

# CONTENTS

---

<b>HISTORY</b> .....	<b>1</b>
Paper 0470/01 Paper 1 .....	1
Paper 0470/02 Paper 2 .....	4
Paper 0470/03 Coursework .....	7
Paper 0470/04 Alternative to Coursework .....	8

---

## FOREWORD

This booklet contains reports written by Examiners on the work of candidates in certain papers. **Its contents are primarily for the information of the subject teachers concerned.**



# HISTORY

---

Paper 0470/01

Paper 1

## General comments

Examiners noted that a significant majority of candidates were well-prepared to meet the demands of the examination. This resulted in many good answers being seen with candidates demonstrating the skills required to meet the demands of individual questions.

Many candidates now restrict the length of their answers to **(a)** questions by endeavouring to stick to the question rather than wandering to the periphery of the topic being asked about. It is possible in these questions, as they test recall, to gain full marks by giving four points or by giving two developed descriptions. Sometimes candidates' responses to **(b)** questions can remain descriptive or just identification. Candidates should be encouraged to turn their statements into explanations so that in the examination they are able to show the Examiner their understanding of that particular aspect of history in the context of the period it happened.

Many sound answers were seen in relation to **(c)** questions that developed both sides of the argument. It is not necessary for candidates to make a judgement at the start of their answer. Indeed this approach often results in them failing to challenge the hypothesis. They may find it useful to think of a plan which allows for an initial paragraph to support the hypothesis and then to put forward reasoned arguments as to why the hypothesis should be challenged. Once a more balanced answer is produced, candidates are in a better position to make a supported judgement or reach a valid conclusion. It is important that candidates move away from writing a summary of what has just been said to reach their conclusion and judgement.

### **Comments on specific questions**

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

#### **Section A – Core Content**

##### **Questions 1-3**

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

##### **Question 4**

Although not popular with many candidates this question was attempted by a significant minority. In **(a)** simple factual knowledge of the Balkan Wars was lacking and very few were able to identify the first war from the second. The better answers described the roles of the Balkan League, Turkey and Serbia and recognised the growth in power of Serbia. On occasions answers were vague generalisations of the state of Europe either in the earlier part of the century or in 1914. In **(b)** very few answers indicated anything other than a weak knowledge of the Bosnian crisis of 1908. This resulted in many responses ranging in their content from the Moroccan Crisis to the assassination at Sarajevo.

##### **Question 5**

This was the most popular question in **Section A** and there were many good and very good answers. Candidates' knowledge of the successes of the League of Nations in **(a)** was sound with many mentioning the Aaland Islands, Greece and Bulgaria and Upper Silesia. A significant percentage of answers introduced aspects of the League's humanitarian work though in many instances this was limited to 'refugees', 'slavery' and 'drugs' without reference to a particular country or region. Some candidates wasted time by writing about the League's failures taking their answer into the 1930s. In **(b)** those who were well-prepared for this question produced two or three well-explained reasons highlighting specific issues as to why the League failed to deal with Japanese aggression. Some responses were restricted to general reasons for the League's failure, such as the lack of an army. This type of response received minimal credit. A significant number of candidates wasted time by writing at length about the reasons for the Japanese aggression. This approach did not receive any credit. Erroneously, some answers stated that 'the League took no action', and then proceeded to write about Lytton and the League's moral condemnation of Japan, whilst others thought 'the League applied sanctions'. Many answers to **(c)** were strong on the events of the Abyssinian crisis but failed to link these to the demise of the League of Nations. When writing about Hoare and Laval a small number incorrectly thought they were the British and French Prime Ministers. Others went off the question when, having dealt with Abyssinia, they wrote about the causes of war in 1939 rather than explaining the reasons for the decline of the League. Nevertheless, there were many good answers where candidates displayed a good understanding of the League's problems through developed points relating to a fundamental weakness in structure and membership and also the impact of the Depression.

