CONTENTS

Group II
Humanities and Social Sciences

HISTORY

General comments

The overall standard was similar to previous years. Once again there was a dearth of really good scripts but also there were few that were very poor, the bulk of the marks being between 18 and 40. There was a significant number of new Centres this year and most performed reasonably well, although there were a number of rubric infringements in these, mainly through attempting two questions from *Section B*. It often takes a few years for new Centres to become perfectly familiar with the types of question and their demands, so it can be hoped that these new Centres will provide some very good scripts in the coming years.

Comments on specific questions

Questions 1, 2 and 3

There are very few Centres, which attempt these questions in the winter exams, and those done by individual candidates are usually very poor, so comments on these answers would be meaningless.

Question 4

An increasing number of Centres prepare candidates for this topic, as well as for the post-1918 period, and mostly to good effect.

(a)   There were some excellent answers to this question and many scored 5 marks. The sequence of events was muddled by a number of candidates which restricted their marks, but it was generally unusual to find answers below Level 2.

(b)   There was a mixed response to this question. Quite a few went little further than the information provided in the source material, or relied too much on the Austrian wish for revenge for the assassination. The importance of Serbia in the Balkans and the Austrian fears of pan-Slavism in that area were often touched upon but not developed, or suffered from a confused knowledge. Thus marks beyond Level 2 were rare.

(c)   Most candidates made a fair attempt at this and a typical response was to say that the assassination was a 'trigger' or catalyst for war, and that it was other events and the growing tension caused by these that brought war. The issue of 'inevitability' tended to get lost as answers developed, but there were many good Level 3 answers, including those which took the route of showing how the assassination set in motion a timetable for aligned powers to mobilise and thus bring about a European war, rather than a Balkan war.

Question 5

This was the most popular question by far but often produced disappointing marks because answers to **(c)** tended to be weak.

(a)   There were many good answers to this with the disputes over the Aaland Islands and Upper Silesia being the ones usually put forward with some degree of accurate detail. There were some candidates who mentioned more questionable 'success' disputes like Vilna and Corfu but, depending on how they were worded, these could still score reasonable marks. A number did go completely astray by describing events which were *not* disputes e.g. the treatment of refugees, financial help for Austria, and the setting up of agencies.

(b) Candidates found some difficulty in developing their answers sufficiently to score high marks. Indeed quite a lot chose to describe successes of the first ten years rather than why they were successes, which did not bring many marks. The source provided a jumping off place for explaining the desire to achieve peace and cooperation, the fact that there was a structured approach to this and that the organisation was backed by many of the important powers. It was pleasing to see that a number of candidates commented that the treatment of Germany, i.e. disarming and weakening her, was seen by many countries as a good omen for peace and that the League would, therefore, protect weaker countries against potentially powerful and militaristic ones. Many also made good use of the fact that most disputes of the first ten years were small, relatively easily resolved or did not involve major countries, and so compared with the problems of the 1930s, the twenties were bound to be more successful. There were some good Level 3 answers but most remained in Level 2.

(c) This was the undoing of many candidates. Few had any real ideas about the effect of the Depression beyond saying that it caused countries to look inward to their own problems rather than internationally. Most dismissed the Depression in the first couple of lines and then proceeded to write about Hitler and Mussolini. Hardly any commented upon 'good work', and what that might mean. Thus did the work of the agencies continue into the 1930s? What other 'good work' had the League done in the twenties that might have been directly affected by the Depression? Candidates generally did not think sufficiently about this question, and it was clear that most were unprepared for it, as it had not appeared in this form in the recent past.

The internal effects upon Germany, Italy and Japan were quite well dealt with and related to the growth of aggressive nationalism by those countries, thus posing great problems for the League. It is possible that those who had chosen Germany as their Depth Study were helped here, but all candidates should have been aware of the link and we were not looking for the sort of depth which might come from a detailed study. Many candidates did put forward the wrong view that Mussolini rose to power through the effects of the Depression, as well as Hitler.

Question 6

Another popular question which produced disappointing results with the weakness shared between parts **(a)** and **(c)**.

(a) This was very poorly known by the majority of candidates and marks above 3 were few and most were in Level 1. The problem was that only the affair at Mukden was known and even this was often not followed through by describing the takeover of Manchuria, and the setting up of the puppet regime of Manchukuo. The later events were hardly ever referred to, and the more general war against China was clearly unknown to nearly all.

(b) This part, on the other hand, was liked by most candidates who had a good rounded knowledge. Even so, there was a good deal of confusion about what happened with regard to sanctions and also the place of the Hoare-Laval pact. The differences in military strength between the two sides was usually given a full treatment although often exaggerated, for example, 'the Abyssinians fought only with spears' when the picture shows them carrying guns and that 'the Italians were a highly efficient fighting force' when they had great difficulty in securing their invasion.

Descriptions of the campaign could score quite well here when related to showing the defeat of the Abyssinians.

(c) Although most had a vague knowledge about these pacts, they could rarely build this into an argument and instead fell back upon showing how events led to war, which was not the question. Many attributed terms to the pacts which were not true and few distinguished between the early axis between Germany and Italy and the later, more binding, Pact of Steel.

