www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12
Paper 1

Key messages

Successful responses are dependent upon candidates reading the questions carefully. This will help them to understand exactly what is being asked and will give them the opportunity to write focussed and balanced responses. Any given dates in the question should be carefully noted to help ensure that responses only include relevant details.

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 describing what happened.

In more extensive responses, candidates should be encouraged to organise their points into distinct paragraphs. This should help to avoid separate points becoming blurred together and in maintaining focus on the original question.

In **Part (c)** responses it is a good idea to encourage candidates to practice writing evaluative, rather than purely summative, conclusions in which they make a judgement and justify this by reference to the balance of evidence cited in their response.

General comments

Many candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge and understanding of both the Core Content and Depth Study questions. These candidates communicated their ideas clearly and accurately, whether explaining the reasons for past events and historical features or building an argument to reach a balanced historical judgement. Some candidates, whilst demonstrating sound and detailed factual knowledge, found it difficult to apply their knowledge to the question set. These responses tended not to be divided into paragraphs and were characterised by description and list of facts, with no explanation.

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

Candidates need to be aware of the specific demands of each type of question:

Part (a) responses should focus on description and only include relevant details. Explanation is not required. Most candidates realised that answers to **(a)** questions can be short and concise and that there is no need to include background information.

Part (b) responses require facts and explanation. Candidates must be selective of the factual knowledge needed to explain events and write in continuous prose, rather than using a 'listing' approach. Most **(b)** questions ask 'Why' a particular event happened, so it is important that candidates direct their response to address the reasons, rather than provide a description of what happened. Successful responses were carefully organised, using separate paragraphs for the different reasons that were being explained. Narrative or long introductions which 'set the scene' are not required.

Part (c) requires facts, explanation and analysis. The most effective responses argued both for and against the focus of the question and reached a balanced judgement. A valid conclusion should go beyond being a summary of what has already been stated by addressing, 'how far' or 'how successful'. Weaker responses often focussed only on 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.

www.dynamicpapers.com

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.

Questions 5 and 6

These were the two most frequently answered questions in the Core section.

Question 5

(a) This question was very well answered. Most candidates demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the benefits Lloyd George wanted Britain to gain from the Paris Peace Conference and included a number of relevant, concisely expressed points. Points made included, 'He wanted to achieve peace', 'He wanted to keep Britain's naval superiority', 'He wanted German colonies' and 'He wanted Britain to be paid reparations. Some responses to this question were overly long, often including the aims of Wilson and Clemenceau which lacked relevance to this question. Others had gained full marks in the first few lines but went on to write nearly a page.

(b) There were mixed responses to this question. The most successful responses explained one of Clemenceau's aims and linked it to the attitudes and actions of Lloyd George and/or Woodrow Wilson, explaining why they did not accept what Clemenceau wanted. For example, 'Clemenceau wanted to economically weaken Germany and demanded huge reparations because a lot of the fighting had taken place on French soil and he wanted money to pay for all the damage done. Lloyd George wanted reparations but not as high as Clemenceau demanded because before the war Germany had been Britain's second largest trading partner and he wanted Germany to recover, so Britain could resume trading, otherwise British jobs would be at risk.' A second explanation commonly used was: 'Clemenceau wanted the Rhineland to be an independent state to help defend France from future attacks from Germany. He had to compromise and settle for an allied army of occupation in the Rhineland for fifteen years and Germany never rearming the area. This was because both Lloyd George and Wilson though that if Germany was punished too hard it would cause resentment and Germany would want revenge in the future.' Less successful responses wrote at length about Clemenceau's aims without including why he didn't get what he wanted.