##### **Question 6**

Those candidates with a sound knowledge and understanding of the inter-war period had little difficulty in gaining high marks on this question. These responses dealt with the failure of the League of Nations, the long-term consequences of the peace treaties, the policies of Britain and France and Hitler's foreign policy including lebensraum. Despite selecting this question many candidates did not answer part **(a)** at all, whilst many of those that did confused the Saar with either the Ruhr (1923) or Rhineland (1936). Additionally many thought that the area had been given to France under the Treaty of Versailles. Some answers incorrectly referred to the plebiscite as an 'election'. Answers to **(b)** often lacked clarity with points being disjointedly linked together rather than as explanations in their own right. Some candidates were able to use parts of the cartoon effectively as part of their answer whilst others developed the three main aspects of 'the treaty', 'fear of war' and 'fear of communism'. The impact of government elections in France was often weak whilst the British policy of appeasement was incorrectly attributed to Chamberlain who was not Prime Minister until May 1937. In **(c)** many candidates failed to progress beyond a Level 3 mark due to their lack of understanding of what Hitler's policy of lebensraum actually meant in practice. Indeed many responses lacked the wider view of the causes of the outbreak of war in 1939. Most were aware that part of Hitler's policies was to expand eastwards but the lack of understanding of what lay east of Germany resulted in a general view that the Anschluss with Austria and the taking of the Sudetenland and Czechoslovakia was part of this policy. When the invasion of Poland was mentioned as the starting point of the war it was not linked with lebensraum. Many responses became a listing of events from 1938 but without any link as to how they contributed to the outbreak of war.

**Question 7**

This question attracted many candidates and produced a significant number of good responses. Most candidates were aware of the Vietcong although they were occasionally incorrectly portrayed as the 'army of the north'. The communist links come over particularly strongly. In a limited number of instances the tactics of the Vietcong predominated at the expense of 'who they were'. Answers to **(b)** were often well explained with a sound understanding of the Truman Doctrine, containment and the 'domino effect'. If any criticism is to be made it is that of the over development of the role played by the French. Many were aware of the Gulf of Tonkin incident but often failed to link this to the power given to President Johnson by Congress. Whilst there were many good responses to **(c)** many answers lacked clarity of thinking that resulted in a failure to provide clear differentiation between military policy and practice, public opinion and the impact of the media. Here many answers resorted to descriptive mode rather than explaining why America withdrew.

**Question 8**

Although the numbers answering on this topic were relatively few there were more responses than in the past. Many were able to identify the main aspects of the structure for **(a)**, including the Security Council, the General Assembly and the International Court of Justice and some went on to state their role. Answers to **(b)** were often limited to the issue of the veto. What was lacking was an understanding of the implications of the veto and how it had been used in relation to specific events in the past. Accounts of the Congo Crisis were often limited to the identification of incidents in the conflict rather than considering the part played by the United Nations.

**Section B – Depth Studies****Question 9**

There were many good answers to **(a)** with candidates demonstrating a sound knowledge of the Spartacists. Many candidates in their answers to **(b)** were content to list the terms of the Treaty of Versailles rather than, as required by the question, to explain why the treaty was hated. In **(c)** the understanding of the recovery of the Weimar Republic after 1923 was often of a high level with many sound explanations being given for the progress that was made. A significant number of candidates developed their answers further to consider the extent of the progress, citing the US loans as a particular problem. Many answers contained reference to the changes in culture and the arts but this tended to be descriptive with the arguments for and against being unexplained.

**Question 10**

The views of women and the family in Nazi Germany were often well known with candidates producing good responses when describing these views in answer to **(a)**. There were, however, numerous examples of repetition in answers. Again in **(b)** the topic was generally well explained although a significant minority included explanations relating to education which was not part of the question. Many answers to **(c)** were unbalanced. The majority of candidates correctly explained the problems faced particularly by the Jews and the use of concentration camps. Disappointingly, few developed explanations around restrictions of rights of the people in Germany or the significant use, and effect, of indoctrination. Many explained the reduction in unemployment with detail of how this was achieved but little was seen in relation to 'Beauty of Labour' or 'Strength through Joy'.