Some picked up useful marks by showing how the pact with Italy helped Hitler to bring about the Anschluss in 1938 when it had proved impossible in 1934, and better answers also were able to show Mussolini's part in the settlement at Munich in 1938. On the other hand a number attributed the re-militarisation of the Rhineland as a by-product of the axis, and generally sequence and chronology were not strong.

Very few could give any significance to the anti-comintern pact beyond a general, and often erroneous, view about encouraging the militism of Germany and Japan. The significance for the USSR, and for relations between the axis powers and the USSR and also the West, was largely missed. Rather like the reference to the Depression in **Question 5 (c)**, this question on pacts seemed to find candidates generally unprepared.

Question 7

This was a very popular question and the best done overall in *Section A*.

(a)   Answers were generally stronger on the part played than on who they were, but most answers were in Level 2 and there were plenty who scored maximum marks.

(b)   The effect of the media reporting the war, its horrors, its failures and its nature was very well done by many, and good illustrative detail was given. The other aspects like cost, number of casualties, futility, mistaken premise for war and its sheer duration were also generally well dealt with. Perhaps the effect of international opinion was the most underused aspect but many did pick it up.

(c)   Answers tended towards the simplistic here and did not usually get the high marks which had been earned in **(a)** and **(b)**. The argument usually was 'unsuccessful because of the cost etc to the USA and the fact that communism triumphed in the end', and 'successful because it showed the USA was prepared to resist communism, it delayed the communist advance in Asia and the withdrawal was accomplished well'. This often got candidates to the edge of Level 4 but the question asked 'how successful', and so some assessment of that was needed to get into Level 4.

Question 8

Not a popular question in the main but there were a number of Centres where candidates regularly chose this and often did very well on it. Generally those who were familiar with the topic scored well whilst those who chose it largely on the basis of knowing one part did poorly.

(a)   Most candidates did quite well on this and some gave very full answers, which well deserved full marks. There were a number who confused the UNO with the League of Nations but even these usually managed to score something as there were, of course, similarities.

(b)   A straightforward question, and those who knew the topic often scored Level 3 marks. Inevitably candidates gave much description about what happened, but it was not difficult to make this relevant to 'why it happened', as events triggered reasons. Some answers had a very confused chronology about the course of events and this sometimes made a nonsense of their given reasons. Better candidates were able to point out that there was a possible hidden agenda by the UNO, as well as the ostensible reasons for intervention. Putting the whole event into the context of the Cold War was important.

(c)   The majority of answers went for a description of the Korean War with special attention to the work of the UN forces and the parts played by the USA and China.

The 'importance' was usually simply stated as 'preserving South Korea', or 'limiting the advance of communism'. Only better answers, of which there were a few, tried to pinpoint the importance for the UN in both the short and long term, as well as the significance for individual countries. Candidates should have considered whether the UN, was strengthened or weakened by the war, whether or not it changed the way in which countries viewed the UN or participated in its workings. There was also the whole question of global involvement in localised conflicts. In fact there was much to argue about in this question, but most candidates were content to take the simple route and thus scored a simple Level 3 mark.

Germany 1918-45

This was far and away the most popular topic, and, on the whole, well done in respect of both questions.

Question 9

(a)   There were many very good detailed answers here with candidates showing good knowledge of who the Freikorps were, their aims, and their activities. A few got things the wrong way round by making the Freikorps communists, but these were very much the minority.

(b)   The answers here were a little disappointing because so many referred only to the terms of Versailles as causing unrest. Also, many candidates did not point to any specific disturbances but just wrote generally about unemployment or 'November criminals', or the dissatisfaction of soldiers. Very few linked the rise of communism with events in Russia or the weakness of the Weimar government with the new constitution. Some went on too far and wrote about reparations, hyperinflation and the occupation of the Ruhr. Certainly this was a case where candidates did not stop to think about the question and what its demands were, and so came out with only a middle Level 2 mark rather than a Level 3 which should have been within the grasp of well-prepared candidates.

(c)   This, of course, was the type of question that many had seen before, and so felt well prepared for it. Generally answers were good but far too many simply gave each term of the treaty and then said it was unfair on Germany. This was only a Level 2 answer. Better answers tried to show that judgement on the terms depended on who you were and when you considered it. Attitudes in 1919 were not necessarily the same as in, say, 1929, nor was Germany's view, for instance, the same as that of France. Level 4 answers demanded that candidates should show awareness of these aspects, even if they were not fully dealt with.

Question 10

There was a tendency to give the same information in both **(a)** and **(b)** answers which was unnecessary but which did not lower marks as long as the answer was still presented relevantly.

(a)   Some information was given in the source and this repeated could get at least a mark. Most had a good general knowledge although fewer referred to actual legislation or specific events. The inclusion of concentration camps and the 'final solution' was perfectly admissible as there was no end date to the question, but some answers concentrated too much on just that aspect.

(b)   This was done quite well but there were not many distinguished answers. The questions of racial superiority and the elimination of undesirables were often not dealt with clearly or accurately. The bulk of answers centred on Hitler's personal dislike of the Jews (for which all sorts of reasons were given), and his use of them as scapegoats for the ills of Germany since 1918 and, indeed, the defeat in the war! Many seemed also to think that all Jews were rich and powerful. Few recognised that persecution of the Jews was just part of a wider policy directed against minorities and opponents.