(c) This question was well answered. There were many well-developed and balanced responses which discussed the extent to which the reduction in Germany's armed forces was the main reason why Germans hated the Treaty of Versailles. Strong responses were familiar with the relevant military terms and quoted figures to show the reductions in the army and navy and that submarines and military aircraft weren't allowed. They used this information to explain the impact of these military terms on Germany - most notably the dent in their pride, their inability to defend themselves effectively and the effects on unemployment figures as a result of the ban on conscription. Another common explanation was they had expected the Treaty to be based on Wilson's Fourteen Points and that all nations would disarm, but they were angry as this hadn't happened. Such responses went on to produce a balanced answer by explaining other reasons why Germany hated the Treaty of Versailles, not least the impact of the 'war guilt' clause and reparations. Weaker responses, whilst usually showing a good knowledge of the terms of the Treaty, needed to more careful organisation to guard against producing a narrative of the terms and to ensure that the impact of a term was developed. For example, most responses identified that, 'Germany didn't like the 'war guilt' clause and felt it was wrong to blame Germany for the war as other countries were involved.' This could be developed into an explanation by including that Russia had mobilised first and Germany got involved to support its ally, Austria-Hungary.

Question 6

(a) This question worked well for most candidates who understood the part Germany's armed forces played in the Spanish Civil War. The most successful responses included precise and relevant pieces of information, for example: German support for General Franco, the help of German aircraft in moving Franco's troops from Africa to Spain and the use of carpet bombing by the Luftwaffe which had a devastating effect on the civilian population, especially at Guernica. Candidates could

have used other examples such as how Germany used the war to test out its new military technology and tactics. Weaker responses were characterised by a lack of factual knowledge, often confusing which side the Germans were supporting and the countries involved in the war. These responses also could have been improved by including specific details, rather than generalised statements, such as 'they provided troops'.

(b) Strong responses identified and explained two reasons why Britain and France did little when Germany remilitarised the Rhineland. The two most common reasons identified were that Britain and France did not want to fight another war and the British public felt that the Rhineland belonged to Germany. The latter identification was explained by developing the idea that, by the 1930s, many people thought that the Treaty of Versailles had been too harsh on Germany and the Rhineland should never have been demilitarised as, after all, it was German territory so in effect they were marching into their own 'backyard'. Other valid reasons put forward was the fact that Britain and France were involved with events in Abyssinia at the time and the French were distracted by a financial crisis and elections. Weaker responses usually readily identified reasons but these needed to be fully developed into explanations. Responses occasionally made reference to why Hitler invaded the Rhineland, which was not the focus of the question.

(c) There were several very good responses to this question which included detailed arguments on either side of the debate. Strong responses explained surprise that Chamberlain had signed the Munich Agreement of September 1938. This was because Hitler had made it clear in his foreign policy aims that he wanted to expand German territory and his actions from 1933 onwards seem to confirm this, most notably his rearmament, march into the Rhineland in 1936 and the Anschluss in 1938. They saw him as a man not to be trusted. His demands seemed to be increasing. These responses often also expressed surprise that the Czechs were not at the meeting and were not even consulted. Such responses produced a balanced answer by then explaining why they were not surprised, most commonly expressing the point that Chamberlain was following a policy of appeasement and the British public did not want another war. He also accepted Hitler's reason that there were many Germans living in the Sudetenland and that it would be Hitler's last demand. Other responses tended to include a narrative of events leading up to the Munich Agreement and details of what happened at the meeting with no expression of surprised/not surprised. A common misconception was that Chamberlain let Hitler have the whole of Czechoslovakia at the meeting, not just the Sudetenland.

Question 7

(a) There were mixed responses to this question. Strong responses were familiar with how the fighting in Korea came to an end in 1953 and gained credit by stating that negotiations started in 1951 and continued to 1953, when an armistice was agreed in July1953. Many also included that a demilitarised zone was set up roughly along the 38th parallel. Weaker responses gave a narrative of the events of the war, often with no reference to how it came to an end in 1953.

(b) Good understanding was shown of one reason why the Cuban Missile Crisis was resolved peacefully - that as Russia had missiles in Cuba close to the USA and the USA had missiles in Turkey near to Russia, there was a serious threat of nuclear war which neither side wanted. Some candidates found it difficult to explain another reason and wrote a narrative of events with no link to the question. Successful responses included two explanations; a second explained reason often cited was that the Crisis was resolved peacefully because Kennedy did not take the advice of his military chiefs. They advised that he attack Cuba to remove the missiles and possibly Castro. Kennedy realised that this would probably lead to a nuclear war, so he decided to introduce a naval blockade to prevent a military clash. This worked as Khrushchev turned his ships back when the blockade was introduced.