**Question 11**

The quality of answers to **(a)** varied considerably. Many were fully aware of the role of Stolypin in relation to suppression and his work in helping the peasants. Others were limited to the phrase 'carrot and stick' which was often offered without any real understanding. The Okhrana was rarely mentioned. Answers to **(b)** were characterised by references to the army and the influence of Rasputin on the Tsarina. On numerous occasions a sound understanding of the impact of events at the time was not evident with identification being stronger than explanation. In a small number of instances the events of March 1917 were confused with those later in the year. Answers to **(c)** again varied considerably in quality. Some were very good whilst others lacked clarity of understanding of the reasons for the Provisional Government being overthrown and a small number actually described events of the Civil War.

**Question 12**

Whilst many were secure in their knowledge of collective farms others were not and often resorted to the reasons why Stalin wanted change, which should have been in **(b)**. Surprisingly very few mentioned the kulaks. There were many good answers to **(b)** often linked to exports and the financing of industry. Again the will to remove the kulaks was rarely mentioned or indeed the collective ownership doctrine of communism. Answers to **(c)** were somewhat disappointing with many failing to explore the different agendas of the Five Year Plans. Knowledge of the 'cost', particularly human, was inadequately explored.

**Question 13**

There were many good answers covering all aspects of the era of the 'Roaring Twenties'. When answering **(b)** many candidates were unable to offer reasons for the growth of the Ku Klux Klan other than 'to deal with' black people. This lack of awareness resulted in detailed descriptions of the activities of the Klan which did not answer the question. Most answers develop Prohibition in **(c)** scoring well within Level 3. Racial intolerance was often ignored or lacked specific examples other than the Ku Klux Klan.

**Question 14**

Whilst the vast majority of candidates who answered this question were fully aware of the 'hundred days' and were able to demonstrate what happened, a significant minority thought it was the period of preparation prior to the introduction of the New Deal. There were some impressive explanations in answer to **(b)** showing a very good understanding of the issues that caused the various interest groups to oppose the New Deal. Most answers dealt well with the idea that many problems were solved often using examples of the work of the Agencies or the impact of the banking measures. On the other hand once issues around unemployment had been explored candidates had little to offer to challenge the hypothesis in the question.

**Questions 15-25**

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

<p><b>Paper 0470/02</b></p>
-----------------------------

<p><b>Paper 2</b></p>
-----------------------

**General comments**

The overall performance of candidates was similar to that of previous years. The contextual knowledge of many candidates was sound and a reasonable number were able to interpret and evaluate sources in an effective way. It was clear to the Examiners that in Centres where candidates had been prepared in the skills necessary for this paper the answers were good, but in a minority of Centres candidates appeared to have had little such preparation and struggled badly with some of the questions. The **20<sup>th</sup> Century topic** was far more popular than the **19<sup>th</sup> Century topic** which had only a small number of candidates.

There were a number of common weaknesses that prevented some candidates from achieving higher marks. First, candidates should be reminded that the Examiner is interested only in how well the questions have been answered. Some candidates appear to believe that Examiners will be impressed simply by the amount of detail they can recall about the relevant topic. This is not the case. It is important that candidates read each question carefully and think for a few moments about what it is asking them to do. This should be done in relation to the sources referred to in that question. The Examiner requires an answer to the question set and this will need to be based on all the sources mentioned in the question.

At the beginning of their answers to questions about pictorial sources, a disappointing number of candidates describe the surface detail of the sources in great detail. This will never achieve more than one mark for the candidates. A similar weakness appears in answers about written sources where candidates find it necessary to paraphrase the sources in detail. Candidates should think about their interpretation of the source. This needs thinking about carefully and needs to be done before any of the answer is written down. Too many candidates want to start writing before they have thought their answers through.

