Principal examiner reports for teachers

Principal examiner reports for teachers summarise what candidates did well and what candidates needed to improve for this examination series only.

This report is to be used in conjunction with the question paper and mark scheme.

For guidance on teaching and learning we provide resources for many of our syllabuses.

Resource	Where to find it
Grade descriptions – Grade descriptions describe the level of performance typically demonstrated by candidates achieving the different grades awarded for a qualification.	School support hub Select: Subject > Resource finder > Syllabus and specimen materials
Schemes of work – Schemes of work are designed to support you in your teaching and lesson planning.	School support hub Select: Subject > Resource finder > Teaching and learning
Lesson planning – Guidance on how to plan a lesson.	Lesson planning
Resource plus – There may be additional resources such as teaching packs containing lesson plans, resources and worksheets and videos for aspects of your syllabus.	School support hub Select: Subject > Resource finder > Teaching and learning
Teaching tools	Teaching Tools
Exemplar candidate responses	School support hub Select: Subject > Resource finder > Teaching and learning
Learner guide – A guide for students to help them understand what the course involves.	School support hub Select: Subject > Resource finder > Teaching and learning
Community forums – Do you have a question or something to share? Our online forums are great way to keep up to date with your subject and the global Cambridge community.	Community forum on the school support hub
Access to scripts for this series.	Access to scripts service
Results analysis is available for some syllabuses.	Results analysis
Test maker is available for some subjects.	Test maker

Other services from Cambridge International Education

- **Digital mocks service**
- **Insight assessments**
- **Professional development**
  - Focus on assessment
  - Online marking workshops

© 2026

HISTORY

Paper 9489/11
Document Question

Key messages

What candidates did well

- The most effective responses were closely focused on the terms of the question and accurately represented the arguments of the sources.
- Effective responses selected precise quotations from the sources to support the comparisons being made in **part (a)** or the support and challenge arguments in **part (b)**.
- Some responses used their contextual knowledge to explain the similarities and differences between the sources in **part (a)**.

What candidates needed to improve

- In **part (a)**, comparisons should be like for like and relevant to the question.
- Using brief quotations from the start and end of sentences, with ellipses in between, does not give sufficient evidence to support arguments.
- In **part (b)**, source content should be used to explain how the source supports or challenges the hypothesis in the question.
- In **part (b)**, the purpose of evaluating the sources is to decide which side of the argument (support or challenge) is stronger. Sources should be placed in context and evaluated to decide whether they lend weight to the support or challenge argument. Commentaries on the context or reliability are valid only if they contribute to the evaluation of the source in the specific context of the question.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) Comprehensive responses

- Many candidates identified, and supported with source details, similarities and differences.
- Comparisons were focused on the terms of the question.
- Candidates used their contextual knowledge of the formation of the Cheka and the Russian Civil War to explain or expand on the arguments in the sources.

Limited responses

- Some candidates completed **part (b)** first and continued to use the focus of that question when they moved on to **part (a)**, which meant their comparisons were not relevant.
- Some responses described the source rather than drawing inferences about the formation of the Cheka.
- Some responses contained lengthy commentary on the bias of the sources rather than explaining the reasons for the similarities or differences.

(b) Comprehensive responses

- Many candidates made effective use of the sources and developed a support and challenge argument.
- Some responses recognised the nuance in the sources which meant they could both support and challenge the statement, for example using the writing of the Commissar for Social Welfare to argue both sides.

© 2026

Limited responses

- Some candidates misread Source B as being negative about the Bolsheviks.
- Some responses were one-sided.
- Some candidates made general comments about the sources rather than selecting precise evidence to explain the argument.
- Some answers discussed the bias of the sources rather than evaluating the sources in context.

Question 2

(a) Comprehensive responses

- Candidates identified, and supported with source details, similarities and differences.
- Comparisons were focused on the terms of the question.
- Some responses used contextual knowledge to explain the reason for the differences between Source A and Source B, often referring to the Battle of Antietam.

Limited responses

- Some responses made general comparisons between the sources rather than focusing on the question.
- Some responses made claims about Lincoln's view which were based on the words of the newspaper editor in Source B rather than Lincoln.
- Some answers described sources without making inferences on which to base the comparison.
- Some comparisons were not like for like.

(b) Comprehensive responses

- Many responses used the sources to support and challenge the view given in the question.
- Many responses made effective use of source content to explain their arguments.
- Many answers made detailed references to the image in Source D and used their knowledge to explain the message.

Limited responses

- Some responses supported or challenged the view rather than explaining both sides.
- Some answers misrepresented the argument of Source A.
- Some answers discussed the reliability of the sources without linking this to their weight as evidence in the context of the question.

Question 3

(a) Comprehensive responses

- Candidates identified, and supported with source details, similarities and differences.
- Many candidates made comparisons which were focused on the terms of the question.
- Some responses used contextual knowledge of the Kuomintang to explain the differences or similarities between the sources.

Limited responses

- Some responses were not focused on the question and contained comparisons which were about the Communists rather than the Kuomintang. This often resulted from answering **part (b)** first.
- Some answers described the sources rather than making comparisons.
- Some answers attempted to compare sources by matching similar words or phrases rather than making question-focused inferences.

(b) Comprehensive responses

- Many responses used the sources to support and challenge the view given in the question.
- Many responses made effective use of source content to explain their arguments.
- Many responses recognised that some of the sources, for example Source C which was written by a warlord, could be used on both sides of the question.

© 2026

Limited responses

- Some responses were one-sided with only support or challenge arguments.
- Some responses misread Source D as positive when the overall argument was negative.
- Some responses wrote about the reliability of the sources but did not place this in context to evaluate the weight of the source as evidence.

© 2026

HISTORY

Paper 9489/12
Document Question

Key messages

What candidates did well

- The most effective responses were closely focused on the terms of the question and accurately represented the arguments of the sources.
- Effective responses selected precise quotations from the sources to support the comparisons being made.
- Some candidates used their contextual knowledge to explain the similarities and differences between the sources in **part (a)** and to evaluate sources in **part (b)**.

What candidates needed to improve

- Using brief quotations from the start and end of sentences, with ellipses in between, will not give sufficient evidence to support arguments and should be avoided.
- In **part (b)** source content should be used to explain how the source supports or challenges the hypothesis in the question.
- In **part (b)** the purpose of evaluating the sources is to decide which side of the argument (support or challenge) is stronger. Sources should be placed in context and evaluated to decide whether they lend weight to the argument. Commentaries on the context or reliability of sources are only useful when they contribute to the evaluation of the source in the specific context of the question.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) **Comprehensive responses**

- Identified and supported similarities between the sources.
- Identified and supported differences between the sources.
- Used contextual knowledge, including the provenance of the sources, war communism, the Russian Civil War, and the role of the White Army and its supporters, to explain the differences between the sources.

