answers to **Question (b) (ii)** on the organisation of collective farms were usually adequate, with the occasional candidate confusing collective farms and communes. Explanations of why Mao introduced and then abandoned the Hundred Flowers Campaign were far more convincing, but answers to whether the Communist Government improved the lives of Chinese people between 1949 and 1960 tended towards generalisations and sometimes strayed beyond the time constraints in the set question.

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century.**Part (a) Questions.**

A small number of Centres had prepared for this depth study. Candidates often thought that Source A showed gratitude by the Boers to the British for looking after their women and children towards the end of the conflict. They had not understood the sarcasm of the writer in the last sentence and this had affected their interpretation of the source. On the contrary, most candidates saw there was a balance of evidence in Source B showing whether or not the British had won the Second Anglo-Boer War. In general terms, this was often the best answered question for this depth study. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** concentrated on the content of the sources and it was rare to find an attempt to address the reliability of the sources.

Part (b) Questions.

Most candidates found it impossible to name two Boer military leaders from the Second Anglo-Boer War, and descriptions of blockhouse tended to concentrate on their medical function rather than on their control and defence functions. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** on the opposition of non-whites to the formation of the Union of South Africa in 1910 tended to be broad generalisations and often strayed beyond the date restrictions in the question. Equally, answers to **Question (b) (iv)** on whether economic changes between 1880 and 1914 had a greater impact on the African peoples than the Anglo-Boer conflicts contained generalisations and again tended to stray beyond the date restrictions of the question.

Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994.**Part (a) Questions.**

A few Centres had prepared very well for this depth study in this season of examinations; candidates from other Centres showed a general understanding of the issues in the questions but lacked much specific detail in their answers. Candidates drew valid inferences from the statistics in Source A but then many were seduced into giving very long answers full of contextual knowledge. In this case, it was usually about events in Europe and especially Germany. Interesting and correct as these answers often were, they did not focus on the actual question that had been set and on the source material provided. At best they wasted valuable time, and worst they wasted time and marks. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)** on the chances of Britain being

able to stem Jewish immigration to Palestine were usually balanced but these also drew on contextual knowledge. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** almost always tried to compare the content of the three sources. Some candidates pointed out that the Source A statistics were from ESCO, an organisation working for a Palestinian state shared by Jews and Palestinians, but failed to develop this idea further.

Part (b) Questions.

Some candidates had a general idea of what the League of Nations mandate over Palestine was, but only a few offered precise details. The problems that faced the British in Palestine in the 1940s was better known and good detail was offered regarding incidents, Jewish liberation groups and clash of cultures and religions in the area. However, answers to why the United Nations Organisation drew up a partition plan for Palestine in 1947 rarely got much beyond the fact that 'somebody had to do something' as the British had walked away. Conversely, **Question (b) (iv)** on whether the birth of the state of Israel was brought about by British weakness was answered with balance and detail. It was particularly interesting to see how many of the candidates had sympathy and understanding for the positions of the British, the Israelis and the Palestinians. Good objectivity was in evidence here.

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society.

Some candidates answered questions for this depth study but too few to allow constructive comment.

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

Some candidates answered questions for this depth study but too few to allow constructive comment.