Another weakness in answers about cartoons is the tendency of some candidates to focus too much on the particular details in the cartoon, or on just a part of it. It is important that candidates try and work out the 'big message' of a cartoon. This means looking at the cartoon as a whole and not being sidetracked by some details. Having worked out a big message, candidates should then support it by reference to details in the cartoon. Some candidates try and do this the other way round. They start their answers by describing detail and never recover.

Some questions will require candidates to explain whether one source proves or suggests that another is wrong. Sometimes such questions involve the use of three sources. In answering such questions it is important that candidates, first, use all the sources referred to in the question; second, compare what the sources say; and, third, evaluate the sources (if they decide that a source is unreliable then it cannot possibly prove that another source is right or wrong). When candidates cross reference to their contextual knowledge to allow them to evaluate a source such cross-referencing is sometimes 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.

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 thus were unable to respond to the particular requirements of certain questions.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### ***Option A: 19th Century topic***

##### **Question 1**

Most candidates were able to give examples of Source **A** being biased one way or the other and better candidates gave examples of it being biased in favour of both sides. The fact that the source contains points that support and criticise both the North and the South led to the best candidates realising that it is not biased at all.

##### **Question 2**

There were a few commonsense answers along the lines of 'yes, you would think he would want to punish old enemies'. Unfortunately, these answers lacked the specific contextual information required to move them to a higher level. The majority of candidates scored good marks by comparing Sources **B** and **C** for differences. A few reached the top level in the mark scheme by using their contextual knowledge, or other sources on the paper, to check whether Source **C** is surprising.

##### **Question 3**

Most candidates scored reasonable marks by comparing Sources **D** and **E**. Better answers find both agreements and disagreements. The best answers were those that used contextual knowledge, or cross-reference to other sources, to inform their use of the sources.

##### **Question 4**

This question was generally well answered. Most candidates were able to interpret both sources. Source **F** shows a Black American confidently asserting his newly granted freedom while the former slave-owner still has some difficulty in grasping the new situation. Source **G** shows the plight of Black Americans far from being an improvement. It was good to see many candidates directly compare their interpretations of the two sources with the better candidates finding similarities and differences. Some candidates lost marks by failing to support their interpretations with reference to details in the cartoons.

**Question 5**

There were a few misinterpretations of this cartoon, e.g. Grant was being thrown out with the rest of the rubbish. Most candidates used their knowledge and understanding of the period to produce a valid interpretation, e.g. Grant will ruin the South. The best answers placed their answers in the immediate context of 1880 using clues in the information given about the provenance of the source. As in answers to **Question 4** some marks were lost by failing to support interpretations by reference to details in the source.

**Question 6**

This question was answered well. Most candidates had a clear idea of what they had to do – show how some sources support the statement and how other sources disagree with the statement. A number of candidates only did one of these but very few failed to make use of the sources.

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

This question produced a wide range of responses. Some candidates wasted time by describing the cartoon in detail instead of thinking about its purpose. They would have produced better and more relevant answers if they had started their answers with ‘This cartoon was published by the Soviet Union in 1960 because...’. A significant minority of candidates ignored the date of the cartoon and claimed that it was about the Cuban Missile Crisis while others thought that the cartoon was published as pro-American. The latter clearly ignoring the fact that it was published in the Soviet Union.

Better candidates realised that there were two important matters to consider: what the message of the cartoon is and why such a message was published in the Soviet Union in 1960. A good number of candidates were able to interpret a valid message and most of them were able to continue and consider the purpose of publication in the context of 1960. There were some answers that provided detailed contextual detail about Castro seizing power in Cuba and why this caused problems for the USA. However, only some of these candidates used this material to develop their answer to the question, i.e. to explain the message and purpose of the cartoon. Other candidates wrote extensively about the context but failed to relate this to the cartoon or to the question.