Limited responses

- Did not focus on the question, specifically on evidence of food requisitioning.
- Used brief quotations from the start and end of sentences which did not give enough evidence.
- Described the sources rather than making relevant inferences or comparisons.
- Focused on assessing reliability rather than explaining the reason for differences between the sources.

(b) **Comprehensive responses**

- Were able to use the sources to support and challenge the view given in the question.
- Many responses also recognised the complexity in some of the sources which meant they could both support and challenge the statement, for example using the speech from Lenin.

Limited responses

- Supported or challenged the view rather than both sides being identified and explained.
- Did not select precise evidence from the sources.

© 2026

Question 2

(a) **Comprehensive responses**

- Identified and supported similarities between the sources.
- Identified and supported differences between the sources.
- Used contextual knowledge of the exemption clause, the Conscription Act, the stage of the war (May–July 1863), and the Battle of Gettysburg, together with source provenance, to explain the differences between the sources.

Limited responses

- Did not focus on the question, often focusing on the Exemption Act as a whole.
- Used brief quotations from the start and end of sentences which did not give enough evidence.
- Described the sources rather than making relevant inferences or comparisons.

(b) **Comprehensive responses**

- Were able to use the sources to support and challenge the view given in the question.
- Many responses also recognised the complexity in some of the sources which meant they could both support and challenge the statement, for example the reasoning for trying to keep morale high despite difficulties.

Limited responses

- Supported or challenged the view rather than both sides being identified and explained.
- Did not select precise evidence from the sources.

Question 3

(a) **Comprehensive responses**

- Identified and supported similarities between the sources.
- Identified and supported differences between the sources.
- Used contextual knowledge of the actions of the New Fourth Army between late 1940 and its formal disbandment by Chiang Kai-shek in January 1941, together with source provenance, to explain the differences between the sources.

Limited responses

- Did not make relevant inferences from the two sources to identify similarities and differences.
- Used brief quotations from the start and end of sentences which did not give enough evidence.
- Attempted to match sources from similar words or phrases rather than making historical inferences.

(b) **Comprehensive responses**

- Were able to use the sources to support and challenge the view given in the question.
- Many responses also recognised the complexity in some of the sources which meant they could both support and challenge the statement, for example the reasons for balance in the US source.

Limited responses

- Supported or challenged the view rather than both sides being identified and explained.
- Did not select precise evidence from the sources.

© 2026

HISTORY

Paper 9489/13
Document Question

Key messages

What candidates did well

- The most effective responses were closely focused on the terms of the question and accurately represented the arguments of the sources.
- Effective responses selected precise quotations from the sources to support the comparisons being made.
- Some candidates used their contextual knowledge to explain the similarities and differences between the sources in **part (a)** and to evaluate sources in **part (b)**.

What candidates needed to improve

- Using brief quotations from the start and end of sentences, with ellipses in between, will not give sufficient evidence to support arguments and should be avoided.
- In **part (b)**, source content should be used to explain how the source supports or challenges the hypothesis in the question.
- In **part (b)**, the purpose of evaluating the sources is to decide which side of the argument (support or challenge) is stronger. Sources should be placed in context and evaluated to decide whether they lend weight to the argument. Commentaries on the context or reliability of sources are only useful when they contribute to the evaluation of the source in the specific context of the question.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

(a) Comprehensive responses

- Identified and supported similarities between the sources.
- Identified and supported differences between the sources.
- Used contextual knowledge of war communism, the end of the Russian involvement in the First World War and the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, together with the source provenance, to explain the differences between the sources.

Limited responses

- Did not focus on the question, specifically on the continuation of the war in Russia.
- Used brief quotations from the start and end of sentences which did not give enough evidence.
- Described the sources rather than making relevant inferences or comparisons.
- Focused on assessing reliability rather than explaining the reason for differences between the sources.

(b) Comprehensive responses

- Were able to use the sources to support and challenge the view given in the question.
- Many responses also recognised the complexity in some of the sources which meant they could both support and challenge the statement.

Limited responses

- Supported or challenged the view rather than both sides being identified and explained.
- Did not select precise evidence from the sources to evidence points made.

© 2026

Question 2

(a) **Comprehensive responses**

- Identified and supported similarities between the sources.
- Identified and supported differences between the sources.
- Used contextual knowledge of the actions of the Davis administration in 1861 and the diplomatic crisis which developed during the civil war, together with the source provenance, to explain the differences between the sources.

Limited responses

- Did not focus on the question, often focusing on trying to match words or phrases rather than making inferences.
- Used brief quotations from the start and end of sentences which did not give enough evidence
- Described the sources rather than making relevant inferences or comparisons.

(b) **Comprehensive responses**

- Were able to use the sources to support and challenge the view given in the question.
- Many responses also recognised the complexity in some of the sources which meant they could both support and challenge the statement, for example the newspaper opinions which gave evidence of both sides of the debate and the fragility of neutrality with attempts to provoke intervention through media reaction.

Limited responses

- Supported or challenged the view rather than both sides being identified and explained.
- Did not select precise evidence from the sources to support the points made.

Question 3

(a) **Comprehensive responses**

- Identified and supported similarities between the sources.
- Identified and supported differences between the sources.
- Used contextual knowledge to explain the differences using provenance of the sources and contextual detail of Chiang Kai-shek as leader of the Kuomintang.

Limited responses

- Did not make relevant inferences from the two sources to identify similarities and differences.
- Used brief quotations from the start and end of sentences which did not give enough evidence
- Attempted to match sources from similar words or phrases rather than making historical inferences.

(b) **Comprehensive responses**

- Were able to use the sources to support and challenge the view given in the question.
- Many responses also recognised the complexity in some of the sources which meant they could both support and challenge the statement, for example the reasons for changing opinions of authors from the USA.

Limited responses

- Supported or challenged the view rather than both sides being identified and explained.
- Did not select precise evidence from the sources.

© 2026

HISTORY

Paper 9489/21
Outline Study

Key messages

What candidates did well

- Answers to the **(a)** questions were focused on causation.
- Successful responses to the **(a)** questions gave a clear statement at the beginning of each paragraph stating a factor of causation.
- Candidates were able to support their answers to the **(a)** questions with specific knowledge.
- Some candidates were able to provide several reasons for the **(a)** questions.
- Candidates showed understanding that historical issues can be interpreted in different ways.
- Candidates were aware that they needed to address both the given and alternative factors on the **(b)** questions.
- Many answers were focused on the given issue and displayed knowledge and understanding.
- Most candidates followed the rubric answering the required number of questions.
- Most candidates demonstrated good time management and provided sufficient answers to all questions.

