

HISTORY

<p>Paper 0470/01</p>

<p>Paper 1</p>

General comments

As in previous years a significant majority of candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge of both the Core and the Depth Study for which they had been prepared. This knowledge was used to good effect in writing well-developed explanations and arguments to their chosen questions. Some candidates were less successful in the selection of the knowledge to be used and this resulted in over long answers which often failed to focus on the specifics of the question. It is important that candidates take a little time to establish in their own mind the question focus, if good marks are to be achieved. Those who fail to get this focus will underachieve.

As stated in previous reports, **part (a)** is not expected to bring a lengthy answer. Explanation is not required, nor is a conclusion. Chronology is an important aspect of historical understanding and essential in putting events in order. Without this skill answers often lack the clarity often needed for understanding and explanation.

Parts (b) and **(c)** require understanding and explanation. Candidates should be encouraged to move away from telling the story and concentrate on explaining events. This is important if the higher levels of the mark scheme are to be achieved. Equally important is ensuring that the answer is based on historical fact. Explanations should avoid the 'I think...' approach. The **part (c)** questions are intended to encourage candidates to think. They should not expect to just use recall of knowledge. Some 'mental agility' is expected so that they use their knowledge and understanding to fit the question as set. Many responses received lower marks because the candidates failed to select and deploy directly relevant material.

There were relatively few rubric errors. Candidates generally used the time allocated well, with the vast majority completing the paper. Where time was short it usually related to over long, unfocused answers.

Comments on specific questions

Section A – Core Content

Question 1

Part (a) gave ample opportunity for candidates to score maximum marks by identifying the successes in any part of Italy in 1848. Too few knew exactly what did happen in Venice, Rome, Milan, Tuscany and Sicily. Many seemed to give very general answers with few specific examples and, therefore, often scored marks within Level 1. Some candidates chose to ignore the question by arguing that the 1848 Revolutions were a failure. In response to (b) there were many candidates who gave superficial answers which tended to be descriptive but often did identify 'why'. They pointed out that, for example, Charles Albert was indecisive or the Pope failed to give a lead; this gained Level 2. There was a significant minority who explained 'why', showing that, for example, Charles Albert's indecisiveness gave the Austrians time to get reinforcements, while the Pope, who originally sent an army to help Lombardy, later withdrew his support; this gained Level 3. The majority of answers to (c) were unbalanced. Candidates knew significantly more about Cavour's role than the role of Napoleon III. Answers often gave the impression that candidates had hoped for a question on the roles of Cavour and Garibaldi. Those without knowledge of Napoleon III were unable to progress beyond Level 3. To achieve the maximum (Level 5/8 marks), candidates need a balanced answer with an evaluative judgement of 'how far'.

Question 2

The limited number of responses to this question prevent useful comment.

Question 3

In answering **part (a)**, some candidates mixed up the 1850 Compromise with the 1820 Missouri Compromise whilst others wrote about 'Bleeding Kansas'. A small number of responses lacked detail, thus staying in Level 1. A few were able to get into Level 2 by giving some examples, such as California being admitted as a free state and the slave trade being abolished in the District of Columbia. In **part (b)**, details of the Dred Scott decision were well known and understood. Most did explain why the decision was important, although a number could have explained more reasons so that maximum marks could have been achieved. Very few candidates discussed how the decision infuriated the abolitionists and hardened the attitude of many northerners against the South or that it also strengthened the Republican Party as the main political party opposed to extending slavery into the Western States. Candidates seemed, in **part (c)**, to understand the key issue of states' rights v slavery, but they were not confident in applying their knowledge to the two questions: 'About slavery?/Not about slavery?' This meant there were some disorganised answers and some which did not achieve their potential considering the candidates' knowledge. Even when candidates were aware that Lincoln was against the expansion of slavery rather than slavery itself, they did not then use this awareness to argue anything relevantly.

Question 4

In answering **part (a)**, candidates tended to concentrate on the 'arms race' in general rather than concentrating on Germany's part. Answers predominately concentrated on naval build up with comment on the Dreadnought but little else. Many answers ignored other aspects of German militarisation. In responding to **part (b)**, answers tended to describe the system and name the countries involved. A limited understanding of the implications of the Alliance System resulted in very few responses developing an answer about the tension created. The Balkan Wars, in (c), were treated mainly by a short descriptive overview of the period. There were very few references to Serbian territorial increases and the ambitions linked to maintaining the unity of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Some were aware that the Austro-Serbia relations were important but failed to develop the point.

Question 5

This was a very popular question. In (a), many answers indicated a good knowledge of the weaknesses from which the League of Nations suffered. The weaknesses were often dealt with at great length, rather than short, sharp points. Overlong answers are not required when answering **part (a)** questions. Many good responses were seen in response to **part (b)**. Candidates were capable of developing explanations, particularly in relation to domestic issues, aggressive foreign policies and the rise of dictators. Some, unfortunately, got side-tracked into long discussions of what happened in Manchuria and Abyssinia. Some thought the 1930s was the first time they had come across Mussolini, despite writing in **part (c)** about Corfu in the 1920s. In answer to **part (c)**, the vast majority of candidates could identify events of success as well as failure for the League. The responses were often spoiled by the lack of explanation as to why the League might, or might not, have been a successful peacekeeping body. A number of candidates strayed from the question focus to write about the League's humanitarian work. This was a waste of valuable time.