**Question 2**

Answers to this question fell into three groups. First, there were those that failed to realise that Source **D** provided the view of the CIA. This meant that they failed to compare Sources **B** and **C** with Source **D**. Some of them just wrote about Sources **B** and **C** while others referred in a general way to what they thought the CIA might think but made no use of Source **D**. The second group scored reasonable marks by comparing what Sources **B** and **C** say with Source **D**. The final group realised that a good answer to this question will not simply involve a comparison of the content of the sources, but will require evaluation of the sources. Whether Sources **B** and **C** prove Source **D** to be wrong will depend on whether Sources **B** and **C** can be trusted. There was some excellent evaluation of Khrushchev’s memoirs based on what happened to him after the Cuban Missile Crisis and his need to rescue his historical reputation. It was important, however, that such evaluation was then used to comment on whether it disproved the claims in Source **D**.

**Question 3**

This question produced a full range of answers. Weak answers described the cartoon in great detail. In some cases these answers explained what each feature in the cartoon represented, but they all failed to explain the message of the cartoon. It is important that when candidates have to interpret pictorial sources they do not get distracted by the detail in the source. They should ask themselves about the overall meaning and then use the detail to support their explanation of this meaning.

Some candidates did try and interpret the message of the source but did not get very far. This was either because they misinterpreted it (they claimed that Kennedy and Khrushchev were thinking about cutting back their own bases), or they interpreted only one part of the cartoon instead of looking for the overall message. This led some, for example, to claim that the message is that America was stronger than the Soviet Union. Answers like this were not wrong and were placed in a level in the middle of the mark scheme, but they miss the overall point of the cartoonist which is that Kennedy was being hypocritical or is over-reacting because of the small threat of missiles in Cuba compared to the far greater threat posed by US missile bases all round the world. An encouraging number of candidates did get this far but some lost marks by failing to support their interpretations by referring to details of the cartoon.

**Question 4**

Weaker candidates failed to spot the difference between the two sources – in **G**, Khrushchev adds the demand about US missiles in Turkey. These candidates simply made assertions about whether they thought he was lying or not in Source **F**. A large number of candidates claimed he was lying because of the difference between the two sources, but better candidates realised that this was not necessarily the case. Some explained that the two sources do not necessarily contradict each other while others explained the difference as part of a negotiating strategy. The best answers used their contextual knowledge, or cross-reference to other sources, to evaluate Sources **F** and **G**.

**Question 5**

Weaker candidates found this question difficult. A number simply paraphrased all three sources while others explained that they were not surprised by Source **J** because if they had been Castro they would have been annoyed. Better candidates did manage to compare Source **J** with Sources **H** and **I** (this was usually about whether there was a deal) and a small number went on to evaluate the sources. It is important that candidates understand that when they are being asked whether one source shows that another is wrong (or variations on that idea) evaluation of the sources should be a central part of their answers.

**Question 6**

Many candidates answered this question well. Most managed to explain how some sources support the statement and how others disagree with it. There are a number of candidates who fail to score the marks they should because they simply assert that the sources do or do not support the statement. It is important that for each source that is used a clear explanation is given of how it does or does not support the statement. There were a small number of Centres where nearly all the candidates ignored the sources and wrote an essay about Khrushchev's motives. Such answers are always given very low marks. Answers to this final question must be based on the sources. Candidates should be reminded that bonus marks can be won by evaluating the sources.

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

**General comments**

As in previous years only a few Centres entered candidates for the coursework option. All Centres used appropriate assignments that allowed candidates to show what they were able to do in relation to the assessment objectives. Centres' marking of coursework was accurate and where the Moderator had to adjust Centres' marks, such adjustments were minor.

A few Centres set their own tasks for Assignment 1, while the majority used the exemplars. When Centres do set their own tasks it is important to ensure that the wording encourages candidates to analyse and evaluate, rather than describe and narrate. Tasks that begin with words such as 'How' and 'What', often encourage the latter. One set of tasks that worked well is given below.

