www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/12
Paper 1

Key messages

It is important that candidates read the question carefully before they begin their response, in order to understand exactly what is being asked and thus only include relevant factual details. Any given dates in the question should be carefully noted to ensure that responses only include knowledge within the timespan of the question.

Candidates should avoid 'listing points' and write in continuous prose. In more extensive responses, they should be encouraged to organise their ideas into distinct paragraphs, otherwise points can become blurred together or focus can be lost.

Strong responses to essay-type questions included conclusions that went beyond the purely summative. In these responses, candidates made a judgement and justified this by reference to the balance of evidence cited in their essay.

General comments

Strong responses were able to demonstrate good factual knowledge and understanding of both the Core Content and Depth Study questions. These responses included clear and accurate communication of ideas, whether explaining the reasons for past events and historical features or building an argument to reach a balanced historical judgement. Weaker responses, whilst often demonstrating sound factual knowledge, found it difficult to apply the knowledge to the question set. These responses tended not to be divided into paragraphs and were characterised by a descriptive 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 now realise that responses 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 always 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 a description of what happened. Strong 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 argue both for and against the focus of the question and reach a balanced judgement. When a question asks, 'Are you surprised a particular event happened?' it is important to include explanations on both sides of the argument. A valid conclusion should go beyond being a summary of what has already been stated by addressing, 'how far' or 'how successful', depending on the question set. Less successful responses often focussed only on one side of the argument. These could be improved by including more contextual examples on both sides of the argument to produce a balanced response.

© 2022

www.dynamicpapers.com

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

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

Questions 5 and 6

These were the two most popular questions in the Core section.

Question 5

(a) Most responses were familiar with the Hoare-Laval Pact of 1935. They included relevant and concisely expressed features of the Pact. Knowledge awarded included that: 'it was a secret agreement', 'between Britain and France', 'it gave two-thirds of Abyssinia to Italy', 'if Mussolini called off the invasion'. Four points such as the ones above featured in some of the strongest answers. Some responses, although eventually discussing the Hoare-Laval Pact, included a lot of detail on the background to the Abyssinian Crisis which lacked relevance to this question. A very small number of responses had no understanding of the Hoare-Laval Pact.

(b) Strong responses were characterised by the identification of a feature of the Depression and the explanation of its importance to the League of Nations. Two well explained reasons made up the best responses. Most commonly explained was the effect of the Depression on the implementation of economic sanctions. Strong responses supported their statements with clear examples, such as: 'As a result of the Depression Japan looked for new markets and sources of raw materials and therefore invaded Manchuria. The weak response to China's appeal to the League was to contribute its downfall. Britain and France refused to impose economic sanctions on Japan during the Manchurian Crisis because the Depression was having a serious effect on their own economies. Even if they had imposed economic sanctions they would not have been fully effective as Japan would still trade with America which was not in the League'. Another factor commonly explained was that, 'The Depression had brought extremists governments to power that increased the size of their armies in order to combat unemployment. This went against one of the main aims of the League of Nations which was disarmament'. Weaker responses, whilst demonstrating understanding of the causes and events of the Depression, often made no reference to the impact on the League of Nations. In this question it was important to explain the effects of the Depression on the League of Nations.

(c) There were some one-sided responses to this question as candidates were much more familiar with the reasons why The League of Nations response to Japanese actions in Manchuria was not surprising. They identified and explained many reasons, including the distance between Japan and Europe, the fact that USA and USSR were not members of the League, the lack of an army, the self-interest of Britain and France and the record of the League in the 1920s when dealing with Great Powers, citing the Corfu incident as an example. Strong responses also explained the other side of the argument, why the response of the League to the Japanese actions in Manchuria was surprising, most commonly citing that the Japanese invasion of Manchuria was exactly what the League of Nations was set up to deal with and identified Article 10 of the Covenant of the League of Nations to explain their point. Less successful responses often included a narrative of the causes and events of the Manchurian Crisis without expressing surprised/not surprised at the actions of the League of Nations. Others drifted from the central focus of the question to discuss the failures of the League of Nations both in the 1920s and 1930s. It is important for candidates to link the points they make to the question set.

Question 6

(a) This question worked well for most candidates who were able to describe the increasing militarism of Japan in the 1930s. Examples given included the influence of the military over the Japanese government and the role of General Hideki Tojo, the Japanese invasion of Manchuria in 1931, the signing of the Anti-Comintern Pact in 1936 and the increase in the size of the army divisions throughout the 1930s. Weaker responses include generalised statements lacking in specific detail. A misconception was that the Tripartite Pact was in the 1930s. It was agreed in 1940 and thus lacked relevance to this question.