Question 6

Part (a) was well answered by many who attempted it. The more obvious facts were known and well presented. It was encouraging to note that some went beyond successes and identified the credit worthy point of the failed Anschluss of 1934. These candidates numbered far fewer than the ones who went beyond 1937 and thus wasted valuable time on the Sudetenland and Czechoslovakia. Many **part (b)** answers were detailed and demonstrated sound knowledge of the reasons why Hitler was able to unite with Austria. This type of answer often started with the failed attempt of 1934 followed by the links forged through the Spanish Civil War and the Rome-Berlin axis. Hitler's rapidly growing military strength and the policy of appeasement also featured. The explanation of these points varied, with perhaps the relevance of appeasement often the more limited. Too many candidates thought that Germany and Austria were formerly together and had been split by the Treaty of Versailles. These same candidates often stated that 'as the Austrians were Germans they should be together', whilst others also incorrectly thought Anschluss was part of the lebensraum policy. The format of **part (c)** gave a positive steer to candidates with regard to content and set this in a specific context. Many responses in relation to the Pact concentrated on the nature of the short-term German-Soviet relations, with regard to war being postponed; disappointingly this often resulted in the 'cause of war in 1939' being forgotten about. That said, many did state that the Pact avoided war on two fronts and developed the interest in Poland, which was to be split in 'half' (a common error). Disappointingly, few candidates mentioned the position of Britain should Poland be invaded and Hitler's belief that the threat would not be followed through. This was often a catalyst for candidates to show their knowledge regarding the 'pros and

cons' of appeasement. This was strong but often not channelled to answering the question. A small number of candidates were convinced that appeasement was either a policy of the League of Nations or a form of formal agreement between Britain and Germany. In this type of question candidates are not required to refer to any issues other than those in the question.

Question 7

There were many good answers to **part (a)**, centred around the 'sphere of influence', the splitting of Germany and Berlin and the situation with regard to Poland. Others mentioned the possible involvement of the USSR in the war against Japan. A small number allowed their focus to wander and wrote about Yalta in general. Some very good answers were seen to **part (b)**. These often started with the change in personnel and the impact of this was well explained. This often then moved to the atom bomb, with a final section on the actions of the Soviet army. Throughout, the focus in these responses was maintained. Weaker answers often failed to keep within the chronological confines of the question. In response to (c), there were strong arguments made for both sides of the hypothesis although overall candidates probably found arguing the case against the USA easier. Disappointingly few thought to justify the Berlin Blockade as an aggressive act. However, many responses included reference to Korea, Cuba and Vietnam as well as to the Warsaw Pact. As the question related to the start of the Cold War these aspects did not receive credit. As a rough rule of thumb it is reasonable for candidates to use an end date of 1950 for the beginning of the Cold War.

Question 8

This was answered by a limited number of candidates. In (a), candidates were generally vague, finding many ways of saying the United Nations Organisation wanted to achieve world peace. In (b), many were aware of the civil war but lacked the detailed knowledge to progress into explanation. **Part (c)** had many examples of the United Nations as a peace keeper despite the focus of the question.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

Part (a) posed few problems and was well done. Knowledge of the events of the Putsch was good and much detail was given - often more than was required. Inevitably there were a small number of candidates who wrote about Hitler's time in prison and the advantages this gave him. Credit was not available for this approach. Many made a good attempt at **part (b)**, although the success of the Stresemann era often formed a significant aspect of the answer, using this as their argument as to why the Nazis failed to progress. Too often the remainder of the answer focused on their coming to power in the 1930s. Answers to **part (c)** often concentrated on Hitler and his ability as a speaker and how that and the promises the Nazis, made them more popular. Few moved beyond this to consider, for example, his relationship with industrialists.

Question 10

Part (a) was generally well done. Most knew of the assassination of von Rath, the pretext for Kristallnacht. The damage caused by the SS, and the implements used, were well described. Answers detailed the impact on Jews although surprisingly reference to the huge number of windows smashed was not evident. Some confused this event with the Night of the Long Knives. Candidates were aware of changes to education and often described these changes in great detail. Less forthcoming was the explanation as to why these changes were thought necessary by the Nazi Party. Some candidates thought that the Nazi Youth was part of the school curriculum. Some well - developed answers were seen in relation to (c). Answers were particularly strong on the benefits, citing particularly employment with additional material as to how this had been brought about. Often, the opposite side was concerned with persecution by the Nazis and the role of women. Little was mentioned about the loss of trade unions and workers rights.

Question 11

Those who answered this question had few problems scoring well on **part (a)**. They were fully aware of the Tsar and his role and position within Russian society, and of the large peasant population and their difficulties. Surprisingly, many were less confident with (b), often failing to develop explanation. Many were happy to concentrate on describing the reasons for failure. The main feature covered by most was Bloody Sunday. There was little reference to repression. In answers to (c), candidates were stronger on the Tsarina than on food shortages. Most referred to her German origins and the rumours about her being a spy. Those who wrote about Rasputin invariably wrote about his hold over the Tsarina, but did not necessarily deal with the consequences of that control for government.