(c)   Most answers gave instances of oppression and also of popularity, or at least, reasons why people should support Hitler, but found it hard to come to a conclusion. Nevertheless, most made a reasonable attempt at creating a balanced argument and so scored quite high marks.

Russia 1905-41

Question 11

Slightly the more popular question of the two.

(a)   It was pleasing to see that some candidates knew this well. However, the majority did not! There were quite a lot of general answers about Stolypin which did not focus on his reforms, but wrote about oppression and help for peasants/industry in a rather vague way. These generally scored 2 or 3 marks.

(b) Candidates often did not put their emphasis on the dates specified but wrote about general causes of discontent and, indeed, a significant number wrote about the coming of the 1905 revolution. What was needed was to show why the discontent which was present before 1914, sometimes dormant, became more intense and open after 1914. Clearly the war and its effects, militarily, socially, politically and economically could then be brought into some sort of logical rationale. Rasputin did not deserve as much attention as he sometimes received, but was relevant nevertheless. Level 3 answers were in short supply but marks of 4 and 5 were fairly common.

(c) Disappointing answers in that most did not focus enough on (i) the October 1917 revolution and (ii) the importance of Lenin. What Examiners generally got was either reasons for revolution (not specifically October), or descriptions of revolution with some attention to Lenin's part. It is vital in **(c)** questions that the candidate's answer produces an argument and/or analysis, and assessment which will lead to a valid and logical conclusion. Answers which are overly descriptive or a collection of bits and pieces barely linked together are unlikely to score better than a low Level 3 at best. Here, in order to assess Lenin's importance the candidate must provide some means of measuring his contribution against other reasons/factors. Importance is not decided by just stating that he produced a popular slogan or that he was a leader. But this was how many judged it i.e. because he did this or that he was ipso facto important.

Question 12

(a) Answers were surprisingly weak on this, with many finding little to say about him except in a very general way such as, 'he was a good leader' or 'he led the Red Army'. The question was not asking for an assessment of his importance, but just a straightforward description of what he did. Most ignored the date and only wrote about 1917-18.

(b) There was better knowledge of this although, again, there was a good deal of vagueness or general statements, and answers often lacked any sort of detail about his manipulations. The only aspect which was regularly dealt with in detail - but not always correctly - was his triumph over Trotsky, with the emphasis being on the immediate aftermath of the death of Lenin. Not many really placed his success in the particular circumstances of the time; in other words a sense of context was missing, which had a significant bearing on what Stalin did and what he was able to do.

(c) Most answers gave general accounts of oppression, usually with reference to the kulaks, purges or show trials. There was little specific detail on these and there was often no formed argument, just an assumption that if Stalin did these things then he kept control by oppression. Although basically that was true, there should have been an attempt to construct a debate about it and show other aspects of rule at that time, for example, did no parts of the population feel that they were better off? Was all the adulation for Stalin stage-managed? Were all his 'ministers' against him but dare not show it? Even a simple consideration of these points would tell candidates that assumptions should not be made without some evidence/illustrations.

THE USA 1919-41

Question 13

(a) Fairly well known although some took this as cue to write about as many agencies as they could think of. Not all read the question, which asked for a description of aims and work, and so they just wrote about the work which limited the marks to a maximum of 3.

(b) This proved something of disaster for very many because they wrote about the wrong election. They wrote about the promise of the New Deal and the comparison between the 'new' incoming Roosevelt and the outgoing Hoover, instead of reviewing what Roosevelt had achieved and how he had consolidated his hold over the hearts and minds of most Americans. Sometimes, because of the way the answer was written, a mark or two could be salvaged, but for many this was a very low scoring question. Even those who correctly identified the election were not very specific as to why he should win it, often not linking their descriptions of the New Deal with reasons for victory. Hardly any looked at the opposition weakness or the context in which the election took place.

(c)   Most candidates relied upon describing the measures of the New Deal and then went on to a simple conclusion that many things, especially unemployment, had been helped, but that there was still poverty and injustice. Most were rather short of evidence other than generalisms. Examiners do not expect candidates to have a batch of statistics in their heads but some indication, perhaps in percentage terms, of improvements in employment would be invaluable evidence here. Many answers reached a mid-Level 3 mark, but there were very few Level 4 answers.

Question 14

(a)   Apart from the information given in the source, candidates did not know very much about Al Capone. Most were able to at least link him with profiteering from the prohibition laws but this was often undeveloped and the gangsterism side did not always appear. The corruption, violence, disregard for people, law, or authority other than his own which accompanied Capone wherever he extended his influence was not brought out, and neither was the 'example' he set for others.

(b)   This question has been set before and with similar results, in that candidates rarely put the emphasis on the 1920s. General reasons for the Ku Klux Klan were, of course, acceptable in part, but Examiners did want the specific reasons why it should revive when it did. Again, even those who recognised this requirement were not sure about it, and often just wrote vaguely about 'new immigration', the 'hardships and unemployment in the South' or 'blacks taking white jobs'. The effects of war were largely lost and once more there was a general ignoring of the historical context.

