

HISTORY

Paper 2147/11
Paper 11

Key messages

It is very important that candidates read the question carefully before they begin their response, in order to give themselves the opportunity to write focused and balanced responses. Any given dates in the question should be closely noted to help ensure that their responses only include relevant information.

Successful responses to **parts (b) and (c)** were carefully organised into separate paragraphs for the different issues which were being explained.

When a question asks 'why' a particular event happened it is important that candidates direct their response to address and explain the reasons, rather than write a description of what happened.

General comments

Many candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge and understanding of both the Core and Depth Study Questions for which they had been prepared. These candidates used their knowledge to good effect and communicated their ideas clearly and accurately. They wrote well developed explanations and arguments in answer to their chosen questions. Some candidates, whilst demonstrating sound and detailed factual knowledge, found it difficult to use their knowledge effectively to answer the question set. These responses tended not to be divided up into paragraphs and often consisted of a descriptive list of facts.

There were very few rubric errors and most candidates had used the time allocated effectively and completed the paper.

Part (a) questions required recall and description. Responses should focus on description and only include relevant details. Explanation is not required. Generally, candidates performed well in giving answers to **(a)** questions that were short and concise, with little unnecessary background information.

Part (b) and (c) questions required understanding and explanation. Some candidates were able to identify numerous factors/reasons when answering their chosen questions but were unable to develop these identification points into explanations. Candidates need to focus upon using their factual knowledge to explain events, rather than using a purely narrative approach. They could identify a factor/reason and then use a link such as 'this means that' which will lead them into an explanation.

Part (b) questions require recall and explanation. Most **(b)** questions ask 'why' a particular issue happened, so it is important that candidates direct their response to address the reasons, rather than write a description of what happened. Successful responses were carefully organised, using a separate paragraph for each different reason that was being explained. Narrative accounts or long introductions which 'set the scene' were not required.

Part (c) questions require recall, explanation and analysis. Most candidates demonstrated that they were aware of how to structure a balanced answer. The most successful responses argued both for and against the focus of the question and reached a supported judgement. A valid conclusion will go beyond being a summary of what has already been stated in the response by addressing, 'how far', 'how successful' or 'how important', depending on the actual question set. Weaker responses were characterised either by a 'listing' narrative approach with few attempts to link the points made to the question or a concentration on only one side of the argument. These responses could be improved by including more contextual examples on both sides of the argument to produce a balanced response.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1 to 3

There were too few responses to these questions for meaningful comments to be made.

Question 4

- (a) There were mixed responses to this question. Some candidates wrote about the second Moroccan Crisis which was in 1911. Other weaker responses included general and inaccurate description. However, there were some good responses which showed an understanding of the events of the Morocco Crisis, 1905 - 06. For example, responses included details such as: the Kaiser's main aim was to prevent France from occupying Morocco. To do this he visited Tangier to give his support to the Sultan and a conference was called at Algeciras in 1906 to discuss the situation.
- (b) Strong responses understood that this was a friendship alliance between Britain and France and identified and explained the reasons why the Entente Cordiale was agreed. The most common reasons explained were the increasing threat from Germany and the protection of each other's colonial interests. Less successful tended to be inaccurate by including Russia in the Entente and assuming that it was an aggressive military alliance.
- (c) This question produced some good responses which included well balanced, supported explanations on both sides of the argument. Candidates wrote confidently about the role played by Austria in causing the war. They understood the long-standing rivalry with Serbia and the impact of the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand. The other approach most commonly used to counter-balance the argument was the actions of Germany. Candidates were well informed on Germany's military and naval expansion prior to the outbreak of war, the formulation of the Schlieffen Plan and the 'blank cheque' given to Austria. Others included the role of Russia and Serbia as well. These responses often made references to the Alliance System and imperialism to support their argument. Weaker responses tended to be descriptive lists of the causes of the First World War. These responses could have been improved by linking each identified point to the question.

Questions 5

This was the most popular question in this section.

- (a) Most candidates had a good knowledge of the use of plebiscites in the peace settlement, 1919 – 1920. The strongest responses included four specific details about the use of plebiscites, for example, plebiscites were when people voted, often to do with to which country they wanted to belong. There was a plebiscite in Upper Silesia in 1921 which resulted in the area being divided between Germany and Poland. Candidates could have used other examples, including that a plebiscite was held in 1920 which saw Schleswig divided between Germany and Denmark. A small number gave no response. Weaker responses included general details, usually on the Treaty of Versailles, which lacked relevance to this question.
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. The most successful responses explained an aim of the French at the peace conference and linked it to a specific term in the Treaty of Versailles to illustrate their dissatisfaction. For example, Clemenceau wanted Germany to be disarmed because France had been invaded twice by Germany in the last fifty years and they did not want to be invaded again. They were very dissatisfied because Germany was not completely disarmed - they could have 100,000 men in their army and this could be a future threat to France. Other common reasons for dissatisfaction often included in stronger responses was the fact that Germany was not broken up into separate states as Clemenceau wished, nor were the reparations high enough. Weaker responses were characterised by descriptions of the aims of French delegation going into the peace conference with no specific reason as to why they were dissatisfied. Others compared the aims of the 'Big Three' which lacked relevance to this question.
- (c) There were a number of well-developed and balanced responses to this question which discussed the extent to which political turmoil was the most serious consequence of the Treaty of Versailles

for Germany up to 1923. Strong responses explained the political turmoil in terms of accepting the Treaty made the government look weak and many Germans thought that 'Germany had been stabbed in the back' and referred to the politicians who accepted the Treaty as 'the November Criminals'. They explained the threats to the government from the Kapp Putsch of 1921 and Munich Putsch of 1923 and their determination to overthrow the Weimar Government and abolish the Treaty of Versailles. Such responses produced a balanced answer by then explaining other serious consequences of the Treaty of Versailles, not least the terms of the Treaty, the most common being the economic and military terms and their effects on Germany. They showed how the terms of the Treaty seriously affected the German economy because of the failure to pay reparations which resulted in the French and Belgian invasion of the Ruhr and subsequent hyperinflation. It is important that candidates read the question carefully as some responses included details from 1924 onwards which were not relevant. Weaker responses included descriptions of the terms of the treaty with no direct linkage to the question. A small number of candidates misunderstood the term 'political turmoil' and wrote generally about why the Weimar Republic was weak.