Question 12

Those who realised the question referred to NEP were able to score a reasonable mark. It was, however, evident that many did not have the relevant understanding of continuity and progression in relation to Russian agriculture. **Part (b)** brought some very well informed responses, relating to developing military strength, becoming a world industrial power and the establishment of a Communist society that might influence other societies. Less strong answers concentrated more narrowly on increasing output. There was a very mixed response to (c), which predominantly concentrated on lack of benefit. Where benefits were considered it was more in terms of output rather than in terms of benefit to the Soviet people.

Question 13

It was rare to see a weak answer to **part (a)**. Many included great detail about the impact of modern machinery, over - production and the fall in prices, often linking them together. One blot was the reference by some to 'dustbowls', which more easily sits in the 1930s. Whilst older industries could be identified in (b), many candidates got themselves tangled up in trying to link them with mass production as mass production = success. Therefore, anything that could not be mass produced could not be successful. Candidates, when dealing with mass production (**part c**), need to avoid over reliance on description. Answers were more successful if they concentrated on how mass production brought economic prosperity. Counter arguments were strong. The role of government was well detailed, as well as the development of consumerism.

Question 14

Most wrote in (a) about white supremacy which was occasionally over - exaggerated into extermination of non-whites. This racial aspect predominated to such an extent, that little else appeared. There were many good responses to (b), developing a fully explained response. In general, failure centred around law breaking, crime and violence, although some did develop points in relation to the Depression. A significant minority spent time on explaining why Prohibition was introduced. This was not required. In the answers to (c), the emphasis was on description. The vast majority who attempted this question knew of the social changes but failed to develop this knowledge into an explanation of how life did, or did not change. Candidates must realise that straight forward description of the dress sense or activities of a flapper will gain little credit.

Question 15

Part (a) was generally well covered, although some candidates were sidetracked into civil war issues and the struggle against Japan. **Part (b)** was quite well done. Candidates knew that China was a peasant society and on that basis alone Mao would have been foolish to ignore them. The emphasis in the responses was on acquiring their support and loyalty for political and military reasons. When land reform was mentioned it was in terms of a means to secure their support rather than a key aspect of transforming China into a communist society. Candidates in responding to (c) were stronger on other factors such as Mao and his army than on Chiang Kai-shek, where most were limited to the American link. Even this US link was not emphasised enough.

Question 16

In answering **part (a)**, candidates demonstrated a good knowledge relating to women in China, offering more than was required. Many answers to (b) were disappointing, with an over-reliance on descriptive material about what took place in communes, rather than why they were introduced. Again in (c), there was much description about the Great Leap Forward, rather than consideration of failure. Reference to famine and falsified figures, and the impact of this, was limited.

Question 17

In (a), answers tended to be very limited and generalised although there was some description of plans for British expansion from the Cape to Cairo, including a railway. In (b), some candidates were able to identify the availability of a labour force and that precious metals were found. Explanation, if present, was in relation to these two identified points. Answers to (c) were limited, often to loss of life.

Question 18

In response to (a), candidates were able to describe the main features of apartheid, including the use of passes and separate amenities. In (b), candidates were able to identify reasons why Verwoerd wanted to restrict education for black people. Some went on to explain the restriction being used to curtail freedom. In (c), explanation of the government's action in dealing with opposition was explained with reference to arrest and torture, with some mentioning Biko and Mandela.

Question 19

The limited numbers of responses to this question prevent useful comment.

Question 20

Some candidates concentrated, in (a), solely around 1948/9 and, therefore, limited their answer, while others began in December 1947 and continued with each war, which meant a loss of land. Some answers, especially the latter type, were very long and achieved the maximum mark well before the end of the answer.

Part (b) brought some very lengthy answers, with considerable detail. Candidates explained well that many Arab states did not like the violence of the PLO and were able to give examples. The expulsions from Jordan and Lebanon were well explained. Some well - designed answers were produced, showing that Arab states were happy to have Palestinian problems to use as anti-Israeli propaganda. Answers were less certain regarding Sadat and the Camp David accords. Although some candidates had only a partial awareness of the career of Arafat (**part (c)**), either in terms of chronology or events, there were many others who had a full detailed knowledge of both his achievements and failures. Many candidates produced outstanding, well - balanced and very lengthy answers, with many achieving the highest level. However, even better candidates should note that it is not the length of answer that is important, but the way in which knowledge is used to present arguments clearly focused on the demands of the question.

Question 21

Only a small number of candidates tackled this question. Generally, **part (a)** was well answered. There were plenty of points to be made over living conditions and most were able to gain credit for answers on water and food supplies, the lack of electricity and sewers, the poor provision of education and a lack of employment. Many achieved maximum marks. In response to **part (b)**, most candidates were able to achieve Level 3 by explaining the civil unrest and how the Israelis attacked by using force. Sound explanations included curfews, arrests and shootings of Palestinians and how this failed to stop the problem, but only fuelled the crisis. Many candidates showed how the Palestinians were portrayed as the underdogs and the Israelis as the aggressors. Generally, this was well - answered. Disappointingly, most answers produced in response to (c) were one sided. Candidates tended to argue that the Accords achieved much because Arafat rejected terrorism and recognised the right of Israel to exist. Only a handful of candidates went on to produce a balanced answer, by showing that there were issues which still had to be addressed, such as the future of Jerusalem, Jewish settlements in the occupied territories and the nature of an independent Palestinian state.