(c)   Many wanted to turn this into a question about 'tolerance' which had appeared in a recent Paper and so lost the focus on 'violence'. Clearly the references in **(a)** and **(b)** should have been followed up as these were obvious examples of violence and then there could have been some analysis of how widespread these aspects were in the USA as a whole, and whether or not there were other pockets of violence. Then some assessment of the hypothesis in the question could be made. Long accounts of greater freedom for women, or the growth of entertainment industry had little mark-earning power unless linked in.

There were very few answers to the remaining Depth Studies and certainly not enough to be able to make meaningful reports on the questions.

The South African option is done mainly by Namibian Centres which are now marked in Namibia. The *China* option has a good following in the summer exam, largely by Centres from Asia and the Far East, but not in the winter; the *Israeli/Palestine* option has only a smattering of Centres, some very good, at any time, but hardly any in the winter; and the *Western Imperialism and Creation of Modern Industrial Society* have quite a lot of entries in the summer, largely from those Centres which used to follow the old nineteenth century syllabus option, but has only isolated candidates, who are usually very weak, in the winter.

> **Paper 0470/02**
>
> **Paper 2**

General comments

The overall performance of candidates was good with clear signs that the majority of candidates are being well prepared in the skills necessary for this Paper. These candidates use their sound contextual knowledge effectively to interpret and evaluate the sources. There is, however, a minority of candidates who struggle badly with the demands of this Paper. Their answers are characterised by copying the content of the sources and by writing large amounts of irrelevant material which shows a good knowledge of the events but little evidence of the source skills which this Paper is designed to test. It is important to stress to candidates that all the questions on this Paper are about the sources rather than the events. Contextual knowledge does have an important place in answers, but only where it is used to interpret and evaluate sources. It should never be included in answers for its own sake.

Two areas where a number of candidates continue to throw away a lot of marks continue to be: evaluation of sources, and answers to **Question 6**. When evaluating sources candidates should not base their judgements on the type of a source, for example, anything written by a communist is untrustworthy, anything written by an eye-witness is reliable. Candidates should use their contextual knowledge to either check the claims being made in the source or to consider the possible purpose of the author of the source. In answering **Question 6** it is very important that candidates: explain how some sources support one side of the argument, while other sources support the opposing view; make clear, by reference to the source letter, which source they are writing about; and explicitly explain *how* a particular source supports or does not support the statement in the question.

The ***20th Century option*** remains far more popular than the nineteenth. There were a number of candidates who attempted to answer the questions to both options and as a result had time to write very brief and superficial answers.

Comments on specific questions

19th Century option

Question 1

This question produced a good range of answers but there was also an encouraging number of candidates in the top level. Candidates reached this level by finding ways in which the sources agree and disagree. Agreements included the Zollverein and Prussia both being powerful factors in unity; disagreements included whether or not there were other factors and whether or not Prussia was the automatic leader of unity. It is important to explain to future candidates that when a question asks 'how far' sources agree, they are expected to consider both agreements and disagreements. Some candidates limited their marks by just looking for agreements. Other candidates were placed in the bottom level in the mark scheme because they summarised one source, then the other, without identifying any specific agreements or disagreements. Candidates should answer questions like this one by explaining agreements or disagreements point by point, not by writing about one source and then about the other - specific matchings and mis-matchings got lost in these answers. The answer that follows was awarded 5 marks. It identifies agreements but not disagreements.

Sources A and B agree that the Zollverein was a driving force behind the eventual unification of Germany. In Source A it encouraged nationalist sentiments and in Source B it helped keep Austria out. They also agree that Prussia was important. Prussia used the Zollverein to make sure it, and not Austria, led attempts at a united Germany.

Question 2

To achieve high marks in this question it was important to use contextual knowledge of Bismarck's aims (or cross-reference to other sources which contain evidence about Bismarck's aims). Many candidates restricted their answers to finding agreements and disagreements between Sources C and D. This made a good start to an answer but it was disappointing to see so few candidates go on to place the sources in context.

Question 3

This question was answered well. Nearly all candidates were able to make a valid interpretation of the source, for example, France is scared of the growing power of Prussia, and support it by reference to details in the cartoon. Many candidates, however, went on to explain their interpretation by using their contextual knowledge. This is how one candidate developed their answer through contextual knowledge:

You can see this cartoon was drawn in 1867. France was really worried about growing Prussian power because of the war against Denmark in 1864 and the Austro-Prussian War in 1866. Both of these wars had made Prussia more powerful and she was now in a position to unite Germany under her leadership. This terrified the French because a unified Germany would be a great threat to France and would be the most powerful country in Europe. This is why the cartoon shows the French trying to stop Prussia from getting any bigger.

The important point about this candidate's use of contextual knowledge is the way it has been used to make more sense of the cartoon. It has not been inserted for its own sake.

Question 4

This was a demanding question and some candidates found it very difficult to use three sources at once. Most candidates were able to find agreements and differences between Source H and Sources F and G. These answers could score up to 5 marks. To achieve higher marks candidates needed to evaluate the sources. Some evaluated Sources F and G (usually in terms of the possible purpose of the sources) but failed to use this evaluation to make a judgement about Source H. The mark scheme for this question is given below.