© 2022

www.dynamicpapers.com

(b) There were some strong responses to this question. These responses demonstrated a good understanding of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and were able to link them to Hitler's foreign policy. Most considered that it was the harsh terms of the Treaty of Versailles that galvanised support for Hitler and gave him the basis for his foreign policy, a main aim of which was to reverse the Treaty. They then highlighted specific instances, most commonly that under the Treaty, the union of Germany and Austria was forbidden. One key part of Hitler's foreign policy was to undo this as he believed that German speakers should be united. He had tried to unify them in 1934 but Mussolini stopped him. However in in 1938 Hitler sent the German army into Austria and achieved Anschluss. Responses also often used the reduction of arms in the Treaty of Versailles and his aim to rearm as a second reason to illustrate the importance of the Treaty to Hitler's foreign policy. Other responses wrote at length outlining all the terms of the treaty but would have benefited from linking this to his foreign policy. A misconception was that Hitler wanted to reunite Germany and Austria.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question. Weaker responses were characterised by confusion of the chronology of events leading to Hitler declaring war on Czechoslovakia in March 1939. Others drifted from the central focus of the question and wrote a narrative of Hitler's foreign policy in the 1930s or wrote in general terms, lacking any specific detail. Strong responses included a careful selection of relevant information and showed a very good understanding of issues relating to the question. They often highlighted surprise that Britain and France had not gone to war when Hitler invaded Czechoslovakia in March 1939 despite guaranteeing the existence of Czechoslovakia at the Munich Conference, yet they did in September 1939 when Hitler invaded Poland. These responses explained reasons for the actions of Britain and France to explain the other side of the argument, most notably that until the invasion of Czechoslovakia they had been following the policy of appeasement but after the invasion of Czechoslovakia they realised that Hitler was untrustworthy and that he must be stopped. The signing of the Nazi-Soviet Pact confirmed their views on Hitler and so when he invaded Poland on 3 September, they declared war.

Question 7

(a) Strong responses demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the events that led to the revolt in Hungary in 1956 and gained credit for including details such as: 'Hungary was led by a Communist government and the Hungarians resented the restriction in their lives where they had no freedom of speech and they lived in constant fear of the secret police'. Credit was also awarded for the names of the leaders. Many were aware that the hard-line Communist Rakosi was replaced by Erno Gero, who was also unacceptable to the Hungarians. Weaker responses drifted from the focus of the question to discuss why the Russians sent in troops or the actual events of the revolution which lacked relevance to this question.

(b) This question was well answered. Strong responses demonstrated a good understanding of why many Germans disliked the Berlin Wall. The two most common reasons identified were that Berliners were split up from their families by the wall and people in East Berlin could no longer flee to West Berlin for better jobs. These reasons were explained, often citing the different standards of lifestyle between the two parts. Others explained the impact of the sealed crossing points and the possibility of being shot if they tried to cross the wall. A misconception, evident in some responses, was that the Berlin Airlift was arranged as a result of the building of the wall. Others explained why the wall had been built, which was not the main focus of the question.

(c) There were mixed responses to this question. Candidates needed to produce a well-balanced answer to explain how effectively the authorities in Poland dealt with Solidarity. Strong responses showed a good understanding and used appropriate factual knowledge to construct a clear and substantial argument. Most considered that the authorities were able to deal with Solidarity with hard-line tactics. For example, despite originally agreeing to their 21 demands in August 1980, when the new Prime Minister Jaruzelski took over in February 1981, talks between him and Lech Walesa failed. Martial Law was imposed, Solidarity was suspended and Lech Walesa and thousands of others were jailed. On the other side of the argument, strong responses argued that Polish authorities were not able to deal with Solidarity effectively because after 1981 Solidarity went underground and continued to operate. The fact that Solidarity had mass public and world-wide support made the organisation difficult to deal with and in 1989 Solidarity won the elections and were in the government. Weaker responses were characterised by describing the background and features of Solidarity without making any explicit link to the question.

© 2022

www.dynamicpapers.com

Question 8

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

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

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

Question 11

This was the most popular question of the Depth Studies.