Question 6

- (a) Strong responses were familiar with the Anti-Comintern Pact and gained credit by identifying the Pact's signatories, the year or years in which they joined and its anti-Soviet intention. A number of candidates gave no response or included incorrect Pact members and reasons as to why it was formed. These responses would have benefited from accurate knowledge of the Pact.
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. Most candidates were able to identify one or two reasons why the British-French guarantees to Poland failed to prevent war in 1939. Strong responses gave two good explanations. The most commonly cited reason was that of the British-French policy of appeasement in 1938 and 1939 and then examples were given to enhance the explanation, most notably the Munich Agreement and their reaction to Hitler's invasion of Czechoslovakia in March 1939. This boosted Hitler's confidence to the extent that he believed Britain and France would not follow their guarantees through, were he to invade Poland. Successful responses then explained the importance of the Nazi-Soviet Pact in August 1939 to Hitler and how this ruled out the danger of Soviet intervention against Germany should Hitler invade Poland. Other responses often only included one explanation, usually omitting the Nazi-Soviet Pact, or missed the phrase 'British-French guarantees to Poland' in the question and wrote generally about why war had broken out in 1939.
- (c) This question produced some good answers. Strong responses examined both sides of the argument, giving evidence in support of the hypothesis and then explaining that Britain and France did have a choice and did not need to allow Hitler to remilitarise the Rhineland. Most candidates were able to identify at least two factors to support the argument for non-action on the part of Britain and France. These most commonly included the impact of the Great Depression on the two countries, the Rhineland as Germany's backyard, the perceived severity of the Versailles Treaty, elections in France and the greater importance that seemed to be accorded to the Abyssinian crisis. Some of these strong responses also referred to the Anglo-German Naval Treaty of 1935 to show that, in effect, Britain had already embarked on a conciliatory attitude towards Germany and the restrictions of the Versailles Treaty. Arguments in favour of Anglo-French action were less numerous and less well supported, and less successful responses were one sided. However, strong responses explained with confidence that Britain did have a choice to try and stop the remilitarisation of the Rhineland. These responses explained that Hitler's move into the Rhineland was a gamble and that Britain and France missed an opportunity and that they would have succeeded easily in resisting his army. Many made the point that this was a breach of both the Versailles settlement and the Locarno Treaty and that the two powers were therefore bound to enforce it. Weaker responses were often characterised by the inclusion of less relevant information, including reasons why Hitler invaded the Rhineland which was not the focus of the question.

Question 7

This was the second most popular question in this section.

- (a) Candidates performed very well on this question and they displayed a good understanding of Marshall Aid. Many very strong answers identified key features, such as: It was introduced by General George Marshall in June 1947, the aim being to stabilise the economies of Western

Europe after the damage caused by World War Two. This was done to prevent the spread of communism.

- (b) This question was well answered. Strong responses contained two detailed explanations of why Stalin wanted control over the governments of the states in Eastern Europe. Most responses identified the same two reasons, the desire to spread communism and the need to create a buffer state between the USSR and the West. Strong responses went on to explain why Russia wanted to create a buffer zone, by including that Russia had been invaded twice by the West in both the First and Second World Wars, had suffered heavy casualties and Stalin did not want this to happen again. He wanted neighbouring states such as Poland to be under his control for protection. Weaker responses often identified reasons, for example, to spread communism but gave no explanation.
- (c) This question invited candidates to say how far they agreed with the statement, 'Truman was the main cause of tension at Potsdam.' Successful responses explained Truman's attitude and stance at Potsdam, usually comparing it to that of Stalin. Credit was awarded for the explanation of Truman's anti-communist attitude and his feelings of mistrust towards Stalin, resulting in differences of opinion, including on whether reparations should be imposed on Germany. Truman also raised tension at the meeting by telling Stalin that America had successfully tested an atomic bomb in a desert in New Mexico. Stalin saw this as a threat. A common misconception was that Truman told Stalin at the meeting that he had dropped the atomic bomb on Hiroshima; this was after the meeting at Potsdam. Well balanced responses also examined Stalin's contribution to the tension, most commonly explaining that he had not carried out the promises he made at Yalta, to organise free elections in Poland. He had liberated Poland, yet the Red Army remained there. Some candidates misread the assertion and included details after Potsdam which lacked relevance to this question. Some responses also confused the agreements made at Potsdam with those of Yalta a few months earlier. It is important for candidates to read the questions carefully to ascertain the focus of the question. Weaker responses, whilst identifying causes of tension, needed to put them into context using supporting details.

Question 8

There were too few responses to this question for meaningful comments to be made.

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9

There were too few responses to this question for meaningful comments to be made.

Question 10

- (a) Most candidates were familiar with the contribution of the US forces to the Allied war effort. Successful responses gained full credit by describing the number of troops arriving on the Western Front from March 1918 onwards, the provision of destroyers and merchant ships and the morale boosting effect for the allies of the US intervention. Candidates could also have included that the US troops were fresh and not tired of fighting and their intervention devastated German morale. Some responses could have been improved by including more specific details than just statements such as 'they provided more resources'.
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. Weaker responses just identified reasons for Germany's surrender, such as the high casualty rate, unstable conditions at home and the fact that they were war weary. Contextual knowledge could have been used to develop these reasons into explanations. For example, the Germans agreed to surrender because they could not fight any longer. The Ludendorff Offensive had made progress in March and April 1918 but a counterattack by Allied forces drove the Germans back, resulting in 400 000 casualties. In August, another 400 000 Germans were taken prisoner. Faced with such severe losses the Germans could not fight for much longer.
- (c) A number of well-developed and balanced responses to this question were seen, with candidates explaining that the German people were starving as a result of the blockade of the German ports and the resulting severe shortage of food. Strong responses then went on to explain other reasons

for the outbreak of revolution in Germany in October 1918. Most commonly, responses stated that the stresses of the war had led to mutinies at Kiel and Wilhelmshaven, both of which were well understood by most candidates. Other responses could have been improved by supporting their identification of reasons with more detailed explanations. Some candidates included events after October 1918, for example the events of November 1918.

Question 11

This was the most popular question of the Depth Studies.