Level 1: Unsupported assertions or answers based on the fact that they come from different times (not developed) or undeveloped use of the provenance (1-2)

Level 2: Evaluates Source H with no reference to Sources F and G, or evaluates Sources F/G with no reference to H (3)

Level 3: Identifies mismatch between H and F/G (4-5)

Level 4: Level 3 plus evaluation of Source H or of Sources F/G (6-7)

Level 5: Uses contextual knowledge to explain how the situation was different in 1870 (8-9)

Question 5

A few candidates decided that Source I has no use at all because it has been changed. Many more claimed that it is useful because of the surface information it contains. More thoughtful candidates realised that the painting represents an interpretation of Bismarck and his role in unification. Some candidates dismissed it because it was only an interpretation, while the best candidates realised the fact that it is an interpretation is the reason it is useful - it tells us how people back in 1885 saw Bismarck's role.

Question 6

Most candidates answered this question well. They were able to organise the sources into two groups - for and against the statement, and explain how each source either supported or disagreed with the statement. A few candidates ignored the sources and wrote their own assessments of Bismarck's role. Such answers are always placed in the bottom level of the mark scheme and cannot be awarded more than 3 marks.

20th Century option

Question 1

Candidates normally cope with cartoons well as this year's candidates did. There was a distinction however between those who interpreted just a part of the cartoon (for example, Bulgaria is behaving itself) or missed the point of the cartoon (for example, it shows Khrushchev is in control of East European countries), and those who understood the central point the cartoonist was trying to make - that Khrushchev was beginning to lose control of parts of Eastern Europe. It is important in questions about cartoons that candidates are not distracted by detail and do interpret the 'big' message of the cartoon. To achieve good marks candidates needed to explain their interpretation of the cartoon by references to details in the cartoon and to the historical context. Some candidates used their contextual knowledge very relevantly by explaining why Yugoslavia is shown off its stand or why Hungary and Poland are shown as getting off theirs, while other candidates simply wrote about the situation in Eastern Europe without relating what they were writing to the cartoon. Some candidates made the mistake of thinking that the cage represented the Warsaw Pact. This cannot be the case as Yugoslavia was never a member. Those candidates who suggested the Iron Curtain, or simply Soviet control, were nearer the mark. The answer that follows was awarded full marks. It offers a valid interpretation which is supported by reference to the cartoon and to contextual knowledge.

The message of the cartoon is that Russia was starting to lose control of countries in Eastern Europe. The man in the middle is Khrushchev. He is holding a whip showing he is trying to control all these countries. Some countries are under his control like Bulgaria and Albania which are sitting quietly. Other countries are trying to break away from the Eastern Bloc. They want more freedom. This is shown by Yugoslavia which is trying to get out of the cage that represents the Iron Curtain. Tito never accepted control from Russia and Yugoslavia was never really under Soviet control. The cartoon shows Russian control beginning to break down.

Question 2

This was a demanding question and many candidates found it to be the hardest question on the Paper. Coping with three sources at once requires a methodical approach which some candidates lacked. Weaker candidates were able to identify similarities between Sources C and D (for example, both anti-Stalin), and differences between Sources B and D (for example, one blaming Nagy, the other blaming Stalin). They then argued that D does prove Khrushchev meant what he said in C but not in B. Better candidates realised that there was rather more to the question than this kind of matching and proceeded to use their knowledge to evaluate the sources. Some candidates evaluated Sources B and C. The best answers demonstrated an understanding that to discover whether Source D proves that Khrushchev was telling the truth it is necessary to first evaluate Source D (this was usually done in terms of purpose). The mark scheme for this question is given below.

Level 1: Unsupported assertions or answers based on undeveloped use of the provenance of the sources
(1-2)

Level 2: Evaluates Source D but no reference to Sources B/C, or evaluates Sources B/C and reference to Source D
(3)

Level 3: Uses content of Source D to explain similarities/differences with Sources B/C (4 marks for doing this with both B and C)
(3-4)

Level 4: Shows that Source D does not necessarily undermine Source B (for 5 marks must also compare D and C)
(4-5)

Level 5: Similarities/differences between Source D and Sources B and C with reliability of Sources B/C evaluated in context
(6-7)

Level 6: Evaluates Source D in context and identifies similarities/differences with Sources B/C   (8-9)

Question 3

This question produced a wide range of answers. Weaker candidates simply described the differences between the accounts in the two sources. These answers placed at the bottom of the mark scheme. Many candidates, however, tried to explain why the sources give different accounts. The strongest candidates considered the possible purpose of the sources – for example, Source E is desperately asking for help so will make the situation sound as bad as possible, Source F is from Yugoslavia which wants to show it is possible to resist Soviet control. Some candidates tried to explain the differences by suggesting that they are about different parts of the rebellion or that one is describing events that were later or sooner than those described in the other source. Other answers were based on the fact that one account is by insiders while the other is from outsiders - therefore one is better informed than the other. All of these answers were placed in the middle of the mark scheme while the answers based on purpose were placed in the top level.