(a) The majority of candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the role of Goebbels in the Nazi Party during the 1920s and gained high marks. Appropriate factual knowledge included that in 1926 he was appointed as Gauleiter for Berlin, he used propaganda extensively to promote the Nazi Party, creating posters and organising rallies. In 1928 he was one of the first Nazis to win election to the Reichstag. Some responses also included details of his work as Minister of Propaganda in the 1930s which lacked relevance as the question specified the 1920s.

(b) There were many strong responses to this question which demonstrated a good understanding of the reasons why the economy of the Weimar Republic collapsed so quickly after 1929. Two explanations were provided in the stronger answers. Most responses considered the effects of the Wall Street Crash on Germany's economy. They included detail of the Dawes Plan of 1924 and explained that although the German economy looked healthy by the middle of the 1920s, it was heavily reliant on American loans. When the US stock market crashed in 1929, the US banks wanted their money back to help them survive the crisis. Banks in Germany started to collapse, businesses shut down and unemployment, which was already high, began to increase. The death of Stresemann and Bruning's welfare reforms were other reasons which were identified and explained as reasons contributing to the collapse of the German economy. Weaker responses included general statements which were often lacking in supporting relevant detail. For example: 'the Depression affected everybody', and 'unemployment rose'. These identifications needed to be explained. Some responses confused the 1923 hyperinflation crisis with the effects of the Wall Street crash, whilst others drifted from the focus of the question to discuss the significance of the Wall Street Crash on the rise of Hitler, rather than concentrating on the economy.

(c) There were some good responses to this question which were well organised and included carefully selected and relevant details. Most responses were familiar with the terms of the Enabling Act, which meant that Hitler could now pass any laws for four years without consulting the Reichstag, which made him dictator of Germany. They detailed how he used the act to consolidate his power, providing examples such as: creating a one-party state, banning all other political parties, abolishing the trade unions and purging the civil service. On the other side of the argument strong responses included alternative ways in which Hitler consolidated his power, including explanations of the impact of the Reichstag Fire, The Night of Long Knives and the death of Hindenburg. Less successful responses confused 'consolidation of power' with 'support' for the Nazi Regime and wrote at length as to why Hitler came to power in 1933, which was not the focus of the question. Weaker responses were also not as secure on the chronology of the events of 1933 to 1934, often putting the Enabling Act before the Reichstag Fire.

Question 12

(a) There were mixed responses expressed concerning the Nazi policies towards the churches. Strong responses were able to provide four details such as: 'In 1933, Hitler made a Concordat, in which Hitler agreed not to interfere with the Catholic Church, if the Church kept out of politics'. Other valid policies mentioned included, 'Hitler started attacking the Catholic Church and arrested some priests. He also set up the Reich Church, where the Bible was replaced with Mein Kampf'. Other responses were characterised by the inclusion of general statements and did not demonstrate any knowledge of Nazi policies towards the churches.

(b) Strong responses to this question described the Nazi master race theory and then explained how its implementation led to the persecution of certain groups in German society. They highlighted that

© 2022

www.dynamicpapers.com

the Nazis believed in the superiority of the Aryan race and that it had to be kept pure, and that members of other races and groups such as gypsies, homosexuals and disabled people were a challenge to the Nazi master race theory. Responses tended to be strongest on the reasons why the Jews were persecuted. Others explained that the mentally ill and disabled people were also a threat to Nazi ideas about Germany being the perfect master race because it was thought that they would not be able to work and contribute to the economy, nor produce healthy children to continue the Aryan race. Weaker responses drifted from the focus of the question, often not mentioning the Nazi master race theory. Instead, they discussed why Hitler hated the Jews and the conditions in the concentration camps which lacked relevance to this question.

(c) There were some good responses to this question which were well organised and included carefully selected and relevant details. To achieve strong responses to this question, candidates needed to produce a balanced answer by explaining how successful and how unsuccessful the Nazi government was in controlling the German people. Responses tended to be stronger on the success that that the Nazis had in controlling the German people. They commonly explained this in terms of the terror and force used to suppress any opposition, discussing the Gestapo who had unlimited powers to search houses, arrest people on suspicion and send them to concentration camps without trial or explanation. Many Germans were frightened to speak out against the regime even if they wanted to. Control was also exercised through the media, and evident in the control over women and education. Many mentioned the mental control influenced by propaganda. The strongest responses fully explained how and why this control took place and the resultant impact. These strong responses also gave consideration to ways in which the Nazis were not in control of all German people. They explained how many young people believed in freedom of expression and values which conflicted with those of the Nazis. They used the Edelweiss Pirates as an example and showed how they shared a strong distaste of the strict regimentation and sexual segregation of the Hitler Youth, and that they often beat them up. During the war they carried out acts of sabotage, helped army deserters and even assassinated a Gestapo chief. The activities of the Swing Movement, the Kreisau Circle and members of the Church were also often used as examples of areas where the Nazis faced challenges to their ability to control German society. Less successful responses would have benefited from a less narrative approach on the control exercised by the Nazis. It is important that reasons are identified and then supporting information is linked to the question. Other weaker responses were one-sided and would have been improved by identifying and explaining the few areas which the Nazis did not fully control.