Questions 22–25

The limited number of responses to these questions prevent useful comment.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/02

Paper 2

General comments

The performance of candidates on this paper was the best for some years. Previous reports have mentioned that the preparation for Paper 2 by some candidates appeared to have focused too much on detailed knowledge of the topic and too little on the skills of interpreting, evaluating and using historical sources. This year fewer candidates attempted to fill their answers with detailed narratives of the events, and more simply answered the questions set - which were, of course, about the sources. Nearly all candidates entered for the 20th century option on German involvement in the Spanish Civil War, had enough contextual knowledge and understanding to enable them to use the sources in an informed way. More importantly, they made sure that the focus of their answers was on the question and on the sources. There were fewer answers this year that pushed the sources to one side and described the historical events at great length.

The 20th century topic remains by far the more popular of the two while the performance of candidates is broadly similar across the two topics. The 19th century topic on the modernisation of Japan was familiar to candidates and most used their contextual knowledge sensibly to interpret and evaluate the sources.

A small number of candidates still struggle with the demands of this paper. There are three main reasons for this. Firstly, some fail to answer the question set. These candidates quite often write interesting and intelligent things about the sources but fail to use such analysis and understanding to produce an answer to the question. When questions ask, for example, 'Are you surprised by a source?' or 'How would someone have reacted to a source?' or 'Does one source prove that another source is wrong?' the Examiner requires a clear answer to these questions. Candidates should be advised to spend some time thinking a question through, examining the relevant sources, and planning, before actually writing their answer. They should then be in a position to give the Examiner a clear answer to the question in the first sentence of their response. The rest of the answer should then use the sources to explain why they think this is a good answer and how they have reached it. Such an approach will help candidates make sure that their answers are relevant, stay focused on the question, and do not degenerate into general descriptions of the historical events.

Secondly, a number of candidates struggle with evaluation of sources. They often cope very well with interpreting and comparing sources, but produce simplistic evaluations. There are a number of satisfactory ways to evaluate sources: the claims of a source can be checked against a candidate's own contextual knowledge, the tone of a source could be examined, cross-reference could be made to other sources in the paper to see if they agree or disagree with the source being evaluated, and finally the provenance of a source can be used. When the latter approach is adopted, it is important to use the provenance in conjunction with what the source says. Provenance should never be used by itself. Candidates should ask themselves questions such as, 'Why is this person saying this?' The most important skill candidates need to master is to decide which one of these strategies is the most appropriate for particular sources, for example there is little point in using the provenance of a source if the information provided is nothing more than, for example, 'from a recent history book'.

Thirdly, some candidates fail to understand the overall message of sources. These candidates focus on details within sources, rather than on the big message, for example, there is often a lot going on in cartoons but cartoonists usually have one big point that they are trying to put across. Candidates should look for that.

Candidates can be given practice in lessons with each of these three areas. The issues identified above should be discussed in class. Direct examination of these areas of weakness should help candidates improve their performance.

Option A: 19th Century topic

Question 1

Most candidates answered this question well. They were able to find agreements and disagreements of detail. The better candidates considered the tone and the big message of each source and were able to explain, for example, that Source A has mixed feelings about the impact of the changes while Source B argues that the impact of change has been nothing but good because it has been carefully managed.

Question 2

The important aspect of this question was to realise that it is the attitudes of the authors of the sources that has to be compared rather than the attitudes of the people being described in the sources. Weaker candidates went for the latter route and gained reasonable marks by explaining that the people described in Source C were interested in foreign ideas while the people described in Source D were not. The better candidates compared the attitudes of the authors and explained that the author of Source C is suspicious of foreign ideas while the author of Source D understands that Japan can learn from them. Only a few candidates used the provenance of Source D to suggest that the banning of the book demonstrates continuing hostility to new ideas.

Question 3

A few candidates described the sources but failed to compare them, while a number based their answer on simplistic use of the provenance of the sources e.g. Source E cannot prove that Source F is wrong because it is British and therefore biased. However, most candidates wrote good answers. The majority were able to at least compare the two sources and argue that Source E does or does not prove that Source F is correct because of similarities or differences of detail, and some went beyond detail and compared the attitudes of the authors of the sources. The better candidates realised that the sources needed to be evaluated and there was some good evaluation in context, particularly of Source E.

Question 4

This question produced a range of interesting answers. The weaker candidates focused on the details of Samurai dress and weapons but most went beyond these. A few ignored the context of change and argued that the photograph was taken because of the importance or social status of the Samurai. The best answers were placed in the context of the modernisation of Japan. Some candidates explained that a record of the Samurai was needed because they were disappearing, while the best candidates focused on the attitude of the photographer towards the decline of the Samurai.