Question 4

Some candidates found Source G more difficult to interpret than Source H. A number simply suggested that Source G is irrelevant to the question. Weak candidates copied Source H and made no attempt to explain its meaning in relation to the question. The key to answering this question well was realising that Source G suggests why the Soviets invaded when they did, while Source H suggests why it was Hungary that they invaded. Candidates did not need knowledge of Suez to be able to interpret Source G, they just needed to be able to see that the cartoon is suggesting the USSR invaded when it did because the UN was distracted. The top levels in the mark scheme were reserved for candidates who evaluated the sources. One popular way of doing this was to explain that the usefulness of these two sources is limited because there were other reasons for the Soviet invasion which they do not mention. To reach the top level candidates needed to explain that these sources are useful because they tell us what the people behind the sources wanted others to believe - few candidates reached this level. The answer that follows is typical of many and was awarded 5 marks.

Source H tells us that the Soviet Union invaded Hungary because an anti-communist rebellion there could lead to other rebellions in other East European countries. It even suggests that the West might use Hungary as a place for launching an attack against Russia. This is why the Soviets could not afford to let the rebellion continue. It could put the whole of Communist Eastern Europe in danger. Source G shows that the UN was busy punishing Israel. This gave Russia the chance to invade Hungary - while everyone was concentrating on Israel. Khrushchev is shown as attacking Hungary in the corner of the classroom where no one can notice him.

Question 5

A few candidates had problems with the term 'meaningless', but many reached Level 4 in the mark scheme by explaining how the two sources disagree. Better candidates either explained how there is not necessarily a conflict between what is said in Sources I and J, or used their knowledge to evaluate the sources. The best attempts at evaluation were those based on considering the purpose of each of the sources. Simplistic evaluation, of which there was some, for example, Khrushchev is biased, was placed near the bottom of the mark scheme.

Question 6

Because of the mark available this is an important question. Some candidates threw away a lot of these marks by answering the question without any reference to the sources. Other candidates increased their total mark significantly by a careful and systematic approach to the question. They first worked out which sources support the view that the invasion was to help the Hungarian people and which sources disagree with it. They then clearly identified the sources in the first group and clearly explained how each one supports the statement. This was repeated with the second group. Such answers scored 10 marks out of the 12. The other 2 marks are awarded for any attempts by the candidates to evaluate the sources. Some candidates lost marks by not making clear which sources they were referring to. Others lost marks by just identifying which sources supported or rejected the statement and failing to explain how they did this.

> **Paper 0470/03**
>
> **Coursework**

General comments

The general standard of candidates' coursework in the November examination was good, although not quite up to the very high standard of the past few years. The entry increased substantially with a number of Centres entering coursework for the first time. Centres helpfully provided the Moderator with copies of the assignments and marks schemes and the moderation of the work was straightforward. About half of the Centres had their marks increased although all of these adjustments were relatively minor. No Centres had their marks reduced at moderation. It might be useful if Teachers bear in mind, when marking coursework, the grade thresholds that are used. For Grades A, C, E and F these are (out of 40) 31, 22, 13 and 11.

The tasks set by Centres were appropriate. Many Centres use the assignments that are available from CIE although those Centres entering candidates for the nineteenth century option have to set their own. There were no examples of inappropriate assignments being set. In *Assignment A* candidates were encouraged to explain and analyse rather than just describe. Most Centres structure this assignment into two or three progressive parts. Part **(a)** can be descriptive but will carry few marks, part **(b)** often requires explanation, while part **(c)** usually requires candidates to form and support a judgement. It is important that the questions set in *Assignment B* test the full range of source skills: interpretation, evaluation, cross-reference, extrapolation and synthesis. To do this it is usually necessary to set 5-7 questions. The most effective questions are those which target specific skills. Centres should not attempt to set an essay for *Assignment B*. This is not an appropriate way of assessing source skills at this level.

The marking of the coursework was generally detailed and accurate. Many Centres annotate candidates' work in ways that are very helpful to the Moderator. It is useful to know which part of an answer is regarded as the crucial section that justifies it being placed in a particular level. The marking of Assignment 1 was nearly always accurate, whereas some of the marking for Assignment 2 was a little harsh.

Some candidates wrote far too much. While they are not penalised for this, they often wandered off the point in *Assignment A* and wasted time writing about the background to the events to be analysed. Most exercises for *Assignment A* require candidates to produce causal analyses and it is important that candidates do this rather than describe or narrate. For high marks candidates need to be able to not only explain how factors acted as causes, but also to compare the relative importance of causes and to explain how they inter-acted with each other. There was much good work produced for *Assignment B* although evaluation of sources remains the weakest area of candidate performance. Some candidates still think they can evaluate sources by only considering the content or the provenance of the source. Both need to be considered. For high marks candidates need to **(i)** interpret the source, **(ii)** consider who has produced the source and the purpose in producing it, and **(iii)** examine the claims being made in the source against their own knowledge of the events and individuals.