(c) Very good understanding was shown of events in Vietnam and events in the USA. Strong responses included a selection of events in Vietnam, most notably the Tet Offensive, the My Lai massacre and the guerrilla tactics of the Vietcong to demonstrate the difficulties that the Americans faced. Such responses produced a balanced answer by then explaining how events in the USA led the Americans to withdraw from Vietnam. They cited the TV coverage of the horrors of war which increased opposition to the war from the US public and led to mass protest marches. They showed how the US casualty figures were very high and the financial costs enormous. All this put tremendous pressure on the US government to withdraw from Vietnam and Nixon's policy of 'Vietnamisation' meant the US could leave. Other responses readily identified events both in

Vietnam and the USA but would have benefited from being supported by more detailed examples. Some responses provided a narrative on the background to the war which was not required.

Question 8

(a) Candidates performed very well on this question and demonstrated a detailed knowledge on the activities of 'Solidarity' in Poland during the 1980s. They expressed a number of concise and relevant points including: workers at the Gdansk shipyard led by Lech Walesa put forward 21 demands to the government, including free trade unions and the right to strike. They wanted an increase in pay and a better supply of food in the shops.

(b) Strong responses were characterised by the explanation of two reasons why Gorbachev did little to defend Soviet control over Eastern Europe. The most common reason explained was that due to the arms race and the military spending on troops in Afghanistan, the Soviet Union was in dreadful economic trouble, its productivity was low and the goods it made were of poor quality. Gorbachev knew that reforms were needed to make industry more efficient. Other factors explained were that there had been almost no new thinking about how to run the Soviet economy since the days of Stalin and that Gorbachev realised that there must be more openness and freedom, so he refused to support the old Communist regimes in Eastern Europe. Weaker responses shifted the focus of the question and described the reforms he instituted rather than explaining 'why'.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question. Strong responses were well-organised and included carefully selected information from the events which happened in Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968 in order to explain which was the more serious problem for the USSR. These responses showed a good understanding of events in both countries and their desire for reform. They compared factors in each, such as their demands, the possible long-term impact of their demands, the ways in which they were repressed and the number of casualties. Weaker responses were characterised by description of the events in both countries with only identifications to compare the seriousness, such as, events were more serious in Hungary because there were more casualties. This could have been developed into an explanation by providing more detail such as, there were more casualties in Hungary, because when Soviet tanks and troops invaded in November there was strong resistance and much fighting, whereas people in Czechoslovakia did not fight back.

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

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

Question 11

This was the most frequently answered question of the Depth Studies

(a) There were mixed responses to this question. A common misconception was that Kapp was a communist leader. Knowledge of the aims of Kapp and the Freikorps in weaker responses was limited to one or two aims, usually that he wanted to destroy democracy and overthrow the Weimar Republic. Such responses often included detailed accounts of the Kapp putsch which wasn't relevant to this question. There were, however, some good responses which gave four precise and relevant aims, for example: Kapp and the Freikorps wanted to overthrow the Weimar government and put a right-wing nationalist government in power. They also wanted to destroy communism and destroy the Treaty of Versailles. Candidates could have used other examples, including that they wanted to oppose the disbandment of the Freikorps and undo the German Revolution of 1918–19.

(b) This question was well answered. Successful responses demonstrated good understanding of the reasons why Germany experienced hyperinflation in 1922–23. They explained that the Germans couldn't pay the second instalment of reparation payments in 1922 and this led to the fall in value of the mark, resulting in inflation. The invasion of the Ruhr in 1923 by French and Belgian troops to take what was owed to them in the form of raw materials, exacerbated the situation. German miners refused to work in protest, nothing was being earned for the German government and they started to print more money which became worthless, the result being hyperinflation. Some

responses included the impact of hyperinflation on the German public which lacked relevance to this question as the focus was on the causes of inflation, not the results.