What candidates needed to improve

- On both the **(a)** and **(b)** questions, some candidates provided a narrative of the topic rather than addressing the question.
- Some candidates were able to provide explicit comment addressing the question and would have benefited from supporting this with specific knowledge.
- Candidates need to ensure that answers are limited to any timeframes given in the question.
- Some candidates displayed insufficient chronological understanding.
- On the **(b)** questions, candidates genuine balance needs to be provided for both the argument and counterarguments.
- On the **(a)** questions, clearer links could be made and argued between aspects of causation.
- On the **(b)** questions, judgements need to consider relative importance rather than being summative.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

(a) **Comprehensive responses**

- Some candidates demonstrated a secure understanding of the importance of Necker's dismissal in July 1789 and kept their focus on its role in causing the revolution.
- Many candidates commented on Necker's popularity with the Third Estate, with some linking this with his middle-class background or his attempts to reform the tax system.
- Many candidates recognised that Necker was the finance minister. Some candidates explained that Necker was widely regarded as a reform-minded minister, whose removal convinced many Parisians that Louis XVI intended to suppress the changes initiated by the National Assembly.
- Some candidates linked the growing hostility towards the King directly to the mobilisation of the Paris crowd and the Storming of the Bastille.

Limited responses

- Many responses showed chronological confusion and were unable to differentiate between his first dismissal in 1781 and his subsequent removal in 1789.

© 2026

- Some candidates confused Necker with Turgot or Calonne, attributing the wrong reform record to him.
- Many candidates described Necker's career and popularity at length without explicitly explaining why his dismissal was a causal trigger for revolution.
- Most candidates were unable to connect multiple factors into a reasoned explanation of why the dismissal specifically mattered, as opposed to simply narrating what happened.

(b) Comprehensive responses

- Many candidates attempted a balanced argument and demonstrated good knowledge and understanding of the topic.
- Some candidates recognised that Napoleon's policies could be argued as both the given and alternative factors.
- Many candidates provided several examples of policies and were able to use this to assess the impact on France.
- Some responses were able to evaluate Napoleon's policies in the context of the revolutionary goals to assess the benefit to France as opposed to the given factor.

Limited responses

- Some candidates wrote descriptions of Napoleon's military campaigns which were not the focus of the question.
- Some candidates identified Napoleon's policies although they needed to support general points with specific detail about the policies.
- Some responses displayed chronological confusion, for example by stating that Napoleon overthrew Louis XVI.
- Some candidates wrote lengthy narratives about Napoleon's time in power without addressing the question.

Question 2

(a) Comprehensive responses

- Most candidates were able to identify effects, for example that the development of roads helped move goods and resources faster.
- Many candidates were also able to explain the easier movement of people from the countryside to urban industrial areas, providing a workforce for the factories.
- Some candidates explained how roads contributed to the connectedness of the national market and industries, as well as their importance in feeding growing urban populations, thereby supporting the early Industrial Revolution.
- A few candidates were able to fully explain the connection between improved transportation of goods within Britain to its impact on trade and growth of the British Empire.

Limited responses

- Some responses were generic and limited to repeating that roads transported goods and people more quickly, without explaining why this mattered.
- Some responses deviated from the terms of the question by switching to the importance of railways or canals.
- Some candidates identified the easier movement of people although they claimed this allowed people to commute every day to the factories, rather than facilitate the mass movement from rural to urban areas for work.
- Some candidates simply described the road system before and after the introduction of Turnpike roads without linking it to the development of the Industrial Revolution.

(b) Comprehensive responses

- Most candidates were able to identify the link between mechanisation and the loss of jobs, with many successfully identifying the Luddite movement.
- Many candidates were able to assess how dangerous working conditions or use of child labour contributed to popular protest, leading to demands for the Factory Acts and reduction in child working hours.
- Many candidates provided balanced answers, for example through considering protest caused by poor living conditions or demands for the extension of the franchise.
- A few candidates were able to give a range of reasons for protest and demonstrate connections between them such as the economic impact of the Napoleonic wars coupled with

© 2026

the population explosion generating a widespread malaise, leading many to realise that real improvement for the working class could only come with the extension of the franchise.
- Some candidates provided judgements through assessing the impact of key factors upon a social class within the same time period.

Limited responses
- Some responses focused narrowly on the appalling labour conditions faced by children without considering the broader social, economic and political context.
- Some candidates described the actual inventions such as the Spinning Jenny with implicit links to the impact they made on the skilled labourers ('people were angry').
- Some responses were descriptive in nature without assessment of how this led to protests.
- Some responses attempted to provide balance through consideration of the benefits of mechanisation which was not the focus of the question.

Question 3

(a) Comprehensive responses
- Most candidates were aware that the Zollverein was a customs union that helped to create economic unity between German states.
- Some responses explained that trade boosted nationalism due to making interconnections between what used to be disparate German states.
- Some candidates were able to explain how railway development and commercial growth brought the states closer together.
- Some candidates not only stated that it excluded Austria but were also able to argue that this helped direct unification towards a smaller Germany under Prussian leadership.

Limited responses
- Some candidates demonstrated incomplete knowledge of what the Zollverein was.
- Some responses misidentified it as a military alliance or believed that it involved other countries such as Britain and France.
- The growth of the middle class, and its support for political unity to protect commercial interests, was not considered by most candidates.
- Many candidates identified factors although they were unable to explain how these led to increased nationalism.

(b) Comprehensive responses
- Many candidates recognised that the Zollverein gave Prussia an economic advantage with some responses assessing the role that this played in the development of both the military and Prussian infrastructure.
- Many candidates understood Prussia's military advantages, especially the needle gun.
- Some candidates also discussed Moltke's leadership, Prussia's use of railways and telegraphs, and Austria's weaker command under Benedek.

Limited responses
- Some responses showed confusion over the timeline and geography of the wars of unification. Some candidates placed the Franco-Prussian War before the Danish War, while others did not understand how Italy's involvement forced Austria to fight on two fronts.
- Most candidates identified relevant points, although fewer reached a clear judgement on whether Austria's isolation was the main reason for Prussia's victory.
- Many responses were stronger on alternative factors rather than the focus of 'few allies'.
- Bismarck's role in creating Austria's isolation was not explained by many candidates, with understanding of it limited to his desire for unification through 'Blood and Iron'.

Section B

Question 4

(a) Comprehensive responses
- Many candidates displayed a good understanding and depth of knowledge in their response.
- Candidates recognised that constitutional balance was necessary to ensure the survival of slavery or their economic model.

© 2026

- Some candidates recognised that maintaining the constitutional balance was not only about economic interests but also about preserving equal representation in the Senate, preventing the Free States from gaining a majority that could pass laws against slavery, and maintaining their traditional social order.
- Some candidates clearly linked the first sentence of each paragraph to an aspect of causation, for example 'They wanted to maintain constitutional balance of sectional interests because of the fear of having less representation in the senate.'