- (a) This question was well-answered. Strong responses included a variety of details including the re-grouping of the Nazi Party after the failure of the Munich Putsch and the realisation that violence would not work and they would have to gain power legally to gain popularity. Others included details on the improved organisation of the party, such as Goebbels being put in charge of propaganda and Hitler's speaking talents. Credit was also given for the foundation of the SS in 1925 and the Hitler Youth in 1926. Some also noted that the Nazi Party made limited progress during this time and often made reference to Stresemann's success in the period as a reason for this. Strong responses commented on how relatively poorly the Nazis performed in the Reichstag elections of 1924 and 1928. Weaker responses included details outside the time period of the question.
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. Successful responses contained two detailed explanations for the Nazi failure in the Munich Putsch. The most common reasons identified and explained were the inadequate planning and Hitler's over optimism about the level of popular support he could gain. Weaker responses were characterised by simply identifying reasons for failure without explanation or they included detailed accounts of the Putsch but made no reference to why it failed. Some responses revealed uncertainty about the course of events.
- (c) There were many one-sided responses to this question, as candidates found it easier to explain reasons other than creating jobs as part of why the Nazis gained support. These responses cited the popularity of the NSDAP, including Hitler's oratory skills, Goebbels' use of propaganda and their widespread opposition to communism. Strong responses were well-balanced and also explained the severity of the high levels of unemployment in Germany in the 1930s after the Great Depression. They showed how the Nazis gained support from the unemployed as they proposed to tackle unemployment through public works and military regeneration. Less successful responses often misunderstood the scope of the question and discussed how the Nazis maintained power, rather than explaining the reasons for their appeal, which enabled them to get into power. In these responses there was a concentration on Hitler's ruthlessness in 1933 – 1934 (his reaction to the Reichstag Fire and the Night of Long Knives) and on the coercive methods the Nazis used through the 1930s to ensure compliance rather than support (for example, the use of the Gestapo) which lacked relevance to this question.

Question 12

- (a) This question was well answered and there were many very strong responses. These responses included descriptions such as: that it was expected that culture would praise Hitler, the Nazi regime and show pro-Nazi attitudes. They described how paintings had to show images of the ideal Aryan family. Credit was also given for the Nazi use of censorship and what was banned; for example, the works of Jewish artists and writers were banned, whilst any books considered 'undesirable' were burnt.
- (b) Good understanding was shown of one reason why the Nazis wanted to gain control of the Churches, usually how they wanted their support because they had a considerable influence over a large part of the German population. Many candidates found it a challenge to find a second reason and weaker responses were characterised by identifying reasons but not going on to provide explanation, such as the Church had a lot of power or the Churches were a possible source of opposition. Strong responses included the Concordat signed by Hitler and the Catholic Church as a relevant explanation. These responses explained that the agreement was significant for Hitler in that the Catholic Church agreed to keep out of political affairs, therefore not criticising the Nazis and reducing the possibility of serious opposition, while the Church would be left to concentrate on religious and pastoral duties.

- (c) Successful responses were well balanced by arguing for and against the focus of the question. Candidates needed to identify and then explain which persecutions were racially motivated and which persecutions were for other reasons. Good understanding was shown of the persecution of the Jews, both because of racial and other reasons. Explanations included that Hitler hated the Jews for racial reasons because during his years of poverty in Vienna he was obsessed by the fact that Jews ran many of the most successful German businesses and this did not fit in with his idea of the superiority of the Aryan Race. He also blamed them for other reasons, including Germany's defeat in the First World War. He thought that Jewish businessmen and bankers had forced the surrender of the German army. It is important to read the question carefully because the emphasis in this question is on 'why' rather than on 'how'. Weaker responses often included extensive details about Nazi policies against the Jews and details of the conditions and deaths in the concentration camps. Strong responses also included explanations on the non-racial persecution of other groups such as the disabled, homosexuals and drug addicts – the persecution occurring largely because Hitler thought they were a drain on the resources of the German state.

Questions 13 and 14

There were too few responses to these questions for meaningful comments to be made.

Question 15

- (a) Candidates performed well on this question and had a good understanding of the problems facing American farmers in the 1920s. Maximum credit was achieved for identifying the following features: falling demand from Europe, competition from Canada, which was much more efficient at producing wheat, and overproduction, which resulted in falling prices. Many responses also stressed that a big problem was that some farmers went bankrupt and were evicted from their land.
- (b) There were many strong responses which contained two detailed explanations as to why Republican policies encouraged economic growth. The most common policies explained were the belief in import duties and the policy of laissez faire. For example, strong responses explained that the Republicans believed in tariffs, such as the Fordney-McCumber tariff which made it expensive to import foreign goods. This meant that American businesses were protected from foreign competition and could keep their prices down. This encouraged people to buy products made in the US and allowed American companies to grow rapidly. Weaker responses often correctly identified the policies but encountered challenges explaining them. Others wrote details about what happened, for example the expansion of the car industry, but would have benefited from providing an emphasis on the policies.
- (c) There were a number of well-developed and balanced answers to this question. Strong responses explained both sides of the argument, manufacturing industries which prospered and those that did not. These responses most commonly used the car industry to explain how manufacturing industries prospered. They explained how mass production and advertising had led to the rapid growth of the car industry and, because of the increased demand for cars, other industries such as steel, glass, and rubber also boomed. On the other side of the argument, strong responses addressed which traditional manufacturing industries went into decline and explained examples of such industries, most commonly, cotton textiles. Other responses were usually one-sided, often confining their answers to the car industry.

Questions 16 to 22

There were too few responses to these questions for meaningful comments to be made.

HISTORY

Paper 2147/12
Paper 12

Key messages

Candidates should ensure that their answers for **parts (b) and (c)** are focused on explaining the particular question, rather than on narrating events. For **part (c)**, analysis is also required, and candidates therefore need to argue both for and against the question and reach a substantiated conclusion. The conclusion needs to go further than restating points made earlier in an answer, and instead should address the command words such as 'How far'.

Candidates should pay particular attention to any dates included in a question and restrict their answer to the dates provided. This should mean that their answer is fully relevant and will prevent answers which go beyond what is required.

General comments

Candidates were able to demonstrate sound knowledge and understanding in both the Core Content and Depth Study topics. Many answers contained good supporting evidence which was accurate and detailed, and used in well-developed explanations and arguments in response to their chosen question.