1. What cultural achievements were made in Germany during the 'golden years' between 1923 and 1929? (4)
2. Why did Germany enter into a period of relative stability and recovery from 1924 onwards? (4)
3. How far did the Weimar Republic recover economically in the Stresemann era? (6)
4. Stresemann has been described as a 'skilled foreign diplomat' whose foreign policy was 'astonishingly successful'. Do you agree with this assessment of Stresemann and his foreign policy? (6)

These questions begin with description, move on to explanation, and end in **Questions 3** and **4** with analysis and judgement.



One worrying trend detected this year was the tendency for some candidates to write very long answers that covered all aspects of a topic rather than answering the question set. Candidates should be reminded that Moderators are not interested in how much candidates know but in how well they can use what they know to answer particular questions. The skills of selection and deciding what is relevant for a given purpose are central to this coursework. Their importance should be emphasised when candidates are being introduced to coursework tasks.

Nearly all Centres use the exemplars for Assignment 2. These work well and produced much good work from the candidates who were able to demonstrate that they could interpret, evaluate and use a range of historical sources.

<p><b>Paper 0470/04</b> <b>Alternative to Coursework</b></p>
--

### General comments

**Depth Study A: Germany, 1918 – 1945** remained overwhelmingly the most popular choice for candidates in this examination. Also popular were **Depth Study B: Russia, 1905 – 1941** and **Depth Study C: The USA, 1919 – 1941**, but with much lower numbers opting for them. Of the other depth studies, only **Depth Study F: Israelis and Palestinians 1945 – c.1994** had a few full Centres opting for it, while the other depth studies had individuals who had specifically prepared for them or candidates who were desperately looking for sources and questions that they believed they recognised.

The vast majority of scripts were written clearly and well set out. A few candidates who attempted questions out of chronological order would assist Examiners if they labelled their questions more clearly. There were very few scripts that were difficult to read either by way of handwriting or watery ink of whatever colour. Indeed, the work of almost all candidates was easily accessible to Examiners. There were very few rubric infringements.

Examiners reported a large number of high quality scripts, which showed the ability to handle, understand and argue source-based questions, as well as being informed and persuasive when handling knowledge-based questions. However, among a number of Centres, a minority but still a substantial proportion, weaknesses were apparent in the answers to source-based questions (part **(a)**). Specific examples on individual depth studies will be given later, but general comment on these weaknesses follows below.

Firstly, candidates had not appreciated that they must use details from the sources to answer part **(a)** questions. It appeared that many had recognised a phrase, word, event or person in a question and wrote all they knew about it in their answers to **Questions (a)(i)** and **(a)(ii)**. If a candidate makes no reference to the source detail in these answers, and therefore does not answer the set question, the marks awarded will be severely limited. Examiners reported that this was doubly disappointing as much of the detail, although irrelevant to these questions, was often correct and extensive.

To a lesser extent, there was another problem for many candidates with **Question (a)(ii)**. Candidates could often support a one-sided argument and offer details from the source to support that argument. Fewer candidates were able to support more than one side of their argument. As has been stated in previous reports, **Question (a)(ii)** will always have evidence in the source to support both sides of an argument. These questions always contain the 'prompt' "How far?" to help the candidates understand that the question requires more than one view. Also, on occasions, candidates began their answers with an acceptable and supported argument. They then drifted into long passages showing contextual knowledge of the subject area but did not use details from the source. Candidates must appreciate that contextual material is always acceptable in their answers as support for, rather than replacement of, source detail and evidence.

Although there were many good evaluations of the sources in answers to **Question (a)(iii)** by way of time, tone, provenance etc., the majority of candidates answered these questions by comparing the content of the sources. Others were aware that provenance was important but made limited assertions, for example, 'It was a diary so it is reliable'. The onus here is on the candidate to show why a diary used in this specific case might affect a source's utility and reliability.

In part **(b)**, the quality of the answers depended very largely on the extent of the candidates' knowledge of the subject area. However, there were still many who had not appreciated that **Question (b)(iv)** requires a balanced and sustained argument, supported by relevant examples and details, leading to a logical conclusion. Although there were many good answers that met these demanding criteria, many candidates offered brief answers. There were other examples of longer answers that showed that the candidates understood the scale of the question but these lacked detail and convincing argument.