Limited responses

- Some responses provided a narrative of sectional divisions or attempts to achieve compromise rather than linking these to the question.
- Some candidates provided a single point of causation based on maintaining slavery, rather than providing several reasons.
- Some responses attempted to show links between the factors or consider relative importance, although these conclusions were often summative.
- Some candidates provided descriptions of slavery rather than considering the focus of the question.

(b) Comprehensive responses

- A good range of responses were seen with many candidates demonstrating sound knowledge of the reasons for the outbreak of war.
- Some candidates clearly assessed the importance of secession to the determination of Lincoln to maintain the Union, leading to the events at Fort Sumter.
- Many candidates were aware of the background of sectional tensions, particularly surrounding 'Bleeding Kansas' and linked this to the tension caused by the election of Lincoln.
- Some candidates provided convincing arguments considering the long-term reasons for the outbreak of war and also the short-term reason of secession. These often then assessed the importance of Fort Sumter as the immediate trigger of the war.

Limited responses

- Some candidates were able to consider alternative perspectives although they needed to develop their arguments on the given factor of secession.
- Some responses provided a lengthy narrative, particularly of sectional divisions, without assessing how these led to the outbreak of war.
- In attempting to provide a link to the question, some responses gave a single line at the end of a paragraph asserting that 'and this raised tensions and led to war' without providing assessment of how the factor led to war.
- Some responses did not focus on the question, instead writing about the reasons for secession.

Question 5

(a) Comprehensive responses

- Most candidates were able to identify that the main purpose of tariffs was to protect American business. Many candidates were then able to explain this through reference to industrial developments during the Gilded Age being protected by increasing the cost of imports.
- Some candidates were able to identify that tariffs provided a source of income for the government. Support was provided to explain that this was necessary before the introduction of the 16th Amendment.
- Some responses explained the political influence exerted by monopolies on the government to ensure tariffs were maintained.

Limited responses

- Some candidates include references to industries or tariffs from the 20th century rather than focusing on the timeframe of the 'Gilded Age'.
- Many candidates were not able to provide multi-causal explanations.
- Some candidates described what tariffs are rather than relating this to the question focus.
- Some responses confused tariffs with monopolies having control of certain industries.

© 2026

(b) **Comprehensive responses**

- Some responses recognised Taft's contributions to trust-busting, referencing his actions against Standard Oil and the American Tobacco Company.
- Some candidates provided a direct comparison of the work of Roosevelt and Taft considering what they each did for conservation or trust-busting.
- Some answers provided an evaluative judgement, for example by acknowledging Taft's minor contributions to Progressivism through the 16th and 17th Amendments whilst placing this in the context of the damage he did to his party, therefore allowing the election of Wilson.

Limited responses

- Many candidates displayed incomplete knowledge and understanding of Taft's presidency.
- Many responses did not focus on the question and instead concentrated on the achievements of Roosevelt and to a lesser extent, Wilson.
- Many responses were descriptive with little focus on the aims of Progressivism.
- Commentary on constitutional amendments was often muddled with many candidates discussing votes for women and Prohibition.

Question 6

(a) **Comprehensive responses**

- Most candidates demonstrated sound knowledge of the topic and were able to identify that the Supreme Court declared some aspects of the New Deal unconstitutional.
- Some candidates were able to explain the impact of the Supreme Court's actions through reference to a specific aspect such as the effect on farmers of declaring the AAA unconstitutional.
- Many candidates at least identified the problems caused by Roosevelt's court-packing plan.

Limited responses

- Some candidates produced descriptive responses narrating the problems caused by the Great Depression.
- Some candidates attempted to provide a balanced answer, for example by considering alternative opposition to the New Deal. This was not required in an **(a)** question and was not valid.
- Many candidates recognised that the Supreme Court opposed the New Deal although they were unable to link this to the idea of 'crisis'.
- Some candidates described why the Supreme Court opposed the New Deal which was not the focus of the question.

(b) **Comprehensive responses**

- Most candidates displayed sound knowledge of American economic weakness.
- Many candidates were able to describe several aspects, for example buying on the margin, lack of government intervention and speculation.
- Some candidates were able to assess how these issues resulted in the Great Crash, showing a direct link with the collapse of the stock market.
- Some candidates considered both long-term and short-term causes and were able to successfully evaluate these.

Limited responses

- Many responses described the economic problems without showing how these contributed to the Great Crash.
- Some candidates provided descriptions of the Depression which was not the focus of the question.
- Some responses only attempted a one-sided argument rather than providing a balanced argument.

© 2026

Section C

Question 7

(a) **Comprehensive responses**

- Most candidates were able to provide a causal explanation either based on why the US chose not to join the world war, or an explanation of why, in April 1917, the US entered the war.
- Most candidates were able to at least identify the fact that the US maintained an isolationist policy until late on in the war. By way of explanation, some candidates referred to the Monroe Doctrine and its corollary.
- Some candidates correctly asserted that the US was not concerned with a quarrel that had no impact on them at all and a number elaborated on the idea that the US stood to gain by doing business with the warring powers and by exploiting markets that could no longer be supplied by the European powers.
- Many candidates were aware of the impact of the Zimmermann telegram as a short-term cause of the USA joining the war.

Limited responses

- Many candidates, whilst recognising that the USA was isolationist, were unable to develop this identification into an explanation. These responses often argued that the USA was more interested in pursuing Westward expansion on the American mainland.
- The sinking of the Lusitania was identified by many candidates, although very few recognised that it happened in 1915 and therefore was not directly responsible.
- Some responses confused the First and Second World Wars, with descriptions of the attack on Pearl Harbour.
- Some responses displayed chronological confusion, referencing the absence of the USA from the League of Nations.

(b) **Comprehensive responses**

- Most candidates were secure on reasons for the popularity of imperialism, most commonly describing the benefits of access to resources, increased prestige and power, and the belief in the ‘White Man’s Burden’.
- Some candidates were able to consider the alternative view that imperialism was not popular. These responses were secure in their understanding of the savagery of Belgian rule in the Congo, or the conflicts brought about by conflicting imperial claims such as at Fashoda.
- Some candidates provided assessment of the economic and social arguments against imperialism propounded by Hobson.
- Some candidates provided specific support throughout their answer, for example by referring to issues relevant to a specific country such as Germany’s desire for a ‘place in the sun’ as a newly established country, or criticism of British actions against the Boers.

Limited responses

- Many responses displayed knowledge of the reasons for popularity or unpopularity, although the support provided was often generalised, for example referring to ‘raw materials’ rather than ivory, rubber or gold.
- Many responses were descriptive, for example narrating what was decided at the Berlin Conference, rather than assessing the focus of ‘popular support’.
- Some candidates did not focus on the term ‘European’ and, for example, provided descriptions of Japanese or American expansion.

Question 8

(a) **Comprehensive responses**

- Some candidates were able to explain at least one valid reason for the League to be considered a success.
- Some candidates who had good knowledge of the dispute provided supported explanations, for example considering how the use of a plebiscite ensured success.
- Some candidates were able to describe the dispute and its resolution.