Some candidates, whilst demonstrating sound and detailed factual knowledge, found it challenging to use their knowledge effectively to answer the particular question set. These candidates were able to identify numerous factors/reasons when answering their chosen questions, but they needed to develop these identified points into explanations. Candidates need to focus upon using their factual knowledge to explain events, rather than deploying a narrative approach. In **part (c)** answers, candidates demonstrated that they were aware of how to structure balanced answers to these questions. Candidates need to ensure that they then use their factual knowledge to substantiate the arguments they make. Candidates do need to focus carefully upon the question set; in some instances they wrote in considerable depth about the main topic of the question, but would have improved their responses with a clear focus on the actual question.

There were some rubric errors seen. The most common was candidates who answered more than the required number of questions, particularly in the Depth Study. Time allocation was generally good, and very few instances were seen of candidates who did not finish or had to shorten their final answers. A small number of candidates wrote extended answers to a **part (a)** question; this is not required.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1 to 4

There were too few responses to these questions for meaningful comments to be made.

Question 5

- (a) Most candidates were aware that the purpose of the 'war guilt' clause was to blame Germany for starting the war, and many candidates were also able to link this to making Germany pay reparations. Some candidates were also able to state that the purpose was to humiliate Germany or relate it to the amount of damage that had been caused during the war. Some candidates wrote more generally about the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, rather than focusing on the 'war guilt' clause.

- (b) There were some effective answers that were able to identify a reason for plebiscites to be included in the peace settlement, and to support their answer by providing an example of this. These answers were able to explain, for example, that they were used to allow populations to decide which country they should be governed by, for example the Saar. Other reasons explained were linked to Wilson's aim of self-determination, and to settle disputes. Other answers were able to identify reasons for the plebiscites but the answers contained inaccuracies regarding the territories the identification related to.
- (c) Those who approached this question successfully were able to identify one of Clemenceau's aims, explaining why it was important to him, and directly link it to an aspect of the Treaty to explain how it was or was not achieved. For example, they identified that due to the 1870 – 71 war and the German invasion of France during the First World War, Clemenceau wanted to weaken Germany so they would not be able to invade in the future. They then explained that this was achieved through terms of the Treaty such as Germany's disarmament and the demilitarisation of the Rhineland. Better responses managed to achieve a balanced answer, explaining not only which aims were achieved, but also which ones were not. Other candidates, however, listed Clemenceau's aims and then provided a list of the terms of the Treaty, without giving any specific links between the two. Other answers concentrated on the aims of Wilson and Lloyd-George, neither of which were relevant to this question.

Question 6

- (a) This question was answered well by many candidates who were able to identify four ways in which Germany was involved in the Spanish Civil War. Commonly responses included that Germany supported General Franco, the involvement of the Condor Legion, and that the Civil War was used to test out Germany's new tactics. Other successful answers identified the effect of these, describing the effect of the carpet bombing in Guernica.
- (b) There were some good answers to this question, with candidates able to explain reasons for the importance of Czechoslovakia to Hitler. Some candidates were able to identify that the Sudetenland contained important resources and the Skoda armaments factory, and to explain that these were important for Hitler's future conquests. Others identified that there were three and a half million Germans living in the Sudetenland and linked that to Hitler's foreign policy aim of uniting all German speaking people. A number of responses erroneously stated that Hitler wanted to reclaim the Sudetenland since it had been taken from Germany by the Treaty of Versailles, or that it was achieving Hitler's aim of Lebensraum. Other candidates described the negotiations at the Munich Conference without relating these to the importance of Czechoslovakia to Hitler.
- (c) There were a number of well-developed and balanced answers to this question, with candidates able to assess how surprising it was that Britain and France pursued a policy of appeasement. Some successful explanations considered the importance placed on the demilitarisation of the Rhineland for French security during the negotiations for the Treaty of Versailles, arguing that this made the French lack of action in 1936 surprising, particularly given the German order to retreat if they encountered resistance. Answers on the other side of the argument often considered the relative military weakness of Britain compared to Germany within the context of the Great Depression, particularly given the lack of support from the colonies and the USA's policy of isolation at the time. Weaker responses would have been improved by keeping their focus on the command words of 'how surprising'. Some weaker responses instead argued whether appeasement was successful, or why Britain and France carried out appeasement. In these cases, whilst the knowledge and understanding shown was often relevant for the general topic, answers would have benefited from a focus on the requirement of the question.

Question 7

- (a) There were mixed responses to this question, with candidates either providing four relevant and focused points, or misinterpreting the question to state what happened during the Prague Spring, having missed the date of 1948 in the question. Successful answers often knew that the communist takeover of Czechoslovakia meant that non-communists were arrested and were forced out, and that elections were rigged. Many such answers were also aware of Jan Masaryk's fate. Benes was rarely mentioned, and the two most common mistakes were stating that the Soviet army invaded and the confusion with the events of the Prague Spring alluded to above.

- (b) Many answers were able to provide several reasons why the Berlin Blockade was lifted in 1949, although these were sometimes not explained. The most frequently seen arguments were the consequences of the Berlin airlift, and Stalin's fear of using force. Candidates displayed a good level of knowledge but some did not explain how the identified point actually led to, in this case, the lifting of the Blockade. Some weaker responses confused the Berlin Blockade with the Berlin Wall or thought that the airlift aided East Berlin.
- (c) This question was often answered well, with many candidates able to provide arguments on both sides as to whether Truman was to blame for the Cold War. Good answers explained how Truman's anti-communism and his introduction of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan led to an increase in tension between the USA and the Soviet Union because of how they were perceived by Stalin. Many then went on to provide a balanced argument by explaining how Stalin's creation of the satellite states was seen by Truman as aggressive expansion, rather than security or protection. Some weaker answers gave a detailed description of ideological differences instead of an explanation of how these differences led to the start of the Cold War.