Question 5

Answers to this question were rather bunched. A few weak candidates went no further than the type of each source. For example, written sources tell you more than drawings, and failed to refer to the content of the sources. Most candidates focused on the information about modernisation in each source and compared them in terms of which provided more detail. Few candidates attempted to evaluate the sources, for example, the purpose of Source I in context.

Question 6

This question was answered well. There were far fewer candidates ignoring the sources. Most wrote clear explanations of how some sources support the hypothesis that Japan adopted western ideas uncritically, while other sources disagree with this hypothesis. A few correctly identified which sources fell into each of these categories, but failed to produce explanations.

Option B: 20th Century topic

Question 1

Candidates usually do well with this type of question, and this year was no exception. Only a few candidates wrote about the sources without making explicit comparisons. Most realised that the important agreements and disagreements were about German motives for intervening in Spain and so only a few focused on agreements or disagreements about incidental details. Most candidates were able to explain that both sources state that Hitler intervened for ideological reasons or to fight Bolshevism. Some misread Source B

and claimed that the sources agree that economic motives were also important. In fact, Source B says the opposite - it states 'in reality Hitler's decision was quite unconnected with economic...considerations'. Better candidates comfortably scored full marks by explaining disagreements over German motivation as well as agreements.

The ability to compare sources for agreements and disagreements is an important skill and candidates do need opportunities to practice it. It was noticeable that while the majority of candidates were very comfortable with this question, candidates in a small number of Centres struggled. Candidates need to realise that a point-by-point comparison is required. It is not sufficient to summarise each source and then conclude that they agree or disagree.

Question 2

There was a very wide range of answers to this question. A disappointing number of candidates identified points in Source C that they believed to be true and then simply asserted that they are true. It is perfectly legitimate for candidates to evaluate a source by testing its claims against their own knowledge of the same events but they must bring to their answers knowledge that is over and above what is in Source C. Once they have done this they can challenge, or confirm, claims being made by Goering. A small number of candidates based their answers on knee-jerk evaluation, for example, Goering was on trial for his life and so he would pretend he had nothing to do with major decisions/events. This was a particularly silly answer because in Source C Goering is going out of his way to emphasise his leading role in the whole affair ('I urged him to give support'). In fact what is noticeable about this source is the number of times Goering uses 'I' - 'I sent', 'I had', 'I saw'. If candidates decide to use the provenance of a source for evaluation purposes (and there is no reason why they should not), they must use the provenance in conjunction with what the source says - otherwise they descend to writing the kind of answer described above. Using both content and provenance of the source, it is perfectly acceptable to argue that Goering could be telling the truth because although he is on trial for his life he is still admitting his central role in the events. The other way to score good marks on this question was to cross-reference to Source A. This mentions that Hitler made the decision to intervene in Spain and that Goering was initially 'horrified' by the idea. This directly contradicts the claim made by Goering in Source C that he urged Hitler to intervene. A reasonable number of candidates used this approach to the question.

Question 3

This question was less well answered but it also produced a wide range of answers. Weaker candidates only used Source D and wrote answers that represented a general German response rather than the likely response of the ambassador in Source E. Better candidates understood the contradictions between Sources D and E and based their answers on it e.g. in Source D Hitler is trying to win Britain over, while in Source E Britain is regarded as a rival. The best answers used their contextual knowledge and explained that the German Ambassador would not have been particularly worried by Source D because he knew that the alliance with Italy was Germany's main concern and that the actions described in Source D were nothing more than a distraction to the main events.

Question 4

Questions based on cartoons usually produce a good range of answers and this one was no exception. The crucial move to make (as always), was to interpret the big message of the cartoon. This needs to be done in conjunction with the provenance. This cartoon was produced by Spanish Republicans and is claiming that the British knew what was going on in Spain in relation to the intervention of Germany and Italy but was deliberately ignoring it. The cartoon is very critical of Britain and it is this that the candidates had to announce surprise or a lack of surprise about - are they surprised by the fact that the Republican government was criticising Britain for doing nothing? A number of candidates only got as far as a sub-message of the cartoon, ignored the provenance, and simply claimed that they were surprised by Britain's actions. In other words, they stated whether they were surprised or not by Britain's actions and not the attitude of the Republican government. These candidates divided into two groups - those who thought that Britain genuinely did not know what was happening, and the better candidates who realised that Britain did know what was happening but was turning a blind eye to it. However, the best candidates realised that they were actually being asked whether they were surprised or not by the attitudes of the people who published the cartoon. A small number of candidates wrote detailed answers but failed to tell the Examiner whether they were surprised or not. These answers are always awarded few marks.

Question 5

This question was generally answered well. Most candidates were able to compare Sources G and H and find agreements and/or disagreements, e.g. they both say that Germany was sending troops, aircraft and tanks; Source H gives the impression of vast numbers of troops, while Source G says the numbers were limited. Better candidates were able to go a little further and compare the overall impressions given by the sources (i.e. compare the big messages). Source H clearly implies that Franco was totally dependant on foreign help, while Source G does not give this impression at all. Of course, the question of whether Source H proves that Source G is lying depends on more than whether or not the two sources agree. The sources have to be evaluated, for example, if Source H is found to be unreliable then it cannot prove that Source G was lying. A good number of candidates used other sources in the paper or their contextual knowledge to evaluate for reliability, and the very best candidates went even further and based such evaluation on the purpose of the sources e.g. Source H is a Soviet cartoon and might have been produced to encourage the Republicans by showing how dependant Franco was. Of course, it is important that such answers use evaluation to produce an answer to the question - does Source H prove that Source G was lying? It is not enough to simply evaluate the sources.