Questions 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22

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

© 2022

www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/22
Paper 2

Key messages

When asked to compare two written sources, candidates should try to compare the overall argument or point of view of the sources, as well agreements or disagreements of detail.

Candidates should think through the question, read the sources carefully and plan the answer before writing anything. In other words, they should know what the answer is going to be before they start writing. Candidates will then be able to directly address the question in the opening sentence, for example, 'The cartoonist's message is…'. The rest of the answer should be used to support the opening sentence.

When asked to compare cartoons for similarities or differences, candidates need to find something that the cartoons both have something to comment on. It is not useful to explain how the cartoons are about different things.

When asked about a cartoonist's message, candidates need to explain the cartoonist's point of view. For example, are they praising or criticising policies or individuals?

The provenance of sources should be read carefully. Who the author or artist was is important and can be used in the answers to most questions.

When answering **Question 6**, clear explanations that directly refer to the content of individual sources, are required.

Contextual knowledge should only be used to explain and interpret the sources. It should never be included in answers for its own sake.

General comments

The overall standard was high. Candidates demonstrated sound knowledge of the historical context of the sources and were able to comprehend and interpret the sources. Very few candidates struggled and nearly all candidates completed all the necessary questions.

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. Most candidates were able to explain agreements and disagreements. There were a lot of agreements and candidates found several without difficulty – for example they agree that the Fourteen Points were the basis of Wilson's plan and that Germany hated the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. On the disagreements, many candidates were able to explain the differences over how influential the Fourteen Points were, and whether or not Wilson achieved self-government. These disagreements were often carefully explained, with candidates giving both sides of the disagreement rather than just identifying the area of disagreement. Although most candidates were able to achieve good answers, only a few

© 2022

www.dynamicpapers.com

compared the big messages of the two sources. Candidates found it much harder to sum up and compare the overall points of view. Some of those who did attempt to do this neglected to use the content of the sources to support their answers. The overall point of view of the sources is: Source A generally supports Wilson and/or the treaty, while B is more critical of both.

Question 2

The essential first step to answering this question well involves working out how the two sources agree or disagree. Although both House and Wilson see positive aspects of the treaty, they largely disagree and the disagreements are far more important than the agreements. Wilson sees the treaty as 'a great treaty', which House certainly does not agree with. A large number of candidates recognised this. Some concluded that this disagreement between the two men proves that Wilson was lying. The stronger responses realised that this was not necessarily the case and went on to evaluate one or both of the sources before reaching a conclusion. A number of candidates pointed out that House and Wilson argued about the Treaty and that this may have influenced what House said in Source C, while others explained that Wilson's speech in Source D was probably made during his tour of the USA when he was trying to sell the treaty to the American people. It is important that candidates make sure they use their comparison and analysis of the sources to reach a conclusion about whether or not Wilson was lying. The best way to ensure this is to directly address the question in the opening sentence of the answer, such as 'I think Wilson was lying in Source D because'. This means that candidates need to decide what their answer is going to be before they start writing. This is the case for answering all questions on this paper.

Question 3

When answering questions about cartoons candidates should try and infer the point of view of the cartoonist. In Source E he is criticising both the Treaty of Versailles and the Allies and predicting that the Treaty will lead to another war. The cartoonist of Source F is also critical of the Allies and their treatment of Germany in the Treaty. A good number of candidates were able to make such a comparison. The best answers went on to explain that although both cartoons are critical of the Allies and the Treaty, they are critical for rather different reasons. Weaker answers analysed one or both cartoons but did not compare them or compared sub-messages, rather than overall points of view, for example, both cartoons show that the Allies had the upper hand.

Question 4

This question asks about 'the cartoonist's' message. This means that candidates should be looking to infer a point of view. There is some ambiguity in the cartoon. Some candidates argued that the cartoonist is saying that the League will take the world to a better and peaceful future, while others suggested that the cartoonist is implying that people are naive if they think the League will lead to a better future. Both interpretations were valid top level answers. Some candidates focused on the man (the world) in the boat instead of the cartoonist. They claimed that the message of the cartoon is that people around the world thought that the League was going to take the world from war to a better future. This shows how important it is to focus on the point of view of the cartoonist. Few candidates struggled with this question, although there were some who misinterpreted the cartoon and argued that it shows the world was still at war.