Question 8

- (a) Some good answers were seen, with candidates able to provide several examples of the impact of the Iran-Iraq War on civilians. These answers often referred to the number of deaths and casualties, or the damage caused to buildings or food shortages. Weaker answers were those not focused on 'civilians' and mentioning instead the impact on Saddam Hussein or the state.
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. More candidates could have provided two explanations for why Saddam Hussein's regime survived the First Gulf War. Some candidates were able to explain that the prospect of Saddam Hussein remaining in power was better than the possible alternative of an Iran inspired Islamic revolution. A few answers were also able to demonstrate how he used the Iraqi National Guard to crush attempts to overthrow him by the Kurds and Shi'ites. Some responses focused on the wrong war, usually the Iran-Iraq war mentioned in **part (a)**.
- (c) There were some good answers to this question, with some responses able to provide several explanations as to the causes of the dispute between Iraq and Kuwait. These responses were also often able to provide a balanced answer, on the one side expanding the role of oil to include Saddam Hussein's accusations of 'slant drilling'. Arguments on the other side often considered his need to secure his position within Iraq through a successful war, and occasionally using Iraq's historical claim to Kuwait. Weaker responses needed to include more knowledge and understanding in identifying reasons for the dispute or answered about the USA's involvement in the area being due to oil.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

- (a) Not all candidates were able to describe events on 1 July 1916. Those who were able to do this described the fighting and also the high numbers of deaths and casualties. Some responses described the Battle of the Marne or the race to the sea in error.
- (b) This question was answered well, with candidates able to explain at least two ways in which conditions in the trenches were unhealthy for soldiers. Explanations included the effect of the trenches being waterlogged, leading to trench foot, and also the prevalence of lice, leading to the spread of disease such as trench fever. Some candidates also explained the psychological effects of living in the trenches, resulting in shell shock. Weaker responses provided detailed descriptions of the conditions in the trenches but did not explain the effect that these had on the soldiers.
- (c) This question was answered well, with candidates confident in their knowledge and understanding of how effectively new technology was used in the First World War. Answers were often balanced, with at least two explanations. The most common approach was to describe the new technology, and then provide examples of when it was used effectively and when it was not, often related to specific battles. Tanks, poison gas and aircraft were explained most frequently, and detailed knowledge was often displayed. Weaker responses would have benefited from moving beyond the description of the new technology, to an evaluation of whether such technology was used effectively.

Question 10

There were too few responses to this question for meaningful comments to be made.

Question 11

This was the most popular question of the Depth Studies.

- (a) This question was answered well, with the majority of candidates able to provide several distinct points about the 25 Points Programme. Most recognised it as being the Nazi programme and having been composed by Hitler and they provided aspects of it such as the opposition to the Versailles Treaty. Very few mistakes were seen, but these were often related to help being provided for the unemployed.
- (b) Very good understanding was shown of at least one reason why Goebbels and his propaganda was important to Hitler, and these points were often well supported and explained. The most common approach was firstly to explain his role in increasing support for Hitler during his rise to power, and then also explaining how he helped in maintaining that support and control once Hitler was in power. These explanations were supported by very good levels of knowledge and understanding, with candidates often able to show how particular groups were targeted by Goebbels' propaganda and how it was successful. Some answers tended to describe the propaganda, without explaining the impact that it had and thus its importance to Hitler. Some answers contained inaccuracies such as stating that Goebbels controlled the radios before the Nazis came to power.
- (c) There were mixed responses to this question and more balanced responses would have improved many answers. Responses often showed understanding of the events leading up to Hitler becoming Chancellor but would have benefited from arguing how these events resulted in Hitler becoming Chancellor. Some good answers were seen, and these often argued that the electoral success of the Nazis meant that alternative coalition governments were unstable, leading to Hindenburg's appointment of Hitler as the only alternative. Arguments on the other side considered factors such as the political manoeuvrings of Hindenburg and Von Papen and the effects of the Great Depression on Weimar politics. A small number of candidates were also able to explain how the failure of the Munich Putsch resulted in the reorganisation of the Nazi Party and explained how the creation of local organisations led to electoral success.

Question 12

- (a) Candidates performed very well on this question and displayed a good level of knowledge about the Nazis' views of the role of women in society. Most candidates stated that women were expected to stay at home and have children and referred to the 'three Ks'. Other answers were also aware that this changed during the war and women were expected to work in factories or mentioned the Lebensborn programme.
- (b) This question proved challenging for some candidates, although some were able to provide two explanations of why the Nazis aimed to achieve autarky. Candidates who understood the nature of autarky often provided an explanation linking the need for self-sufficiency to Hitler's long-term foreign policy aims and the possibility of a future war, but would have improved their responses by providing a second distinct explanation. Some candidates made incorrect statements such as that autarky was trying to destroy the Treaty of Versailles or was part of the Nazi Jewish policy.
- (c) Some responses to this question were one-sided, with few answers considering the impact of Total War on German civilians. Some provided limited explanations of the impact of the allied bombing of German cities such as Dresden, or the impact of the naval blockade, leading to shortages, but there was often a lack of supporting detail. Explanations about the impact of Total War were either not attempted or limited to general statements about women working, which lacked consideration of the impact that this had. Other answers did not focus on civilians, but instead provided descriptions of the impact of the war on German soldiers.

Question 13

- (a) Candidates displayed a good general level of knowledge and understanding on this question. Most responses were able to identify that life for Russian peasants in 1905 was hard due to famine and starvation. Other identifications were also that their lives were controlled by the Communes, and that disease was common. Some answers neglected to concentrate on peasants, and instead concentrated their answers on conditions in the towns and cities.
- (b) This question was answered well, with many candidates providing at least one explanation why the October Manifesto was introduced. Most commonly candidates explained how the events of Bloody Sunday resulted in the Tsar needing to calm the situation by making concessions, or how the extent of the unrest meant that the Tsar had to take action. Other candidates provided good explanations as to how the October Manifesto divided the opposition, enabling the Tsar to regain control.
- (c) Candidates needed to produce a well-balanced answer explaining ways in which the Tsar was firmly in control of Russia at the start of 1914, and ways in which he was not. There were many good explanations agreeing with the hypothesis, with answers examining the Fundamental Laws and the role of Stolypin in establishing the Tsar's control. Answers were less assured in their explanations of the other side of the argument, with a tendency to make generalised comments about the existence of opposition. The unpopularity of Rasputin was a valid argument on this side, with some candidates explaining that this caused dissatisfaction amongst some of the nobility. Often, however, the timeframe given in the question was missed, and answers referred to Rasputin helping the Tsarina rule Russia during the First World War, or how the First World War impacted the popularity of the Tsar.

Question 14

There were too few responses to this question for meaningful comments to be made.