Limited responses

- Most candidates provided general comments about the weaknesses of the League of Nations.

© 2026

- Many candidates did not make any direct reference to the Upper Silesia dispute.
- Some candidates referred to other disputes such as Corfu which was not relevant to the question.

(b) **Comprehensive responses**

- Some candidates were able to provide balanced and well supported assessments.
- Most candidates displayed understanding of actions taken by the USA to help the German economy.
- Some candidates were able to directly relate the actions of the USA to the reduction of European tensions, for example by assessing the impact of the Dawes Plan to French and German relations.
- When considering the alternative perspectives, some candidates considered both the lack of involvement by the USA and also actions taken by other countries and organisations such as the League of Nations.

Limited responses

- Some candidates wrote general descriptions about USA isolationism without linking this to the 1920s.
- Many candidates wrote about Wilson's involvement in the Paris Peace Conference which was not the question focus.
- Many candidates recognised that the USA was not involved in the League of Nations although they did not relate this to resolving European tensions.
- Some responses went outside of the timeframe given in the question, for example writing about Hitler's actions in Germany.

Question 9

(a) **Comprehensive responses**

- Most candidates were able to display a good level of knowledge and understanding of the Munich Conference.
- Most candidates attempted a multi-causal answer.
- Most candidates suggested that war was averted, and because Britain was not ready, Chamberlain felt he had bought Britain and Europe some time.
- Some candidates were able to explain the positive reception the agreement had amongst the British public, recognising that this was important to Chamberlain as an elected politician.

Limited responses

- Some candidates wrote a lengthy narrative about the events surrounding the conference, only addressing a single issue of causation at the end of the response.
- Some candidates described the policy of appeasement rather than explaining why Chamberlain therefore thought the Munich Conference was a success.
- Some candidates described Hitler's actions after the conference which was not the focus of the question.
- Some responses displayed confusion with the Munich Putsch or the Italian invasion of Abyssinia.

(b) **Comprehensive responses**

- Most candidates were able to display knowledge and understanding of the involvement of some European powers.
- Some candidates were able to explain the reasons behind the intervention.
- A few candidates provided a balanced response which also considered the reasons behind the lack of involvement of some countries such as Britain and France.
- A few candidates were able to explain Germany's involvement in both sides of the conflict.

Limited responses

- A few candidates wrote at length about American isolationism which was not the focus of the question.
- Some candidates described the Spanish Civil War rather than the question focus of the non-intervention agreement.

© 2026

HISTORY

Paper 9489/22
Outline Study

Key messages

What candidates did well

- Candidates were generally able to demonstrate the extent of their historical knowledge and their analytical skills.
- For part **(a)** questions, most candidates were able to identify several factors that helped explain the event/action/intention that was the focus of the question.
- Many candidates were able to use relevant historical detail to support causal explanations in part **(a)** questions.
- Many candidates produced well-structured responses that showed clearly their understanding of the topics covered.
- Some candidates were able to demonstrate how different factors could be linked and/or prioritised in order to provide an overall judgement on causation.
- For part **(b)** questions, many candidates understood the need to provide alternative interpretations of the historical events they were being asked to analyse.
- They were able to provide and analyse relevant evidence to support alternative interpretations of historical events.
- Candidates provided evidence of relevant study of the topics in the question paper.
- Some candidates were able to resolve apparent contradictions in their alternative interpretations to reach a balanced overall judgement on the issues under consideration.

What candidates needed to improve

- For part **(a)** questions, some candidates simply made assertions about causation without providing the necessary detail to support these assertions. They need to provide appropriate commentary on why things happened in order to strengthen their explanations.
- Sometimes, candidates simply wrote about events surrounding the topic in the question without focusing on the specific requirements of that question.
- Candidates need to try and ensure that the length of their response is appropriate to the marks available for the question – for part **(a)** questions, the mark is half that available for part **(b)** responses and the length of answers should reflect this.
- Candidates should read each question carefully and make sure that they fully understand what is required before attempting an answer. Candidates need to ensure that the information they use is closely related to the question
- When candidates make assertions about a topic, they should ensure that each assertion is adequately supported by relevant specific detail.
- For part **(b)** responses, candidates should try and offer alternative interpretations and provide clear evidence to support each of them.
- In providing an overall judgement, there needs to be clear support for that judgement in the final analysis, including an explanation of why one interpretation is better or how apparent differences can be resolved.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: European option

Question 1

(a) Comprehensive responses

- Were aware of and identified key constitutional changes between 1790 and 1795.

© 2026

- Were aware of, and able to summarise, the key differences between the different constitutional experiments.
- Were able to explain the changes from absolute to constitutional monarchy, constitutional monarchy to Republic and Republic to Directory.
- Were able to utilise knowledge of the difficulties facing those governing France like the king's unwillingness to cooperate, the role of the Sans Culottes, the divisions within the revolutionary movement and the impact of war as well as underlying economic difficulties to provide detailed explanation of several factors.
- Were able to demonstrate how factors might be linked and/or prioritised to give a supported judgement.

Limited responses
- Often only provided general description of the difficulties facing France in 1789.
- Concentrated on the description of the revolutionary events in 1789.
- Described a range of changes without explaining clearly why they were happening.
- Provided only partial coverage of changes over the specified period.
- Sometimes went beyond the time frame to include the Napoleonic Coup of 1799.

(b) Comprehensive responses
- Were able to identify the main opposition groups to the Directory and explain their different motives.
- Were able to demonstrate why the different objectives of each group made it impossible for them to cooperate. For example, even the royalists disagreed on whether to return to the status quo before the Revolution or adopt a more constitutional form of monarchy, and the various republican groups wanted no monarchy at all but could not agree on what type of republic should be established.
- Identified a range of other significant factors that enabled the Directory to survive for five years. These included a recognition that the people of France were wearied by successive changes and anxious to avoid a repeat of the horrors of the Reign of Terror, some success in financial management, military success abroad and the support of the army in suppressing attempted coups at home.
- Used relevant detail to support an analysis of some or all of these factors.

Limited responses
- Were often aware of two types of opposition, monarchist and republican, and offered limited suggestions of their inability to cooperate, usually simple incompatibility of aims.
- Sometimes spent significant time on describing Napoleon's career and successes under the Directory.
- Often tried to explain how Napoleon was able to overthrow the Directory, though this was not part of this specific question.
- Often offered little evidence of any successful measures taken by the Directory like a more democratic system of government, ending of the feudal system and aristocratic privilege, fairer taxation and replacement of the failing currency.

Question 2

(a) Comprehensive responses
- Explained the meaning of free trade and why it helped manufacturers by:
  - Enabling cheaper imports of raw materials such as cotton from the USA for the growing cotton industry in Northwest England.
  - Making it easier to export goods to new markets like finished cotton goods to India.
- Explained how the development of industries encouraged innovation in the transport industry, most specifically canals and railways, and eventually steamships.
- Suggested that the increases in profits from international trade led to further investment in factories and new ideas, as entrepreneurs saw opportunity for further profits.