(c) This question produced some very good responses, with detailed arguments on either side of the debate. Most candidates began their responses by disagreeing with the hypothesis by explaining that Stresemann had done a lot of good work to bring about the recovery of the Weimar Republic. The best responses were organised into separate paragraphs for his work towards economic recovery, his progress towards improving foreign relations and his encouragement of cultural matters. They discussed the changes he made in these areas and the impact on Germany. For example: Stresemann ended hyperinflation and put the economy on a seemingly sound footing with a new currency and loans from the USA. Some of the money went into German businesses and public works, creating jobs. In 1928 Germany had achieved the same levels of production as before the war and regained its place as the world's second greatest industrial power. In agreement with the hypothesis responses explained that some Germans were unhappy with Stresemann signing the Locarno Treaties and joining the League of Nations because Nationalists saw this as an acceptance of the Treaty of Versailles, which they hated. Others included that many Germans preferred a traditional culture and considered the new culture to represent a moral decline. The most common point in agreement with the hypothesis was that the economic recovery appeared to be an illusion because the economic recovery depended on American loans and if the loans were recalled in an emergency Germany would be in serious economic trouble, which is what happened in 1929. Answers were stronger when explaining the ways that Stresemann successfully brought about the recovery of the Weimar Republic; in fact, weaker responses generally gave a one-sided response and did not explain why Stresemann's actions were not seen as a total success. Weaker responses also included a narrative of Stresemann's actions with no assessment as to their impact. These responses could have been improved by developing more detailed arguments.

Question 12

(a) This question was very well answered. The majority of candidates were familiar with the Nazi persecution of minority groups. Most included the Jews as one of the persecuted minority groups and used the Nuremberg laws and Kristallnacht as examples to demonstrate how they were persecuted. It was also well understood how other groups, who did not fit in with Hitler's views of the superiority of the Aryan race, were persecuted. Most commonly cited was the 'euthanasia programme' begun in 1939.

(b) Strong responses identified and explained two reasons why some young people opposed the Nazi regime. The most common reason identified and explained was that many youngsters believed in freedom of expression and values which conflicted with those of the Nazis. They used the Edelweiss Pirates as an example and demonstrated how they shared a strong distaste for the strict regimentation and sexual segregation of the Hitler Youth. Others used the characteristics of the Swing Movement and the White Rose group to explain why young people opposed the Nazi regime. Less successful responses tended to be very generalised, such as 'They didn't like the restrictions the Nazis put on their life'. This identification needed to be supported by relevant contextual knowledge. Some responses also tended to be more focussed on the activities of the Hitler Youth, rather than emphasising why some young people opposed the Nazi regime.

(c) There were some good responses to this question which were well organised and included carefully selected and relevant details. In agreement with the hypothesis, responses explained the consistent policies that the Nazis had towards women. They explained that Hitler had a very traditional view of the role of women and regarded them as essential to the Nazi plan of increasing the birth rate and producing more Aryan babies. He wanted to provide more future soldiers for the German Army. Examples were often given of the tempting financial incentives that he gave to married couples to have at least four children. This idea remained consistent throughout the Nazi period. Responses were stronger on this side of the argument. Strong responses also gave consideration to ways in which Nazi policies towards women were not consistent, most commonly the attitude towards women working and having a career. These explanations focussed on the fact that before the outbreak of war, the Nazis saw the role of the women as homemakers and they were forced out of the professions and strongly discouraged from having a job. In the late 1930s the Nazis had to do an about-turn, as they suddenly needed more women workers to replace the men who were going to war. This meant that many women now had to struggle with both family and work responsibilities. Some made the valid point that, despite the about-turn, the Nazi policy on women was still torn between the traditional stereotype of the mother and the actual needs of

the workplace as there was no chance of women serving in the armed forces, as there was in Allied countries. Weaker responses adopted a narrative approach on the role of women in Nazi Germany and would have been improved by making reference to whether the policies were consistent or not.