### Comments on specific questions

#### ***Depth Study A: Germany, 1918 – 1945***

The majority of candidates attempting questions for this depth study were able to draw valid inferences from Source A (**Question (a)(i)**) and show where, within the source, support for their inferences could be found. Many saw that there was a paucity of evidence and that there were only rumours to explain the death of the men involved. It was this question where many candidates were seduced, by the recognition of the phrase 'Night of the Long Knives', to produce long narratives of the circumstances surrounding the event. These rarely mentioned any source detail and they did not answer the set question. The answers to **Question (a)(ii)** were varied. Some excellent efforts saw that there was not only obvious detail of opposition by way of the Rohm and von Schleicher plan but also the very fact that Hitler could admit his involvement in the deaths and threaten the Reichstag. The fact that his orders had been carried out also showed that opposition was limited. The majority of candidates only listed the Rohm plan, while others used contextual knowledge rather than the source detail to support limited opposition. Very few candidates gave full evaluations to the two sources in answer to **Question (a)(iii)**, although many noted that Source A was from a British newspaper and Source B was 'Hitler himself' speaking. There was little by way of development or explanation of why the provenances might be significant.

Many candidates scored well in **Question (b)(i)**, while others gave features that were not specific to the 'Nazi totalitarian state'. Equally, many scored well when describing the Nuremberg Rallies in **Question (b)(ii)**, giving detail and explanation of the place and importance of the rallies in the Nazi Party's message of power and pomp. However, there were a significant number who confused the rallies with the Nuremberg Laws of 1935. In their answers to **Question (b)(iii)**, many candidates could show that Hitler recognised that Germany's youth were 'the next generation', that they were future soldiers and would make excellent spies on their own families. Some excellent answers went on to develop these themes in the context of Hitler's foreign ambitions and the sustenance of the Thousand Year Reich. **Question (b)(iv)** posed problems for many. Whilst superior candidates saw the need to restrict their answers to the period of 1933-34 as stated in the question, and realised the need to show what actions were lawful or unlawful, many did not recognise the limits in the question. These recounted the events of this limited period but did not dwell on the issue of legality. Superior answers tended to show that the acquisition of power by Hitler was largely legal but the application of this power was often illegal. Less disciplined candidates wrote about events ranging from the Munich Putsch of 1923 to the collapse of the regime in 1945. This was a question that offered the opportunity for specific and relevant detail to be argued closely, but many saw it as a question about intimidation and violence only.

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

Again with this depth study, candidates found it relatively easy to identify valid inferences and to support them from Source A. Indeed, the reference to Bloody Sunday being 'the work of our Little Father' evoked some emotional and anti-tsarist answers. This theme often developed in answers to **Question (a)(ii)** where candidates showed that the Tsar understood that the events were significant, but he was not fully aware of all the details. Equally, candidates wondered how the Tsar could write about Bloody Sunday in the tone that he did and relate it in the same entry alongside such insignificant family events as lunch, his walk and his mother staying overnight. Answers to **Question (a)(iii)** often contrasted the content of the two sources. Other candidates noted the provenance of each source but went no further than offering a 'stock' evaluation of the sources as 'Father Gapon was there so he should know' and 'it is a diary so it is reliable'. Superior candidates offered sophisticated comments regarding Gapon's motives writing in an autobiography, while also commenting on the tone and language of Source B to show the Tsar's detachment.