Limited responses
- Were able to identify and describe some benefits of international trade with limited supporting detail.
- Provided few specific examples.
- Sometimes suggested that 'free trade' meant that goods were transported free of charge.

© 2026

(b) Comprehensive responses

- Were able to identify and explain key changes affecting working conditions in various work environments. For example, the Factory Acts of 1833 and 1844 and the Mines Act of 1842.
- Supported their analysis with clear details of what some of these Acts attempted to achieve.
- Provided a counter argument based on the lack of enforcement, for example the small number of factory inspectors appointed to try and enforce the Acts which were passed.
- Were able to explain why the restricted membership of parliament meant that there was little interest in improving the lives of workers with industrialists more interested in profits than worker welfare.
- Some candidates were able to identify ways in which parliament actively resisted change in the early 1800s, like the constraints placed on Trade Unions and cases like the Tolpuddle Martyrs.
- Were able to suggest reasons why attention to working conditions gradually improved in the 1840s.

Limited responses

- Suggested that the Reform Act of 1832 was responsible for improvements in working conditions.
- Simply described working conditions with limited evidence of attempts to improve them.
- Were aware of some significant Acts of Parliament without being able to provide clear details about what they achieved.
- Often wrote about Public Health legislation which was about housing and sanitation and did not affect working conditions.
- Sometimes provided an account of Chartism which was aimed at political reform, not improving working conditions.

Question 3

(a) Comprehensive responses

- Were aware of, and able to explain, the significance of 1848 as a turning point in Prussian development.
- Understood the significance of the Zollverein and why its increase in size after 1848 offered greater opportunities for development, especially the membership of Hannover which gave Prussia access to North Sea ports.
- Recognised and explained the particular importance of Otto Manteuffel and his internal reforms which improved the funding of industrial growth and, in particular, the expansion of railways.
- Recognised the importance of the growing isolation of Austria and its inability to challenge the economic expansion of Prussia.
- Sometimes recognised that Prussian success was building on earlier developments like the founding of the Zollverein in 1834 or the agricultural reforms Prussia had undertaken earlier in the century.

Limited responses

- Were able to identify some factors without providing any significant explanation of their importance.
- Sometimes concentrated on the Frankfurt Parliament and its political implications for Prussia and for Austro-Prussian relations.
- Sometimes focused more on the development of moves toward unification rather than economic development.
- Concentrated on Bismarck's role in Prussian development in the 1860s.

(b) Comprehensive responses

- Provided detailed analysis of the military reforms of von Roon and the way in which these enabled von Moltke to develop new tactics and strategies that enabled Prussia to win the victories that led to the unification of Germany.
- Supported these with relevant detail about new technologies and tactics and how they were used in victory, for example the use of railways to move troops rapidly to the French border and the previous creation of detailed maps of the French border provinces that gave them a significant advantage in the lead up to the Battle of Sedan.

© 2026

- Were fully aware of Bismarck's diplomatic manoeuvring and his manipulation of international relations to isolate first Austria and then France, for example his use of the Luxembourg Crisis and subsequent Hohenzollern Candidature to raise tensions between France and Prussia and his manipulation of the Ems telegram to provoke France into declaring war.
- Sometimes candidates put these together to create a complex web of the connections showing how both Bismarck and the military leadership produced the results that led to German unification.

Limited responses

- Tended to concentrate on Bismarck with only limited references to military leadership.
- Identified Bismarck as part of military leadership because of his role in supporting von Roon's reforms despite the fact that it was von Roon who supported Bismarck's candidature as Minister President.
- Wrote an essay on how Bismarck unified Germany.
- Included other factors when the question clearly asked for a direct comparison between two specific factors Bismarck's diplomacy and military leadership.

Section B: American option

Question 4

(a) Comprehensive responses

- Were able to identify and explain a number of factors that led to the rise of abolitionism in the 1850s. These included:
  - The Compromise of 1850 which included acceptance of the Fugitive Slave Act despite opposition from many northern states.
  - The publication of *Uncle Tom's Cabin* which revealed the truth about conditions under which slaves were kept, even in the least cruel households.
  - The issue of states' rights and the principle of popular sovereignty which led to the Kansas Nebraska Act and subsequent 'bleeding Kansas' outbreak of communal violence.
  - The case of Dred Scott who was denied citizenship despite having lived free in the northern states.
  - The rise of the Republican party which had opposition to slavery as a specific policy.
- Were able to provide detailed support for their explanations.
- Some candidates were able to demonstrate links between factors and provide a detailed causal summary.

Limited responses

- Few candidates were able to identify some key factors and described the events and actions.
- Described these events/actions, often in some detail, without effectively linking them to the rise of abolitionism. For example, detailed description of the Kansas Nebraska issue including the caning of Senator Summer or John Brown's attack on Harpers Ferry and subsequent events.
- Provided little evidence about how such factors contributed to the rise of abolitionism.

(b) Comprehensive responses

- Understood fully the purpose and achievement of the Missouri Compromise.
- Provided detailed analysis of the context and purpose of the Compromise including the need to maintain parity between slave and non- slave states in the US Senate and how this was achieved, and concerns over how to deal with the vast land acquisition in the Louisiana Purchase of 1803 as people began to move west into these new territories.
- Were aware that as westward expansion gathered momentum, this compromise might no longer be sufficient as the dividing line of latitude only divided the recently gained land.
- Demonstrated a clear understanding of how the independence of Texas and its attempts to join the Union created a big problem for the Missouri Compromise.
- Were able to show how the Mexican-American War and subsequent Treaty of Hidalgo-Guadalupe created a situation where the continuation of the Compromise of 1820 was impossible leading to the Compromise of 1850.
- Some responses reached a valid judgement on the success of the Compromise based on short-term success versus longer-term failures whilst others measured its effectiveness against the rapid breakdown of cooperation after 1850.

© 2026

Limited responses

- Often recognised that the Compromise involved maintaining a balance between slave and free states.
- Showed limited awareness of the issues involved in expanding west.
- Were often unclear about the political position and status of Texas during this period.
- Were descriptive with limited detail and little consideration of alternative perspectives.
- Knew that the Mexican war was significant while providing limited description of its outcome.

Question 5

(a) Comprehensive responses

- Understood the way in which tariffs worked and was able to explain how they could work to the advantage of some groups in society.
- Recognised and explained how, for big businesses, especially 'robber barons', tariffs helped to keep out foreign competition and allowed them to raise prices and maximise their profits.
- Were aware that big business was closely involved with the Republican party which held power for most of this period and therefore were able to influence government policy.
- Explained how the government depended on tariffs as a main source of income in the era before the introduction of federal income tax.
- Made some attempt to analyse weaknesses of opposition groups.