Questions 13 to 22

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

www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22
Paper 2

Key messages

- Candidates should provide a direct answer to the question. For example, if a question asks whether a source is surprising (as in Twentieth century option, **Question 3**) it is sensible to begin an answer with, 'Source E is/is not surprising because'.
- When comparing sources, candidates should do this point by point and then try to compare how far they agree in their overall messages, rather than summarising each source in turn.
- Candidates need to think carefully about which questions require the sources to be evaluated and carry out such evaluation.
- Knowledge and understanding of the historical context should be used to interpret and evaluate the sources but this material must not take over the answer. What candidates have to say about the source is always paramount.
- When answering **Question 6**, answers need to be based on the sources.
- When quoting from sources, the quote should be written out in full.

General comments

Nearly all candidates completed all six questions and there was little evidence of candidates struggling to complete the paper within the allotted time. The candidates had little trouble in understanding the written sources, although the cartoons presented some candidates with more of a challenge. There were many impressive scripts, and the overall standard of responses was good. Many candidates provided clear and direct answers to the questions. The contextual knowledge and understanding of many candidates were impressive and most were able to use this to make good use of the sources. This was particularly the case in **Questions 2**, **3** and **4**. There was also some excellent evaluation of sources.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

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

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 1

There was a wide range of answers to this question. It is important to find exact agreements and disagreements. For example, both sources state that the Soviets wanted security, that the Marshall Plan tied Europe to the USA and that there was an ideological struggle. Agreements can be stated in this way. Disagreements need to be explained in a little more detail. It is not enough to state what the sources disagree about. The two sides of the disagreement need to be stated, for example 'Source A states that the Marshall Plan was selfish, but Source B claims it was aimed at helping Europe economically.' A good number of candidates managed to identify both agreements and disagreements, but better responses went on to compare the overall messages of the two sources – in Source A, Soviet actions are understood or justified, while in Source B they are criticised as being aggressive. Some candidates made false matches and some just summarised each source. It is not a good idea to summarise the sources as this often took candidates away from making direct comparisons.

Question 2

Most candidates were able to use an agreement or disagreement between the sources to argue that Source C does not or does prove that Source D is wrong. For example, Source C blames the USSR, while Source D

blames the USA. However, to answer this question properly it is necessary to evaluate at least one of the sources, as well as comparing them. The crucial word in the question is 'prove'. This indicates that the sources need to be evaluated. A good number of candidates argued that although Source C disagreed with Source D, it did not prove it wrong because of its purpose and audience. There were also many good evaluations of D because of its purpose and audience.

Question 3

This question produced a range of interesting answers. The key to producing a good response is to use the provenance of the source, its message, as well as knowledge of the context of the time. The cartoon was published in the Soviet Union at the beginning of the Cold War in the same year as Churchill made his 'Iron Curtain' speech. Therefore, it is not surprising to find the Soviets being critical of Churchill. In fact, they are being more than critical, they are accusing him as being as bad as the Nazis in his aggressive, warlike ambitions. A good number of candidates managed to provide excellent answers by explaining all of this. Slightly less strong answers focused on what the cartoon is saying about Churchill but did not also focus on the fact that it was the Soviets behind the cartoon. They used their knowledge of Churchill in terms of his 'Iron Curtain' speech or his leadership during the Second World War to explain reasons for being surprised or not surprised. Weaker answers gave general reasons for being surprised by the cartoon, for example Churchill is depicted as mad. Some candidates explained perfectly good reasons for being surprised or not surprised but neglected to actually state whether they were surprised or not. It is vital that candidates do this. A good way of beginning an answer to this question would be, 'I am surprised/not surprised by this source because'.

Question 4

When answering questions about why sources were published when they were, it is important to focus on the message of the source and the historical context. Source F is criticising American intervention in Greece and Turkey. It claims it was a 'smokescreen' for American expansionism. The context is the British decision in February that it could no longer support the Greek government, and the announcement of the Truman Doctrine in March (just before Source F was published). The best answers focused on the possible purpose of the Soviets in publishing this source at this time. Less good answers explained the big message of the source – that the US claimed to be defending the freedom of Greece but was really trying to expand its power – and used this as the reason for publication. Some candidates gave the context as the reason for publication. They explained about either the US replacing Britain in Greece, or about the Truman Doctrine, and used this as the reason for publication. The weakness of these answers was that they did not use the content of the source. It is crucial candidates ensure that they clearly state that the purpose, message or context that they have explained was the reason for publication. Some candidates explained, for example, the message of F but did not state that this was the reason why the source was published.