Question 15

- (a) Most candidates had a good knowledge of what a 'flapper' was, and many achieved high marks. Such responses included details of their clothing and actions, being aware that they were young women who wore shorter clothes and went out in public unchaperoned. Other valid responses included that they were often from the middle and upper classes, and that they came more often from urban areas.
- (b) This question was answered well, with candidates able to explain at least one reason why the 1920s became known as the Jazz Age. Answers displayed a good level of knowledge and understanding of the growth in the popularity of jazz, and often explained how it had started in the south and spread to gain young white audiences throughout the country. Other valid responses included details about specific jazz musicians, or venues such as the Cotton Club, to demonstrate its popularity. A number of responses would have benefited from the inclusion of a second explanation.
- (c) Very good understanding was shown of the reasons for the failure of prohibition, and many strong and well-balanced responses were seen. Candidates were confident in agreeing with the question hypothesis that it failed because it encouraged violence, often using examples such as the growth in violence between the rival gangs, and in particular the St Valentine's Day massacre. Other reasons for the failure were explained well, with responses explaining the role of speakeasies, the inability of the police to enforce it, or the widespread accessibility of alcohol leading to prohibition failing. Some candidates also considered the detrimental economic effect on the government through the loss of taxes, for example. Weaker responses that provided a description of the various reasons, would have benefited from linking these reasons specifically to how this meant that prohibition failed.

Questions 16 to 22

There were too few responses to these questions for meaningful comments to be made

HISTORY

Paper 2147/21
Paper 21

Key messages

- Candidates should provide a direct answer to the question. For example, if a question asks whether a source proves a certain point to be correct (as in twentieth century option, **Question 5**) it is sensible to begin an answer with, 'Source G does/does not prove'.
- When comparing sources, this should be done point by point and then candidates should try to compare how far they agree in their overall messages.
- Working out which questions require the sources to be evaluated and carrying out such evaluation is important.
- When answering **Question 6**, candidates should base answers on the sources.

General comments

The majority of candidates answered questions on the twentieth century option, although there was a reasonable number of responses to the nineteenth century option. Nearly all candidates answered all six questions but a very small number did not answer **Question 6**. There were many scripts demonstrating a reasonable grasp of the issues raised by the sources and the skills required to tackle these issues. Most candidates could interpret the sources, apply their contextual knowledge to use the sources effectively, and cross reference between sources. The ability to evaluate sources was not so evident. Candidates need to think carefully about whether each question requires the sources to be evaluated. Many candidates demonstrated good contextual knowledge and understanding but it is important that this is used to analyse the sources more effectively rather than take the place of the sources.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

Question 1

This question was answered well, with a good number of candidates managing to explain agreements and disagreements between the two sources. Most candidates compared the two sources point by point. Agreements included by candidates were: Brown expected slaves to join him, Brown's force was small, Brown attacked the arsenal and Brown's actions led to the Civil War. The disagreements listed were: Source A says that Brown had 18 men while Source B says 21, and A claims that Brown was hanged in Richmond, while B says Charleston. Only a few candidates summarised each source in turn without making any specific comparisons. A reasonable number of strong answers explained the differences between the overall big messages of the two sources, with Source A focusing on Brown being mad and destructive ('mad visionary', 'Brown's insanity', 'uncoiling a terrible chain of events'), while Source B gave a more positive representation of Brown (fulfilling 'a pledge to God', 'his honest blood', 'moral courage', 'single-hearted devotion').

Question 2

Many candidates would have answered this question better if they had realised that it requires at least one of the sources to be evaluated. The use of the word 'prove' is a strong indicator that evaluation is required. Some candidates thought that because Source D differed in its views from Source C it proved C to be wrong. They based their answers on the fact that Source C praises Brown, while Source D is strongly critical of him. However, both sources are problematic and cannot be trusted. Source C is from a speech by Frederick Douglass and Source D from a newspaper from a Southern slave-holding state that later seceded from the Union. These are issues that needed to be investigated before deciding whether Source D proves that

Source C was wrong. Some very strong responses did this. Some candidates analysed and compared the sources well but did not address the issue of proof in their answers.

Question 3

This question was answered reasonably well. Many candidates were able to go beyond the details of the two illustrations and made inferences about the impressions they were intended to create about Brown. Some excellent comparisons were made, with most focusing on contrasting impressions. Weaker responses tended to focus on small details, while others wrote about the two illustrations separately and did not make any comparisons.

Question 4

Only a small number of responses focused just on the surface information in Source G, constituting an uncritical use of the source. There were a few weaker answers that failed to address the issue of usefulness, simply paraphrasing Source G. Most candidates realised that to judge usefulness they needed to evaluate the source using its content in conjunction with its context and provenance. This realisation opened up different, and more satisfactory, ways of answering the question. Some candidates used the context and provenance to dismiss the source as biased, while others argued that as Brown was speaking after he had been sentenced, he had no reason to lie. Better answers used contextual knowledge or cross-reference to other sources to check the claims being made by Brown. All of these answers rested on the assumption that the source was or was not useful because it was or was not reliable. However, a few candidates were able to go beyond this and explained how the source is useful for showing us how Brown wanted to be remembered, and how he was trying to create a version of himself for posterity.

Question 5

This question required candidates to make use of their contextual knowledge to decide whether or not there were good reasons for being surprised by Source H. This source is somewhat ambivalent about Brown. The author expresses admiration for Brown but at the same time is clear that the North cannot interfere with slavery in the South and that Brown should be punished for his acts. The key to whether one would be surprised by Source H is to be found in the details about the provenance of the source. It comes from a Republican newspaper in the State of Illinois which was a strong supporter of the Union in the Civil War. This led some candidates to be surprised by some parts of Source H and some to be not surprised by other parts of the source. There were also candidates who realised that there were good reasons for being both surprised and not surprised. All of these answers achieved good marks provided that they contained some contextual explanation, for example 'I am surprised by Source H because it supports the execution of Brown. This is surprising because the source is from a Republican Northern newspaper which you would expect to be supporting Brown. This was Lincoln's party which was against slavery.' The best answers went beyond this and demonstrated understanding that there is no inconsistency within the source and no reason to be surprised by any part of it. They explained that many Republicans were willing to admire Brown's anti-slavery principles, but they did not support his actions. They believed that his actions at Harpers Ferry were illegal, could worsen relations with the South and might hasten the end of the Union. Weaker answers would have benefited from the use of contextual knowledge. They either expressed surprise by the apparent contradictions within the source, or they identified what in Source H they were surprised or not surprised by, without producing a valid explanation.