Limited responses

- Produced general description of how business operated in the gilded age.
- Recognised few links between business and government.
- Sometimes turned into accounts of the boss system and poor treatment of workers.
- Provided little acknowledgement of any opposition to tariffs.

(**b) Comprehensive responses**

- Demonstrated good knowledge of the achievements of Theodore Roosevelt in several different areas of policy.
- Were able to identify, and analyse the importance, of laws relating to protection of consumers with particular reference to the Pure Food and Drug Act and the Meat inspection Act.
- Good responses sometimes made an effective link between trust-busting and consumer rights, for example the Hepburn Act.
- Identified and analysed other areas of policy where Roosevelt made a difference.
- Looked at trust-busting as a way of reducing the power of big businesses.
- Recognised Roosevelt's contribution to the beginning of environmental awareness with the establishment of the first National Parks.
- Explained how he helped workers in supporting actions like the coal workers strike of 1902 and introducing employers' liability legislation.

Limited responses

- A few candidates confused Theodore Roosevelt with Franklin D. Roosevelt.
- Often provided detailed description of trusts and trust-busting with little on other things Roosevelt achieved.
- Provided limited coverage of alternatives to protection for consumers.

Question 6

(a) Comprehensive responses

- Were well aware of the term *laissez faire* and how it applied to government policies in the 1920s.
- Were able to offer some explanation of the links between big business and the Republican Party and why this led to limited regulation.
- Recognised and explained the significance of the election of successive Republican presidents Harding, Coolidge and Hoover.
- Explained how the success of the economy and rapid expansion of consumerism and new industries seemed like an unstoppable force and therefore did not need any government regulation.

© 2026

Limited responses

- Few candidates were aware that republicans were generally against regulation.
- Few candidates were able to describe some features of economic growth in the 1920s.
- Often wrote extensively about credit, the stock market and 'buying on the margin' with little attempt to link them to business regulation.
- A few candidates wrote about the causes and effects of the Wall Street Crash.

(b) Comprehensive responses

- Were aware of the scale of the problem and were able to relate its importance to its visibility as a sign of the failure of the US economy.
- A few responses also linked these to more general mental and physical health issues.
- Many responses provided greater detail and fuller analysis of other problems caused by the Great Depression, specifically unemployment, bank collapses, business failures loss of savings and agricultural poverty.
- Many candidates were able to link homelessness, in particular, to unemployed and thus produce a prioritised judgement.
- Good responses often demonstrated how unemployment was the basic root which linked all other factors in a complex web of effects.

Limited responses

- Described Hoovervilles.
- Explained why people became homeless, with limited supporting detail.
- Described the Wall Street Crash and some of the things that happened after it without clearly linking it to what was being asked.
- Wrote about Roosevelt and the New Deal with limited detail.

Section C: International option

Question 7

(a) Comprehensive responses

- Understood fully the transformative effect of the Meiji Restoration on all aspects of Japanese life and government.
- Explained why contact with western imperialism led to the recognition that Japan needed to move from its medieval shogunate to a modern unified government with central control and a modern well-equipped army.
- Were able to show how this was achieved by building an export-orientated economy to provide funds for military growth.
- Explained how contact with the west provided the impetus for reform with education and government based on European systems and a new modern army and navy that mirrored the best European practice.
- Some responses showed how the reforms led to the emergence of Japan as a regional power through victory in the first Sino-Japanese war, the creation of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance and possibly also the victory over a European power in the Russo Japanese War.

Limited responses

- Tended to spend a lot of time describing early contact with western powers, especially the USA.
- Simply described some of the reforms introduced with limited detail.
- Sometimes provided information about the emergence of Japan as a world power by describing international events from its victory in the Sino-Japanese War to its contribution to the allied victory in World War One with little reference to the Meiji restoration.

(b) Comprehensive responses

- Showed awareness of the economic possibilities offered by obtaining control of parts of Africa in terms of both developing markets for the large quantity of finished goods now being generated in Europe as a result of the industrial revolution, and in terms of gaining access to new resources to promote continuing development of new industries. Some candidates separated these two economic factors and treated obtaining resources as an alternative factor to trade, which is an acceptable alternative interpretation of the question.

© 2026

- Sometimes, effective links were made to the economic downturn in Europe created by excessive production, known as 'the Long Depression'.
- Many candidates were able to offer a range of alternative factors for the growing interest in African colonies. These included international prestige and power, control of strategic routes and port facilities, theories of racial superiority, a sense of responsibility to spread Christianity and growing popular interest created, sometimes, by a deliberate attempt by governments to divert attention from domestic issues.
- Were able to offer comparative analysis on the relative importance of some of these factors and reach a balanced judgement in response to the prompt in the question.

Limited responses

- Often gave limited attention to trade and provided lengthier description of other factors, offering only minimal analysis.
- Sometimes had a limited idea of what trade involved.
- Sometimes included the slave trade and suggested that slaves were taken to Europe and forced to work in factories there.
- Occasionally included details of events that had only limited connection to the question, like detailed description of the outcome and effects of the Franco-Prussian War.

Question 8

(a) **Comprehensive responses**

- Showed clear awareness that this was one of a series of treaties made between the Allied victors and each of the countries that had joined Germany and Austria in the Central Powers.
- Recognised that whilst all the treaties had common terms about issues like territorial reduction, military restrictions and reparations, every treaty also had specific conditions attached to each of these generic terms.
- Explained clearly what these specific terms included and why the Bulgarians had reason to feel angry about them.
- Demonstrated how territorial losses deprived Bulgaria of important industrial resources and access to the Aegean Sea thus undermining the economy and, with the additional burden of reparations, made post-war recovery difficult. On top of this border changes left many Bulgarians outside the country and raised the possibility of border disputes which military reductions left Bulgaria unable to defend itself against.
- Sometimes suggested that, compared with other countries which had a much bigger part in causing and pursuing the war, they were treated much more harshly.

Limited responses

- Identified generic terms that were part of all the treaties that ended the war, with little specific detail from the Treaty of Neuilly.
- Often described the terms without any suggestion of why the Bulgarians might be angry about them.
- Sometimes confused Neuilly with other treaties from the Versailles settlement and included terms from those treaties.

(b) **Comprehensive responses**

- Identified all or most of the major international conferences that were held in the 1920s.
- Considered the successes and failures of different international conferences and negotiations throughout the period from the Washington Naval Conference of 1921-2 to the Kellogg Briand Pact and the Young Plan.
- Recognised and analysed the relative successes of individual conferences. For example, the Genoa Conference was generally accepted as a complete failure. There was some suggestion that the Rapallo Pact, that came out of the failure, might be seen as a success for Germany and Russia which were no longer isolated in international affairs, but the general consensus was that it simply added to international tensions and thus compounded the failure of Genoa.
- On the other hand, the Locarno conference was generally hailed as a success, many candidates including the quote that 'Versailles marked the end of the war, but this was the beginning of peace'. Objective assessment, however, went on to point out the weaknesses and failings of this landmark conference.
- Many responses were able to tease out some of the nuances of success and failure from individual conferences/meetings.