Question 5

There were some excellent answers to this question. A good number of candidates realised that the cartoonist is criticising the Iron Curtain and the Soviet Union. When asked about a cartoonist's message, it is important that candidates realise that this often involves inferring the point of view of the cartoonist. Less good answers explained the big message of the cartoon – the divide between the Communist and Capitalist worlds was immovable – but did not see that the cartoonist has a point of view about this. Some candidates focused on details in the cartoon, such as the fact that Britain, France and the USA appear to be allies, which took them away from the main points being made by the cartoonist. A few candidates misinterpreted the cartoon and claimed that the UN was stronger than Britain and the USA or that they were so weak they had to leave the important work to the UN.

Question 6

Candidates needed to focus on two basic things when answering this question. Firstly, they needed to base their answers on what the sources say and, secondly, they needed to make sure their use of sources was directed at testing the hypothesis given in the question. The majority of candidates provided good responses by explaining how some sources support the hypothesis and how other sources do not. Most of them were able to provide satisfactory explanations that involved direct use of the hypothesis and the content of the sources, for example 'Source E disagrees that the Soviet Union was responsible because it shows that Churchill through his Iron Curtain speech was acting like the Nazis and was aggressive and threatening. He is shown as demanding that Anglo-Saxons rule the world. This caused worse relations between the West and the USSR.' Some candidates realised that some sources could be used both ways. Source E, for example, can also be used to argue, 'Source E supports the idea that the Soviet Union was to blame for

worsening relations because it issued cartoons like this criticising Churchill, and even comparing him to the Nazis. Doing this would not help relations with the West.' The number of candidates neglecting to make proper use of the sources was small. However, there were some candidates who only used truncated quotations from the sources. These often contained only a few words and did not satisfactorily support the point the candidates were trying to make. Any quotations used should be given in full.

www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

There were too few candidates for meaningful comments to be made.

www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

Candidates are required to give an extended response to one question from a choice of two from their chosen Depth Study. Responses should be balanced answers that are well-structured, analytical and address the question of importance or significance. An in-depth and wide range of knowledge is required to support arguments and reach conclusions.

General comments

A small range of Depth Studies were undertaken. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45 was the most popular choice among candidates, followed by Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41. There were also some responses to Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-18 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41. There were too few attempts at Depth Study E (China), Depth Study F (South Africa) or Depth Study G (Israelis and Palestinians) to make any meaningful comments.

Good answers had been well-planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced responses with supported explanations. The best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions, but more could have provided a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were very few rubric errors where candidates had attempted both questions from the Depth Study or multiple Depth Studies. Less successful answers contained much narrative or description or did not properly address the question that was set. These candidates wrote a lot about the topic or Depth Study in general, rather than focussing on the parameters set by the question. Some candidates also strayed from the chronology set out in the question, which sometimes led to large sections of the response lacking relevance. Candidates must read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance or significance.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914–18

Question 1 was by far the more frequently answered, with very few candidates attempting **Question 2** this session.

Question 1 was generally well answered. Candidates tended to have an in-depth knowledge of the war at sea and were able to give detailed descriptions and explanations of the importance of the Battle of Jutland in 1916. The strongest answers provided detailed evidence about the battle and then balanced the response by examining other aspects of the war at sea such as the German U-boat campaign in the Atlantic and the periods of unrestricted submarine warfare, the use of the convoy system, Q-boats, mines, and the British blockade of German ports. Weaker responses tended to lack focus on the parameters of the question and some candidates provided material on the Western Front or other fronts in the First World War that lacked relevance. It is vital that candidates carefully read the question and identify the focus, which in this case was the war at sea.

Question 2 There were too few responses to this question for meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45

Question 3 and **Question 4** were both popular choices among candidates.