Question 6

It is crucial that candidates attempt to answer this question and that they use the sources when doing so. The question asks whether or not the sources provide convincing evidence that Brown was a hero. The wording of the question makes clear that the question is about the sources rather than the candidates' contextual knowledge of the period. The most straight forward way to answer it is to use the sources in the order in which they appear in the paper, explaining whether each one supports or disagrees with the hypothesis given in the question. It is crucial that candidates make clear which source they are referring to, which side of the debate they think each source falls on, and that they then explain why they think this. A number of candidates provided answers such as this: 'Source D certainly does not support the view that John Brown was a hero. It says he was a 'cowardly villain' and that he deserved to be hanged. It also says that the New York Times newspaper should be ashamed of itself for supporting him. Source A agrees he was not a hero and describes him as mad, his actions as 'a ridiculous fantasy' and accuses him of causing war and rebellion.' Candidates that similarly explained sources on the other side of the debate provided the much stronger responses. A good number of candidates did not use the sources or did not use them in a valid way.

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 1

This question was answered well. Agreements most commonly identified included: Khrushchev not consulting Castro, Castro being furious, Khrushchev backing down and Soviet-Chinese relations being threatened. The most commonly identified disagreement was Kennedy promising not to invade Cuba in Source A, but not making such a clear promise in Source B. Most candidates made a point by point by comparison and only a small number made unsupported claims about the sources or summarised the two sources without directly comparing them. It is important to remember that disagreements need rather more explanation than agreements. It is not enough to simply state what the disagreement is about, for example 'The sources disagree over Kennedy's promise not to invade Cuba.' Instead, a full explanation is required such as, 'Source A states that Kennedy had promised not to invade Cuba, but Source B claims that Kennedy did not give an 'absolute assurance' that he would not invade.' Although a good number of candidates produced good answers by explaining agreements and disagreements, only a smaller number of stronger ones went on to compare the overall messages of the sources. Source A has a balanced view about how far Khrushchev had been successful, while Source B sees the Crisis as a disaster for him.

Question 2

This question produced many excellent answers. These contained and combined three elements: the exact context of 29 October, the message of the cartoon and the purpose behind publishing the cartoon. Less successful answers contained just one or two of these elements. In other words, when faced with a 'purpose' question like this one, candidates need to consider the intended impact on the audience of sending out this particular message, and why this was being done then. The question asks why the cartoon was published on a certain date – 29 October 1962. This was the day after Khrushchev agreed to take the missiles out of Cuba and Kennedy agreed not to invade Cuba and to remove missiles from Turkey. The message of the cartoon is that the Soviets had been humiliated by the power of the US. Its purpose was to make the American public proud of the US or to get them to despise the weakness of Soviet communism (or something similar). Most candidates focused at first on the context and many referred to the precise context and to the agreements of 28 October. Weaker answers used a more general context. However, many candidates were then able to address the message of the cartoon, and then go on to consider the intended impact on the audience.

Question 3

This question proved challenging for some candidates. Some based their answers only on agreements or disagreements between the two sources. There is some logic to this approach. It is possible, although not very convincing, to argue that Source D makes Source E surprising because it disagrees with it, for example in Source D, Communist actions are not justified but in Source E they are. Stronger responses evaluated either, or both, of the sources. For example, when one considers the fact that Khrushchev was desperately trying to justify his actions to the Supreme Soviet and was fighting for his political career in Source E, then Source D fails to make what is said in Source E surprising.

Question 4

This question was generally answered reasonably well. A small number of candidates did not recognise Khrushchev and thought that the figure on the right was Kennedy. Most candidates were able to explain valid sub-messages, for example that neither Castro nor Khrushchev welcomed the fact that the missiles had to be withdrawn, or that their withdrawal would weaken Cuba, or that it would weaken the Soviet Union. A few candidates managed to get beyond this type of answer. To do this, candidates had to consider whether Khrushchev really meant the words at the top of the cartoon or whether these were just to appease Castro who he had let down badly. In other words, Khrushchev was lying to Castro and the cartoonist's message is that Khrushchev is willing to sacrifice Cuba.

Question 5

This question, like **Question 3**, required candidates to do provide some evaluation. The key word in the question that candidates needed to focus on was 'prove', and the best way to start their answers was by directly referring to the issue of proof in the first sentence, for example 'Source G does not prove that Khrushchev's motive was to protect Cuba because'. Some candidates missed the issue of proof and just showed how Source G does, or does not, suggest that Khrushchev's motive was to protect Cuba. There is

plenty of evidence in Source G for these answers but they missed the crucial issue of whether or not Khrushchev can be trusted. Source G is from a letter to Castro sent immediately after the crisis. In Sources A and B, it was evident that Castro was furious with Khrushchev and that there was a danger he might prefer China to the Soviet Union as an ally. A small number of very strong responses suggested that in Source G Khrushchev was trying to keep Castro on side and therefore we cannot necessarily trust the claims he was making about his motives. Other candidates used their own knowledge or cross-referenced to other sources to identify other possible motives for Khrushchev or to confirm the claims made in Source G.

Question 6

It is crucial that candidates attempt to answer this question and that they use the sources when doing so. This question was about how far the sources provide convincing evidence that the Crisis was a success for Khrushchev. The most straight forward way to answer it is to use the sources in the order in which they appear in the paper, explaining whether each one supports or disagrees with the hypothesis given in the question. It is crucial that candidates make clear which source they are referring to, which side of the debate they think each source falls, and that they then explain why they think this. A number of candidates provided answer such as this: 'Source A supports the idea that Khrushchev was successful in the Cuban Missile Crisis because it says that he was able to claim victory because Kennedy had agreed not to invade Cuba. Source E also supports this idea by claiming that the Crisis had 'guaranteed the existence of a Socialist Cuba'.' Candidates that similarly explained sources on the other side of the debate provided the much stronger responses. A good number of candidates did not use the sources or did not use them in a valid way.



HISTORY

Paper 2147/22
Paper 22

Key messages

- Candidates should take enough time at the start of the examination to read through the sources and only start writing once familiar with them all.
- It is advisable to answer the questions in the order they appear on the question paper. This means that candidates will have dealt separately with all the sources in turn before attempting **Question 6**, which requires the use of all the sources together.
- Candidates should try to use their time effectively, so they can answer every question fully. If candidates experience difficulty answering the questions within the allotted time, it is preferable to provide a brief answer to some questions, rather than to omit a question entirely.
- Better responses tended to provide a direct answer to the question. An effective way of doing this is to start the answer with words from the question. For example, if asked how reliable a source is, candidates could start with 'This source is/is not reliable because'.