Question 6

This question was answered well. There were far fewer candidates ignoring the sources. Most wrote clear explanations of how some sources support the hypothesis that Hitler intervened to try out new soldiers, weapons and tactics, while others suggest he had other motives. A few correctly identified which sources fell into each of these categories, but failed to produce explanations.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03

Coursework

The coursework submitted for IGCSE History continues to be of a high standard. Many candidates produced impressive work, demonstrating high levels of skill and understanding. Most were able to show that they could analyse, evaluate and use historical sources in context, and could write multi-causal explanations as well as compare the importance of different causal factors. Most Centres had their marks left unchanged but there was a growing minority of Centres who awarded very high marks for work that was good but not outstanding. Marks of 38-40 out of 40 can be awarded and are sometimes justified, but Centres should remember that marks of this order should only be given for outstanding work.

The administration of most Centres was excellent, with well-organised and clear sets of coursework being received by Moderators in good time. Most Centres provided clear and helpful annotation of candidates' work, explaining where and why certain levels had been reached. Such information makes the Moderators' task much easier. It is also helpful if teachers write the total mark for each candidate on the front of their folders.

Most Centres use the approved tasks from CIE but there were a few interesting Centre- devised tasks. It does not help candidates if too many (more than 5) questions are set for Assignment 1, as these often lead to brief answers that lack depth, development and analysis. Some Centres set an essay for Assignment 1 and this often works well as it provides candidates the chance to write at length and develop their ideas. If there are several questions, teachers should ensure that they do not all test the same skills. The questions should be progressively more demanding. The first could require description, with the next question requiring explanation, while the final one allows candidates the chance to show that they can develop, sustain and justify a point of view e.g. about which factors, or individuals, are more important. Some good work was seen where candidates had to assess the significance of individuals such as Lenin and Stalin. If candidates are required to write about short and long-term causes, they should try to examine and explain their different functions as part of their answer. The main weakness of Assignment 1 answers remains a tendency by some candidates to drift into description and narrative, even when responding to questions asking for explanation and analysis.

A few Centres set inappropriate questions for Assignment 2. It is not sufficient to provide candidates with a few sources that they might use while answering questions that appear to be similar to the type set for Assignment 1. In Assignment 2 the questions must be directly about the sources, as they are in Paper 2. A range of source skills should be tested and the final question should require candidates to reach their own conclusion, using all the sources together. Most of the work for Assignment 2 was excellent, with candidates making inferences about message and purpose and carrying out contextual evaluation of sources.

HISTORY

Paper 0470/04

Alternative to Coursework

General comments

As with previous seasons of examination, Depth Study A (Germany, 1918-1945) proved by far the most popular choice for candidates this season. Also popular were Depth Studies B and C (Russia, 1905-1941 and USA, 1919-1941). There was an increasing interest in Depth Study F (Israelis and Palestinians, 1945-c.1994). All of the other Depth Studies were chosen by candidates but not in the same numbers as for those already named.

At the higher end of the quality scale, the knowledge and skill of candidates in handling both source and knowledge based questions was very good, with outstanding scripts seen by all Examiners. There were very few rubric infringements and most of the scripts were presented neatly and clearly so that all that the candidates wished to say was accessible to the Examiners. However, a few candidates presented problems to Examiners with poor or very small hand writing and/or had returned to the use of pale ink.

Despite the high standard achieved by many candidates, two technical problems were apparent for a small but significant number of candidates. Firstly, candidates did not always recognise, comment upon or support with evidence from the source, the two arguments available in Source B to answer **Questions (a) (ii)**. Also, candidates often became preoccupied with the provenance of the sources so that their answers to **Questions (a) (iii)** became little more than stock or incomplete evaluations of the utility of the sources. Candidates must support their assertions with evidence from the sources. Examples of both of these issues will be given below.

Comments on specific questions,

Depth Study A: Germany, 1918-1945.

The vast majority of candidates were able to draw valid inferences from Source A about the antipathy between the Communist Party and the Nazi Party in January 1933. In answers to **Question (a) (ii)**, they saw both bitterness and fear in the words of the leaflet. Some candidates, in spite of the information given in the attribution of the source, believed the source to represent the views of the Spartacists in 1919. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)** showed that many candidates were able to use the source to demonstrate how the Nazi Party targeted specific social groups like farmers and young people. These comments were well supported by evidence from the source. However, a significant number of candidates only gave one side of the argument, either failing to show how the SPD offered a much broader 'way of life' for its supporters or by thinking that the term SPD was another name for the Nazi Party. These answers were heavily one sided or confused. Evaluations of the sources' utility (**Question (a) (iii)**) were often incomplete as candidates either commented that Source A showed bitter language or hatred but did not support this with evidence from the source, or gave stock evaluation of the sources e.g. Source A 'is reliable as it was a leaflet of that time' or Source B was 'reliable as the historian would have had plenty of time to check his facts'. Explanations often ended at that level, with no development of the argument, no support from the source or with no explanation of why the candidates' assertions would be important in judging utility.