General comments

As ever, **Depth Study A**: *Germany, 1918 – 1945*, was the most popular choice with candidates, and this popularity was overwhelming. Equally popular with one another were **Depth Study B**: *Russia, 1905 – 1941*, and **Depth Study C**: *The United States of America, 1919 – 1941*. Of the rest of the Depth Studies, only **Depth Study E**, *Southern Africa*, had whole Centres preparing candidates specifically for questions in this area of study. There were a few attempts at other Depth Studies with some good answers on China, and on Israelis and Palestinians. Attempts at **Depth Study G**: *The Creation of Modern Industrial Society* were usually made by candidates unsure of their knowledge to answer the Depth Study for which they had prepared. It was extremely rare to find examples of answers to **Depth Study H**: *The Impact of Western Imperialism in the Nineteenth Century*.

Examiners reported an improvement in the standard of answers to Part **(a)** questions, where it was clear that candidates had reacted positively to advice given on the technique of answering source-based questions. However, there are still weaknesses, which will be addressed later in the report. The concept of balance in answer to **Questions (a)(ii)**, **(a)(iii)** and **(b)(iv)** had been learned by many candidates, where the phrase "on the other hand" was used regularly as a 'trigger' to offer a second point of view. Generally, candidates are still scoring better on Part **(a)** questions than on Part **(b)** questions.

The most common failing among candidates now appears to be that a significant minority believes that if it copies out part or all of the sources in answer to every question, whether Part **(a)** and/or Part **(b)**, it will be credited with marks. Candidates must appreciate that only information and argument relevant to the question will be rewarded. Some candidates also see **Questions (a)(iii)** and **(b)(iv)** as offering the opportunity to choose one source, or one element, to write about. These questions require a balanced approach.

Examiners reported that most of the candidates' scripts were well presented and organised so that all that they had written was accessible. Also, the number of scripts written in pastel shaded ink was mercifully low. The number of rubric infringements reduced once again this year.

Comments on specific questions

As well over 96% of candidates answered questions on **Depth Studies A**, **B**, **C** and **E**, specific comment will be made on those Depth Studies alone. However, generic weaknesses on specific types of questions will also apply to those Depth Studies not mentioned.

Depth Study A

Germany, 1918 – 1945

This was the most popular Depth Study by far and many candidates performed well, with full and focused answers. However, the overall standard of answers appeared to be less compelling this session. In **Question (a)(i)** some found it difficult to express inferences or conclusions regarding Source A's evidence of Goebbel's attitude to propaganda. Indeed, a large number either repeated the information in the source or drew general inferences without showing where they had found the evidence in the source. Most suggested that Source B – **Question (a)(ii)** – showed that Shirer was impressed by Nazi propaganda, but few showed conclusively that Shirer had deep concerns about the hypnotic qualities of this propaganda. Some commented on the phrase 'It was worrying' but failed to develop the idea further. Some candidates showed their confusion with the source by describing Shirer variously as a 'woman', 'a German' or even as 'Chancellor of Germany'. As stated previously, many saw **Question (a)(iii)** as a choice between the two sources rather than as a comparison and few addressed the 'keyword' 'controlled' in a developed manner.

Fewer attempted to test for reliability, which should have proved relatively easy, for example, Goebbels speaking, in 1933, and an American journalist recalling his time in Germany over 20 years later.

Almost all candidates scored well in **Question (b)(i)**, and saw that the required information was to be found in Source B. It was common to find answers to **Question (b)(ii)** offering general trends rather than specific detail for example, 'changes in the curriculum were made' without references to biology, history etc. Also, candidates asserted 'they were told to be loyal to Hitler', but the detail and the means were omitted. The question on the Nuremberg Rallies was done fully and well by those who understood what they were. However, there were many answers that lacked detail and showed that candidates knew little about the subject. Most commonly, the Nuremberg Rallies were confused with the Nuremberg Laws of 1935. Sometimes Nuremberg was confused with Hindenburg, and also Nuremberg was alleged to be a wealthy area of Germany, where the inhabitants opposed Hitler. There were a number of full and well-balanced answers to **Question (b)(iv)**, where 'terror' and 'propaganda' were dealt with in general terms and specific examples were used to support an argument. Weaker candidates often made a choice between 'terror' and 'propaganda', while others compared the two aspects of control in a philosophical manner, pointing out the advantages and weaknesses of both policies in a very general fashion. Some candidates confused 'terror' with 'terrorism', while others did not understand the term 'propaganda' fully. It was variously described as 'the secret police or Gestapo', an 'enforcement group' and, more accurately, as 'peaceful lies'.

Depth Study B

Russia, 1905 – 1941

In answer to **Question (a)(i)**, most candidates were able to draw inferences from the statistics in Source A and were able to show where they had found their evidence. Most scored well here. It was pleasing to note how many candidates understood the term 'capitalism' in their answers to **Question (a)(ii)**. Good evidence was then drawn from the source. However, very few could show the limitations of the source to offer an alternative view to the source demonstrating that the NEP was a capitalist policy. Candidates did not notice that the source showed a limited number of examples, that there was possible bias in the provenance or the possible distortion of memory over 60 years. Equally, **Question (b)(i)** offered a hint for candidates when it asked for two examples of industries that remained in government control during the NEP. In answers to **Question (a)(iii)**, candidates often saw the question as offering a choice between the two sources rather than requiring a comparison. However, most were able to gain marks available to a Level 3 answer because they commented upon the detail of the content of the source(s). Very few tried to test for reliability. This was disappointing as there was much to question e.g. in Source A, only a few commodities were shown and these were all agricultural, no specific provenance for the source etc. and for Source B, there were limited examples, the provenance and the issues of memory and bias.