Question 5

The best answers were based on a reading of Source H and on relevant use of contextual knowledge. Source H is defending the Treaty of Versailles. This led the best candidates to ask - why would a member of Wilson's government being doing this at that time (as Wilson was leaving office)? Most argued that the author of Source H was trying to defend Wilson's reputation and that this was a particularly important thing to do in light of the fact that Wilson had failed to persuade the USA to accept the Treaty or the League. This led them to conclude that the source is not surprising. Less successful answers used the content of the source and its provenance, but no contextual knowledge. For example, they argued that it is not surprising a member of his government would praise him at the time of him leaving office. A number of candidates produced good analyses of the source but did not say whether they found the source surprising. As was noted about **Question 2** above, it is crucial that candidates directly address the question.

Question 6

There were many good answers that carefully explained how some sources support the hypothesis and how some do not. Most candidates understood that this was the right approach to the response but a few struggled. This was usually because although they knew which sources supported, and which did not

© 2022

www.dynamicpapers.com

support the hypothesis, they were unable to produce adequate explanations. Some grouped the sources but then made assertions about the groups as whole, instead of writing about each source individually. Some attempted to use the sources but would have benefited from using them in more detail. For example, it is not enough to write, 'Source G supports the idea that Wilson achieved his aims because it shows the League was going to work.' The following is much better, 'Source G supports the idea that Wilson achieved his aims. One of his aims was a League of Nations and Source G suggests that the League is going to take the world to a better future by showing it as a rainbow.' A very small number of candidates did not use the sources and wrote an essay about Wilson and the Treaty of Versailles.

© 2022

www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/03
Coursework

There were too few candidates for a meaningful report to be produced.

© 2022

www.dynamicpapers.com

HISTORY

Paper 0470/42
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

This is a one-hour paper that requires candidates 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 was undertaken by candidates. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45 was the most popular choice, followed by Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–41. Some also attempted Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-18 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41. There were too few answers to Depth Study E (China), Depth Study F (South Africa) or Depth Study G (Israelis and Palestinians) to make any meaningful comments.

Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced answers with supported explanations. The very best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions. 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 at length about the topic or Depth Study in general, instead of 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 in relevance. Candidates need to 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 widely answered, with too few candidates attempting **Question 2** this session to make any meaningful comments.

Question 1 was generally well answered. The strongest responses got to grips with the focus of the question and had a good knowledge of the role the machine gun played in the development of trench warfare in the First World War. Many good answers examined the impact of the deadly aspects of the machine gun such as its high rate of fire and began to explain how this led to the development of a defensive war, with trenches being dug to protect machine gun crews, as well as bunkers and dug outs. This was then balanced by examining the importance of other factors that contributed to the development of trench warfare, most notably other weapons such as artillery and gas. A few candidates also demonstrated more breadth in their responses by considering important events on the Western Front such as the failure of the Schlieffen Plan, the Battle of the Marne, the race to the sea and the First Battle of Ypres. A small number of responses also validly commented on the lack of military strategy at the time. Weaker responses tended to be descriptive or did not link the machine gun and alternative factors to the development of the trench system; these responses described the successes and failures of each weapon or the development of other weapons, such as the tank, which were actually used to try and break the stalemate caused by trench warfare

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

© 2022

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918–45

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

Question 3 was generally well answered. Many candidates had a strong knowledge and understanding of the economic recovery in the period after 1923 and were able to explain why this resulted in poor electoral performance for the Nazi Party by 1928. Most strong answers focused on the policies and achievements of Stresemann, including the burning of the old currency, the replacement of the old currency with the Rentenmark and the Dawes and Young Plans. Alternative factors often examined the methods and actions of the Nazi Party itself as reasons for its lack of electoral success and highlighted the violence, anti-Semitism, the failed Munich Putsch and the role of the SA. A small number of candidates also looked at the cultural achievements made in the Stresemann era. The best answers explained the relative importance of each of the factors and drew valid and convincing conclusions supported by strong, well-selected examples. Less successful responses tended to lack focus on the lack of electoral success of the Nazis and provided narratives of the Stresemann era. Some candidates provided too much pre-1923 background information.