**Question (b)(i)** asked candidates to name two revolutionary groups active in 1905. This did not mean that these groups had to be official parties of the time. Some candidates offered the Social Democratic Party along with Bolsheviks/Mensheviks, without appreciating the overlap here. There were some full and comprehensive answers to **Question (b)(ii)** about the Bloody Sunday protest. Candidates were well informed about the dire living and working conditions of the time, and that there was a need for some kind of representation. Equally, many understood why the Tsar was able to survive the 1905 Revolution with comments on the October Manifesto, the loyalty and support of the army, Okhrana and the Church. Candidates also developed notions of the spontaneity of the Revolution and the lack of planning and the lack of central control and direction. Answers to **Question (b)(iv)** fell into two categories. All had views on the loyalty of the Russian people to Tsar Nicholas II but only the very best were able to offer a balance of detail and restrict their observations to the pre-war period as required by the question. Many went on to discuss problems of the war period and the rumours surrounding Rasputin and Alexandra, which were outside the limits of the question.

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

Most candidates were able to draw appropriate inferences from the statistics in Source A (**Question (a)(i)**) about the boom in the American economy of the 1920s, although some interpreted the figures to show an increase in trade union membership. Answers to **Question (a)(ii)** were often better balanced than answers to the same question in other depth studies. Candidates saw evidence that most had benefited from the boom but that 'others did not have the purchasing power to continue buying the flood of goods pouring out of the factories' and that there was 'reckless speculation'. Another group acknowledged that many had seen benefits but then went on to counter this with contextual knowledge regarding farmers, the black community, immigrants, women etc. All these last points were significant at the time but the candidates had not used the detail from the source as required by the question. Very few candidates attempted to evaluate both sources in terms of provenance and/or time, but contented themselves by contrasting the sources' content.

Answers to **Question (b)(i)**, which asked for two examples of developments in the film industry of the 1920s, often commented on the 'sale of sex'. In truth, sex has always sold, whatever the medium or whatever the age. Candidates needed to develop this idea to show the emergence of film stars, giving a few examples. Hollywood's development and the introduction of 'talkies' were popular examples. However, with this question and also in some answers to questions in other depth studies, many candidates showed that they thought that television had been with us throughout the twentieth century. The effects of the development of hire purchase (**Question (b)(ii)**) were either well known, completely unknown or confused with buying shares on the margin. This question attracted some imaginative and speculative answers. Conversely, there were many thorough and full answers on why agriculture did not share in the prosperity of the 1920s. These answers often gave national and international contexts in their explanations. However, some had the simplistic notion that 'as industry was booming, nobody was interested in farming'. Despite some of the comments about farmers, black community etc., used to answer **Question (a)(ii)**, many saw the US economy as a complete success between 1919 and 1928. Nevertheless, there were some excellent answers showing a balanced argument of success, failure and dangers, all supported by relevant and substantial detail.

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

There were too few genuine attempts at these questions to make helpful and constructive comments.

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

There were too few genuine attempts at these questions to make helpful and constructive comments.

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

Despite the limited nature of Source A, most candidates were able to draw and support valid inferences regarding Egyptian impatience and the need to take action. Also, most candidates were able to provide evidence from Source B that the superpowers controlled much of the war and they pointed to the use of the oil weapon to show that the Arab nations had found a lever. In answers to **Question (a)(iii)**, some candidates saw that Sadat's language might be affected by the fact that he was making a speech, and most said that as Source B was taken from a British textbook it was, therefore, reliable/unreliable.

The candidates from Centres that had prepared for this depth study may have been small in number but they were also, to a large extent, informed and knowledgeable. Hence, Yom Kippur's importance was well known, as were the actions of the Arab oil producers after the Yom Kippur War (**Question (b)(ii)**). Further, there were some comprehensive and detailed explanations of the early Arab successes in the war. Candidates also attempted to offer balance in the answers to **Question (b)(iv)** and, again, the detail was impressive. A few candidates denied that the USA's support was important to Israel's success in the Yom Kippur War by asserting that the effort of the people of Israel was the most important reason. These attempted to show how the state of Israel had been successfully established in 1948 against all odds, against much physical and critical opposition and 'would continue to resist for all time'.

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

There were too few attempts at these questions to make helpful and constructive comments.

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

There were too few attempts at these questions to make helpful and constructive comments.