General comments

There were too few scripts on the nineteenth-century option for any meaningful comments to be made. On the twentieth-century option the general level of responses was good. The characteristic of the responses that marked out the work of the best candidates was the ability to evaluate sources in relation to the purpose of the author. This paper included four questions where this was a relevant issue.

A feature of the scripts was their length. Many candidates wrote more than they needed to, including much unfocused detail from the sources. These responses would have been improved by an approach of selecting appropriate points to illustrate the argument being made. Some weaker responses paraphrased a whole source before making any direct comment on the question asked. A good example of this was **Question 2**, where many candidates first described what each of the two cartoons showed before attempting any comparisons. Despite this, it was rare to see incomplete scripts, suggesting that candidates could have benefited from spending a little more time planning their answers. Nonetheless, most of the candidates produced responses that showed well developed skills of source handling, and an often impressive depth of contextual knowledge, applied relevantly to their answers.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

There were too few responses for any meaningful comments to be made.

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 1

This question was answered well. A large majority of the candidates were able to use contextual knowledge to explain whether or not they were surprised by what Johnson said in Source A. Some of these responses anachronistically used material on events from after the date of the speech, which was clearly weaker than using earlier material, for example on the Truman Doctrine, Containment or the Domino Theory. Some argued that they were surprised because Johnson did not reveal his true motive – to fight communism – but this approach was not totally convincing since that was certainly what Johnson was talking about, even if he did not actually say it. The best answers moved beyond checking the accuracy of Johnson's claims, and explained their lack of surprise in relation to Johnson's purpose in making the speech, which dated from the

time that he was escalating the US presence in South Vietnam. These responses appreciated that it was unsurprising that Johnson was attempting to win over public opinion for his action.

Question 2

The question asked whether two sources agreed. To judge this, it was necessary to interpret both cartoons in a plausible way. Some candidates did this, on one or both cartoons, but then struggled to make a valid comparison. The messages of the cartoons were not totally clear-cut, so considerable latitude was allowed in what comparisons were rewarded. Most candidates could see that the cartoonists agreed that the USA was involved in Southeast Asia, some added that this involvement was a struggle against communism, or that the USA was offering its help. In short, there were some clear agreements. Disagreements were a little less straightforward, though the nature of US involvement was often seen as different – distanced or indirect in Source B, but directly involved in Source C. Whether they showed success or failure was a more nuanced issue – Source B showed a struggle but no immediate outcome, whilst Source C showed danger, but in the future. The essential basis for comparison had to be a common criterion that could be applied to both cartoons; candidates needed to do more than simply describing/interpreting both cartoons, then asserting that they were different. The best answers understood that being asked about the level of agreement was inviting a comparison of the cartoonists' opinions, rather than of details of what the cartoons depicted. They concluded that Source B's cartoonist supported US intervention, whilst Source C's cartoonist opposed it.

Question 3

This question asked about a source's utility and most answers rested on the assumption that the source was useful for the information it provided. However, some responses were hindered by a misreading of the source, leading to inaccurate statements about what it said. Some thought that McNamara had written that without US intervention in Vietnam, communism would have spread further in Southeast Asia. In fact, he wrote that he seriously questioned this idea. Others focused too generically on provenance, with a range of comments about the source being useful/not useful because of who McNamara was, the post he held, the time he was writing, the fact he resigned, and so on. The best, properly developed answers, used the provenance as a way into a discussion about the way in which McNamara's possible purposes in writing his book might affect the credibility of what he was saying. However, the use of provenance was often based on undeveloped assertions – e.g. *He was there at the time so he would know*. A small number of answers argued that McNamara's willingness to admit that he was wrong made what he said more plausible, and therefore useful. This was a sensible idea, but stronger responses provided the insight that a specific purpose might lie behind his apparent candour.

Question 4

The question asked why a cartoon was published at a particular time. The approach candidates need to adopt in questions like this one is to give reasons for publication. There are three broad types of reason: because of what was happening at the time (context), because of what the cartoonist wanted to tell the audience (message), and because of the intended impact of the message on the audience (purpose). However, the cartoon first needs to be interpreted correctly. The cartoon in this question proved challenging for some candidates. Some took it literally, some thought it showed an American soldier talking to a Vietnamese soldier, some thought it supported the idea of sending troops to Vietnam. However, most answers understood that the cartoonist was not in favour of the war. The date of the cartoon was 1970, which offered a background of events such as the anti-war movement, Vietnamisation, and the bombing of Laos and Cambodia. To be successful, answers based on context had to use events like these, specific to the time, rather than being general to the war in Vietnam. The clearest messages of the cartoon were that continuing the war was pointless, or that the US troops should be withdrawn. Many candidates put both context and message together. The best answers added purpose into this, seeing the cartoon as an attempt to put pressure on the government, or to encourage anti-war protest.

Question 5

The best answers to this question could see that there was a possible purpose behind Westmoreland's arguments, such as justifying his own actions during the war, or attempting to shift the blame for failure, and that this purpose would raise questions about Source F's capacity to prove or disprove claims in Source G. In other responses, the issue of proof was resolved simply by whether or not the two sources agreed. These answers attempted to compare the sources for agreements and disagreements. Agreement meant that Source G was right, disagreement meant it was wrong. However, these comparisons sometimes lacked validity. The only valid comparison that some candidates included was that Source F suggested the war could have been won, whilst Source G suggested it could not. Other attempts to compare were hindered by

not comparing 'like with like' (i.e. no common criterion) or on misunderstanding of the sources. It was quite rare to see answers trying to deal with proof in relation to the provenance of the sources, and those that did usually relied just on assertions of Westmoreland's 'bias'.

Question 6

The simplest and most effective way of answering **Question 6** is to work through the sources in turn, using content from the sources to illustrate how they either support or question the given hypothesis. Most candidates did this reasonably effectively. However, although the sources contained evidence on both sides of the hypothesis, a good number of answers worked only on one side. These answers showed that they thought the USA had been right, or wrong, to get involved, so they used only evidence that confirmed their viewpoint. The question is about the sources as evidence, and not directly about the issue in the hypothesis, and better responses appeared to understand this distinction. The best responses also provided genuine source evaluation - evaluation in relation to the purpose of the author of the source (rather than general comments on source provenance), and evaluation which served the purpose of answering the question. Some candidates struggled with the latter, having got as far as establishing the reliability (or unreliability) of the source. These answers would have been improved by commenting on how this affected the utility of the source as evidence in relation to the hypothesis.