Question 4 was generally answered better than **Question 3**. The strongest responses were able to explain how the Hitler Youth organisations helped develop Nazi rule after 1933. Many candidates examined the youth groups for both boys and girls and gave in-depth details about how they indoctrinated and prepared young people for a future in Nazi Germany as either soldiers or mothers. This was then balanced with other factors. Many answers compared the youth organisations with the changes made in the school curriculum but were careful not to confuse the two different aspects of education as, although they largely had the same motive, they were separate institutions in Nazi Germany. Other factors often cited included events in 1933–34 which allowed Hitler to consolidate his position, such as the Enabling Act and the Night of the Long Knives, the role of the SS and Gestapo, propaganda and economic and racial policies. The best answers explained the significance of the different factors in detail and compared and contrasted them throughout their answers, as well as in their conclusion, to reach a convincing judgement. Weaker responses often made the confused schools with the Hitler Youth organisation or examined too few alternative factors. A small number of candidates moved the focus of their answer away from the question on the development of Nazi rule and towards support for the regime, which was not the question set.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905–41

A number of candidates attempted this Depth Study. Both questions were answered, although **Question 5** was the more popular choice, with **Question 6** having too few responses to make any meaningful comments.

Question 5 was generally answered well. Candidates focussed on addressing the question and provided many different causes of the March Revolution in 1917. Knowledge and understanding of the impact of the First World War was outstanding in the best responses and answers commented on many different social, economic and political consequences it had for the Russian government and its people. Most commonly cited were the Tsar's decision to go to the front line and leave the Tsarina and Rasputin in charge, the shortages of food and fuel in the cities and the lack of peasants for the harvests, leading to poor harvests and inflation. Good answers gave convincing and well supported explanations of how and why this factor was an important cause of the Revolution in March 1917 and then compared it with other factors such as the poor living and working conditions of the workers, the peasant land issue in the countryside and the issues surrounding the autocracy and calls for representative government from the liberals and progressives. Other responses tended to lack specific knowledge of the period or focused too much on the 1905 Revolution and, in some cases, confused the two. A few responses examined material post-March 1917 during the Dual Government era which was not relevant for this question.

Question 6 There were **t**oo few responses to this question for any meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study D: The USA, 1919–41

This was the second most popular Depth Study, with **Question 8** answered by more candidates than **Question 7**.

Question 7 was generally well answered. Most candidates were able to give some valid material on how the First World War led to the introduction of Prohibition and commonly cited the anti-German feelings towards German-named US breweries at the time of the war and the patriotic call for the grain to be sent to the Allies, rather than to brew alcohol. This could have been explained in much more depth; it was often just described, with some relevant examples provided. This was then balanced by comparing the importance of the war with

© 2022

www.dynamicpapers.com

the importance of other factors such as the temperance movements, religion and economic arguments. The strong answers drew valid conclusions and supported their arguments with well selected factual evidence. Many responses were, however, more descriptive in nature and provided only generalised material on the focus of the question. Some responses went beyond the parameters set out in the question and examined the Prohibition era after the Volstead Act was passed, which was not relevant for this question.

Question 8 produced many strong responses. Candidates got to grips with the question and provided an abundance of specific and detailed knowledge of the actions and reforms introduced by Roosevelt in his first Hundred Days as part of his first New Deal. The best answers were able to explain how significant these reforms were and how they dealt with the economic consequences of the Depression such as unemployment, decreased production and trade, low income amongst farmers and poverty. Commonly cited were the Emergency Banking Act, the CCC, the NRA, the AAA and the PWA. A few responses were able to give further examples of alphabet agencies set up to deal with the economic depression of the 1930s. These answers were well focused on the demands of the question and drew valid and convincing conclusions about the significance of each agency or reform introduced as part of the Hundred Days. Many candidates also evaluated each alphabet agency and piece of legislation individually and in great depth to demonstrate their relative significance in dealing with the economic problems of the time and this helped them draw well supported judgements. Other candidates also examined the nature of the Second New Deal or the impact of the outbreak of the Second World War as other valid factors that were significant in dealing with the economic issues. A few weaker responses confused the agencies or the two New Deals and would have been improved by giving a more specific and less descriptive response to the question. They tended not to address significance.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930– c. 1990

There were **t**oo few responses to these questions for any meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study F: South Africa: c. 1940–c. 1997

There were **t**oo few responses to these questions for any meaningful comments to be made.

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

There were **t**oo few responses to these questions for any meaningful comments to be made.

© 2022