Most candidates were able to gain marks in answers to **Question (b) (i)** on the Enabling Act, although many suggested only that it gave Hitler power to make laws etc. without reference to the Reichstag. Both the details of the Reichstag fire and its effects were well known as were the reasons for the Night of the Long Knives. Candidates scored heavily on these questions, and their knowledge, attention to detail and arguments/explanations were of a high quality. However, some candidates confused the Reichstag fire and the Night of the Long Knives with the events of Kristallnacht, 1938. **Question (b) (iv)**, on the issue of whether the weakness of the Weimar Government enabled Hitler to become Chancellor of Germany, provoked a range of interesting responses. At the weaker end of the range, answers were little more than assertions that the Weimar Republic was weak and/or Hitler was strong. More thoughtful responses looked

at the weaknesses of the Weimar constitution, the context of the introduction of the Weimar Republic, the early threats to its existence and its inability to deal with the Great Depression. All this they compared to the policies, promises and propaganda machine of the Nazi Party, and almost argued that Hitler's appointment as Chancellor was inevitable.

Depth Study B: Russia, 1905-1941.

In answers to **Question (a) (i)**, candidates were able to draw many valid inferences about the bleakness of Petrograd in 1917 and the shortages of food of the time. Source B presented some problems to candidates who saw the references to Kerensky's health and performance to show he was either a great, heroic leader because he spoke despite being ill, or as a pathetic character, who had little long term impact. One candidate, at least, thought that the cheering was because Kerensky had finished speaking, 'having banged on for two hours'. However, there were some balanced, well-argued answers which saw that there were at least two sides to this question. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)**, on which of the two sources was more useful as evidence about Russia in 1917, often compared the content of the two sources. Some evaluated the sources by contextual knowledge of the year of 1917, but Examiners often found that the author of Source A 'would want to make the Russians look stupid because he was American and the Americans hated Russia'. The same stock and incomplete evaluation was offered for Source B as 'the writer was British and the British hated the Russians'.

Most candidates were able to identify Lenin's April Theses and put them into context. Answers to **Question (b) (ii)** were often full and very detailed. This aspect of 1917, the Kornilov Affair, was very well known. Also, the answers to **Question (b) (iii)** were full and the reasons for the second revolution in 1917 were well understood and equally well explained. However, there were some candidates who wrote about the first revolution in Russia in 1917, and Tsar Nicholas and Rasputin were blamed for everything that went wrong in that year. Some also wrote about the 1905 revolution or confused revolutions and their causes. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** on whether Lenin or Trotsky contributed more to the establishment of Bolshevik rule in the period 1917-1924, more often chose Lenin. Candidates reasoned that as the original force behind the Bolshevik Party, he should be given all the credit. Better candidates listed the contributions of the two men but rarely did they develop a reasoned conclusion for their decisions. Very few candidates mentioned that Lenin would have been handicapped as a leader after 1922 with health problems, but much of their individual contributions were discussed. Weaker candidates tended to argue in generalisations e.g. 'Lenin was in charge so he must have contributed most' or 'Trotsky won the Civil War so he did most'. The assertions were neither developed nor compared. Overall, there were some impressive scripts for this Depth Study.

Depth Study C: The USA, 1919-1941.

Candidates were able to draw valid conclusions from Source A regarding tolerance in American society and many felt that if the wife of the president was less than optimistic about changes to a more tolerant society, there could be little hope for African Americans in the Southern states. Answers to **Question (a) (ii)** showed considerable sympathy for Mose and his lifestyle, to the extent that many could only see the downside and poverty in the source, whereas other candidates could appreciate that Mose kept some of his produce and was provided with a house and had his accounts dealt with. Although there were some good answers to **Question (a) (iii)** on the utility of the two sources as evidence about the Southern states, few took advantage of the provenance of the two sources. Indeed, some candidates thought that the letter in Source A was from President Roosevelt himself, while most did not appreciate the possible significance of Source B coming from an interview funded by the US government.

Many candidates were able to provide intimidation as one of the difficulties faced by black voters in the 1920s and 1930s. Other offerings were of the Jim Crow laws and the 'grandfathers' law but these were not common. Answers to **Question (b) (ii)** on the role of the National Recovery Agency were both well known and full of relevant detail, or were poorly understood and the answers were the subject of guesswork. Equally, the reasons for the continuation of unemployment despite the New Deal were either wide-ranging in evidence or again speculative at best. Whilst there were some good answers to **Question (b) (iv)** on whether the Alphabet Agencies had greater economic than social effects, the main problem for most candidates was to decide what evidence was economic and what was social. Many candidates had evidence of both effects but failed to tease out which was which. Hence, some answers were confused and consequently lacked an organised argument.

Depth Study D: China, 1945-c.1990.

Most of the candidates who chose this subject were able to draw valid inferences from Source A to show that the Cultural Revolution had split families and damaged family allegiances. Also, most candidates felt that Source B showed that the Red Guards lost most of their previous freedom of action and that Mao emerged as the only real winner in this period. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** tended to concentrate on comparisons of the content of the sources rather than evaluations of utility. Candidates often failed to use the significance of the provenance of Source A and the balance of information in Source B.