Question 3 was generally well answered. Most candidates were able to give accurate and detailed examples of the military restrictions from the Treaty of Versailles and the stronger responses were able to explain why these were an important cause of instability in Germany, 1919–23. The best answers explained how the military restrictions caused increased unemployment, resentment, and nationalism in Germany and that it led to the formation of battalions of Freikorps who attempted a coup in 1920 when the Allies forced the Weimar government to disband them. Responses were given balance by examining a range of other important factors that led to stability. Most candidates examined other aspects of the Treaty such as the financial and territorial restrictions, as well as the War Guilt Clause. A few stronger answers also included material on other economic and political problems in the early Weimar period such as the Ruhr invasion, hyperinflation and the issues caused by the Weimar Constitution. Weaker responses tended to lack specific knowledge or contained errors and inaccuracies concerning the Treaty or lacked any developed explanations about why the factors were an important cause of instability in Germany.

Question 4 responses tended to be strong. Candidates had a detailed and generally accurate knowledge of the Enabling Act and its significance in allowing Hitler to establish a dictatorship within a one-party state. Examples were precise and well-selected, and explanations were focussed on significance. Most responses contained a clear balance and candidates commonly cited the significance of other events such as the Reichstag Fire, the Night of the Long Knives, and the death of Hindenburg. A few of the best responses attempted to draw valid conclusions and judgements about which factor was the most significant in allowing Hitler to establish a dictatorship in Germany by 1934 and this was commonly done by comparing and contrasting the relative consequences of each event between January 1933 and August 1934. A few of the weaker responses tended to focus too much on events pre-1933 and examined the reasons the Nazis had success in the Reichstag elections of 1932; while there is some relevance to this material for this question, it led some candidates to answer a different question about why the Nazis came to power in 1933, and this question required candidates to focus on how Hitler established his dictatorship once he had already become Chancellor in January 1933.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41

Question 5 was answered by a good number of candidates, with very few attempting **Question 6**.

Question 5 had some strong responses, and many candidates were able to confidently get to grips with the question. The strongest answers demonstrated a solid grasp of the range of reforms introduced by Stolypin between 1906 and 1911 and explained how the agrarian reforms, such as the extension of credit for peasants from the Peasants' Land Bank, helped create an enlarged kulak class that would be more supportive of the Tsarist regime. Many candidates also discussed Stolypin's more authoritarian methods for keeping control in Russia. This was then balanced by examining other factors that brought stability, most notably the October Manifesto and the creation of the Duma, the use of the Russian Army and Okhrana amongst others. Other responses tended to be too narrative in style and focussed too much on the causes of the 1905 Revolution and some examined aspects of the First World War, which was not relevant to this question, as there was little stability in Russia after 1914.

Question 6 There were too few responses to this question for meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919–41

This was the second most popular Depth Study, with **Question 7** proving slightly more popular than **Question 8**.

Question 7 produced some strong responses from candidates. Many candidates were able to provide a detailed and comprehensive set of explanations that focussed on the Monkey Trial as an example of intolerance in the USA in the 1920s. The best answers gave some details about the trial but ensured their analysis was dedicated to explaining how the trial was an aspect of a wider religious intolerance in parts of conservative America during this period. Nearly all answers demonstrated a clear balance in approach and candidates commonly cited the importance of racial and political intolerance in the USA in the 1920s as well. Many good responses examined the importance of the KKK, the Red Scare, immigration and even aspects of Prohibition in their explanations. Weaker responses would have been improved by less descriptive material, broader analysis, and greater breadth.

Question 8 was generally well answered. Most candidates had a solid knowledge and understanding of the significance of Huey Long in his opposition to the New Deal in the 1930s and the strongest answers gave some detailed evidence of how he challenged Roosevelt's reforms by promising more radical alternatives. Most scripts then provided balance by examining other examples of radical opposition, most commonly Dr Townsend and Father Coughlin, as well as more conservative opposition, including the Supreme Court. The best responses focussed on significance and attempted to draw conclusions and make supported judgements about the relative significance of the different forms of opposition to the New Deal. Other responses would have benefited from more specific knowledge or wider scope.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930–c.1990

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

Depth Study F: South Africa, c.1940–1994

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

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