Most scored well in answers to **Question (b)(i)**. This was surprising, given the limitations of some of the answers to **Question (a)(ii)**. Also, many could describe the main features of War Communism in answer to **Question (b)(ii)**. However, the Kronstadt Rising of 1921 was known by very few, and the significance of the Rising was known by even fewer candidates. Some asserted that the Rising took place in 1917 as part of the October Revolution, while others confused Kronstadt with Kerensky and Kornilov. Almost all candidates concentrated on the successes of the NEP – **Question (b)(iv)**. However, if candidates knew that all **(b)(iv)** questions required a balanced approach, they could have used the significance of the year 1928, Stalin's views, the 'scissors' effect, and so on.

Depth Study C

The United States of America, 1919 – 1941

Most candidates could draw and support inferences from Source A – **Question (a)(i)**, although there were many examples of candidates simply copying out the source verbatim. Nevertheless, good marks were scored here. Most showed that the cartoon in Source B favoured Roosevelt's views by demonstrating that the large number of newspaper cuttings proved that the New Deal was profitable. Few candidates used the comic drawing of the two businessmen to support this side of the argument. Very few showed that, despite the comic drawing of the men, they did represent the issue of opposition to Roosevelt.

As with other **Question (a)(iii)** answers, already dealt with above, candidates either saw the question as one of choice between the sources or, at best, a chance to compare the content of the sources. Very few tested for reliability when there was plenty of scope to do so, for example, Source A – an election speech in 1936, the language, tone etc. and Source B – the relative merits of cartoons, of newspapers, the tone and style of the specific cartoon, and so on.

Most scored well on **Question (b)(i)** where measures declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court were well known. **Questions (b)(ii)** and **(b)(iii)** proved difficult for candidates. Father Coughlin was a name known to some of the candidates, but few could offer detail of his criticism of Roosevelt. However, many knew he used radio broadcasts. Equally, the threat of Senator Huey Long to Roosevelt was often described in unconvincing, general terms, for example, 'he was an opponent', 'he criticised Roosevelt'. The lack of specific detail about this man and his ideas showed that the Senator was not well known by candidates. Most candidates gained their reward in answers to **Question (b)(iv)** by demonstrating that Roosevelt had not lost support, but this lack of balance limited their arguments and their marks. No candidate referred to the Democrats' loss of 72 seats in the House of Representatives in the Congressional elections of 1938, although some did refer to the cut back in federal funding in 1937, which increased unemployment and led to a recession.

Depth Study E

Southern Africa in the Twentieth Century

This Depth Study was attempted and prepared for by a number of Centres in Africa. Candidates were able to draw inferences from Source A easily enough and scored well when they demonstrated the evidence for the inferences. In answer to **Question (a)(ii)**, most supported the idea that the South African government had involved itself fully in the South African economy and listed examples from the source to support their argument. Few offered any balance by showing that the list in the source was limited and did not refer to agriculture. Again, in answers to **Question (a)(iii)**, candidates often chose to concentrate on the content of one or both sources. Tests for reliability concerning the provenance, dates and contextual knowledge of events in South Africa between 1930 and 1990 were not used.

In answers to **Question (b)(i)**, most candidates gained marks for the commodities of diamonds and copper suffering a decline in exports in the 1930s. Answers to **Questions (b)(ii)** and **(b)(iii)** were often disappointing, with candidates unable to identify the thrust of **(b)(ii)** about the methods of recruitment for the Rand mines, and only two candidates wrote convincingly about the important Marketing Act of 1937. Answers to **Question (b)(iv)** tended to concentrate on the problems of the black population of South Africa during the 1930s, although a few did offer some balance by showing that the white population enjoyed the benefits of the economic growth and that some of the black population gained greater opportunities, even if this was not always accompanied by greater wealth.

Conclusions

While there was a noticeable improvement in the overall standard of scripts, there are still areas that need attention. Some candidates have understood the need for balance in answers to **Questions (a)(ii)**, **(a)(iii)** and **(b)(iv)** (evidenced by the phrase 'on the other hand'). Many more candidates must appreciate that these three questions are not about one point of view or one set of details, but that they require a balanced and reasoned approach. Also, the highest marks for **Question (a)(iii)** will only be achieved when candidates test for the reliability of the sources. Nevertheless, the general improvement in this season's examination was pleasing to, and noted by, all Examiners.

On a lighter note, three examples of gentle humour (or misunderstanding) are worth recall. One candidate described Goebbels as "a nice, honest man" while, to the Führer's everlasting gall, he was referred to as a "black Communist". Perhaps the most amusing comment came in an answer to a question in **Depth Study G**, where one of the disadvantages of canal transport in Britain was alleged to be "being killed by a hippopotamus".