Answers to **Question (b) (i)** showed that candidates were easily able to give examples of the groups targeted by the Red Guards during the Cultural Revolution. Also, the significance of Mao's Little Red Book was understood and candidates gave full detail and explanation. Most candidates understood why Mao introduced the Cultural Revolution and gave full explanations regarding the need to renew and re-invigorate the revolution as well as Mao's need to re-establish his control and power base in the Chinese Communist Party. There were many full answers to **Question (b) (iv)** but most concentrated on the improvements in the lives of Chinese people after Mao's death, highlighting economic and industrial developments under Deng's regime.

Depth Study E: Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century.

The number of Centres that prepared candidates specifically for this Depth Study was small. Candidates demonstrated some skill in their answers to **Part (a)** questions but many performed poorly on the **Part (b)** questions. Candidates appreciated that Source A showed that General Smuts was hostile to any mixing of the races in South Africa and that he tried to rationalise and support this view as being 'Christian principles'. Candidates also saw some kind of balance in Source B for the Indian community. They noted that while Indians were prohibited from entering some areas of South Africa and while Indian marriages were deemed illegal, protest and organisation under Gandhi led to progress and improvements in the longer term. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** usually compared the content of the sources rather than test them for utility and reliability.

Although there were some informed and honourable exceptions, most candidates found **Questions (b) (i), (ii) and (iii)** very demanding. Many had poor or very marginal knowledge or understanding of the South African Native National Congress, the Mines and Works Act of 1911, and the reasons for the Native Land Act of 1913. There were some better attempts at **Question (b) (iv)** on whether white rule was a complete success in South Africa before 1948, but many weaker candidates concentrated on the post 1948 period and the introduction of apartheid. Some candidates wrote only of changes in conditions and life under the presidency of Nelson Mandela.

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

This Depth Study has attracted an increasing number of Centres and candidates over the past few years. On the whole, answers to the questions set for this Depth Study were well developed. Candidates were easily able to detect that Source A showed a distinct antipathy to the existence of the state of Israel and that Source B showed a more measured, balanced and objective view about the impact of Nasser's propaganda. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** on the comparative usefulness of the sources about Arab attitudes towards Israel were often very well argued, with references to the position of Cairo Radio as a government propaganda medium, and the more balanced and equitable language of Source B compared to Source A. Candidates often were able to evaluate fully by effectively cross-referencing between the two sources to make valid deductions and showed how observations in Source B explained the motives behind the rhetoric in Source A.

Most candidates were able to offer full answers to all **Part (b)** questions. Candidates knew which two Arab countries, other than Egypt, were involved in the 1967 war, although a significant number named Lebanon incorrectly. The detail surrounding the closure of the Straits of Tiran was understood and fully developed by most candidates, but some concentrated on the outcome of the pre-emptive air strike by Israel without recalling the importance of the Straits to Israel economically or the need for Israel to secure America's agreement for Israel to proceed without American condemnation. Answers to **Question (b) (iii)** were full and some candidates wrote copiously about why President Nasser went to war with Israel in 1967. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** showed different interpretations of the question of the importance of the role of the superpowers and other non-combatant nations in the Six Day War. Some saw the question as asking for a comparison between the roles of the superpowers and the non-combatant nations, whereas other saw it as needing a comparison between the importance of all outside influences on the preparation and prosecution

of the war against the roles of the combatants themselves in the preparation and prosecution of the war. Both approaches were acceptable and many candidates produced detailed and thoughtful answers.

Depth Study G: The Creation of Modern Industrial Society.

Very few candidates attempted this Depth Study in this season. There were too few genuine and prepared attempts to make meaningful comments, but it was clear that many found the sources difficult to understand and had little knowledge to provide full and developed answers to **Part (b)** questions.

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

Several Centres had prepared specifically for this Depth Study but the overall numbers of candidate attempts was small compared to more popular Depth Studies. In answer to **Question (a) (i)**, candidates had little difficulty in drawing valid inferences about the considerable British influence in and over China, especially in the areas of opium importation, textiles and control of the customs service. Candidates also found little difficulty in showing how Source B was enthusiastic about British imperialism in China while Source C was not. Answers to **Question (a) (iii)** largely compared and contrasted the content of the sources rather than evaluated them. This was a pity as the provenance of each source offered good evidence for discussing utility, whilst there was plenty of opportunity in the sources for successful cross-referencing.

In answer to **Question (b) (i)**, some candidates knew what the 'unequal treaties' were and a few candidates gave good detail. Answers to **Questions (b) (ii)** and **(b) (iii)** showed that candidates had some appreciation and knowledge of the two Opium Wars and the reasons for China's defeat by Japan in 1894-5, but that the knowledge was more partial and adequate without being comprehensive. Answers to **Question (b) (iv)** on how far the actions of European countries were harmful to China in the nineteenth century ranged from the full condemnation of European imperialism but in very general terms of oppression, taking the riches, imposition of Christianity, with little thought for the feelings, culture and history of China, to more thoughtful and balanced answers which gave detail of a variety of impacts, both good and bad.