© 2026

Limited responses

- Treated this as a question about the League of Nations.
- Sometimes wrote extensively about the Treaty of Versailles though the Paris Peace Conference was convened in 1919 so does not fall within the remit to this question.
- Provided details of only a few conferences with little attempt to analyse success/failure.
- Included conferences from the 1930s like the World Disarmament Conference and, in at least one case, the Munich Conference.

Question 9

(a) **Comprehensive responses**

- Were able to identify a number of factors which led to Hitler's failure.
- Explained in some detail why Mussolini took an interest in the threat, recognising that at this stage Mussolini was very opposed to Hitler who he described as 'a mad little clown', and understood that Hitler had not yet built up his armed forces to a point where he could risk any conflict.
- Some candidates had a clear understanding of the internal situation in Austria, explaining that the Nazi party was still relatively small there and the assassination of the Chancellor, Dolfuss, created antagonism towards them and resistance to their attempted coup.

Limited responses

- Simply described what happened.
- Suggested that Austria had been part of Germany rather than the centre of an independent empire and that Anschluss was simply a correction of an unfair separation of German territory.
- Sometimes characterised Italy as acting on behalf of the League of Nations.

(b) **Comprehensive responses**

- Were fully focused on the issue of the failure of the League.
- Provided substantial detail of the actions of Japan in creating an incident that gave them an excuse to invade China and seize Manchuria.
- Analysed the response of the League and the effect it had on the perception of the League's effectiveness.
- Considered in detail the structural weaknesses of the organisation and the way in which they contributed to this failure and to the overall collapse of authority of the League.
- Were able to demonstrate how the League was weakened, in its relationship with Japan, by the effects of the Great Depression on its leading members and by the failure of the World Disarmament Conference and withdrawal of Germany.
- Identified and explained how succeeding crises further weakened the League leading to its increasing irrelevance. Relevant details usually included the remilitarisation of the Rhineland and re-armament of Germany, Italian invasion of Abyssinia, the Spanish Civil War and the actions and objectives of the leading members, specifically Britain and France in pursuing appeasement.
- In some instances, suggested that appeasement was a policy adopted by the League as an organisation.

Limited responses

- Provided some relevant details about the Japanese invasion of Manchuria with limited analysis.
- Treated this as a question about the Manchurian crisis rather than one about the failure of the League in general.
- Identified some of the other problems the League faced in the 1930s, with limited consideration of how these related to the League's reaction to Manchuria.
- Sometimes included comment on the successes and failures of the League in the 1920s like the Aaland Islands or the Silesian coalfields issue and the Corfu Crisis without linking these sufficiently to the question.

© 2026

HISTORY

Paper 9489/23
Outline Study

Key messages

What candidates did well

- Candidates were generally able to demonstrate the extent of their historical knowledge and their analytical skills.
- For **part (a)** questions, most candidates were able to identify several factors that helped explain the event/action/intention that was the focus of the question.
- Many candidates were able to use relevant historical detail to support causal explanations in **part (a)** questions.
- Many candidates produced well-structured responses that showed clearly their understanding of the topics covered.
- Some candidates were able to demonstrate how different factors could be linked and/or prioritised in order to provide an overall judgement on causation.
- For **part (b)** questions, many candidates understood the need to provide alternative interpretations of the historical events they were being asked to analyse.
- They were able to provide and analyse relevant evidence to support alternative interpretations of historical events.
- Candidates provided evidence of relevant study of the topics in the question paper.
- Some candidates were able to resolve apparent contradictions in their alternative interpretations to reach a balanced overall judgement on the issues under consideration.

What candidates needed to improve

- For part **(a)** questions, some candidates simply made assertions about causation without providing the necessary detail or support for these assertions. They need to provide appropriate commentary on why things happened in order to strengthen their explanations.
- Sometimes, candidates simply wrote about events surrounding the topic in the question without focusing on the specific requirements of that question.
- Candidates need to try and ensure that the length of their response is appropriate to the marks available for the question – for part **(a)** questions the mark is half that available for part **(b)** responses and the length of answers should reflect this.
- Candidates should read each question carefully and make sure that they fully understand what is required before attempting an answer. Candidates need to ensure that the information they use is closely related to the question.
- When candidates make assertions about a topic, they should ensure that each assertion is adequately supported by relevant specific detail.
- For part **(b)** responses, candidates should try and offer alternative interpretations and provide clear evidence to support each of them.
- In providing an overall judgement, there needs to be clear support for that judgement in the final analysis, including an explanation of why one interpretation is better or how apparent differences can be resolved.

© 2026

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

(a) Comprehensive responses

- Were aware of and able to explain the key weaknesses of the Directory which existed from 1795. These included:
  - Radical groups like the surviving Jacobins thought that the latest constitution was a betrayal of revolutionary principles. This opposition was reflected in the Babeuf Plot and other disturbances by radical groups.
  - Royalists were not happy with the Directory because they favoured a restoration of monarchy, either a full restoration of the *Ancien Régime* or the establishment of a constitutional monarchy.
  - Some of the middle classes were opposed to the Directory because they lost money in the government's attempts to restore economic order, through the changes in the currency and through the bankruptcy of two-thirds.
  - Many people were fed up with war and opposed measures needed to continue it, like conscription and increased taxation.
  - In the countryside, many people were strongly Catholic and opposed the continued restrictions on the Catholic Church.
- Often included details of what the Directory tried to achieve and how its failure increased its unpopularity.

Limited responses

- Candidates only described some of the structure of the Directory, the problems it faced and the actions it took to try and deal with them.
- Some candidates included details from the government of Robespierre which preceded the Directory.
- Some candidates spent time on an account of how Napoleon took over from the Directory which is not quite the question that was asked here.
- Generally wrote about the economy.

(b) Comprehensive responses

- Were able to account for and analyse the extent to which Louis XVI's actions and intentions in the years before 1789 led to the Revolution.
- Were often able to distinguish between long- and short-term actions and their consequences:
  - Identified and explained the causes of Louis' financial problems due to royal extravagance.
  - Were able to account for the failure of various financial measures attempted by successive finance ministers as a result of Louis' unwillingness to antagonise the upper classes.
  - Analysed Louis' failure in the way he dealt with the Estates General and antagonised the Third Estate.
  - Demonstrated how Louis' actions in gathering troops at Versailles increased fears amongst the Paris *sans-culottes* and led to the storming of the Bastille and the March of the Women.
- Were equally well informed of other factors that contributed to the Revolution and able to analyse their effects:
  - The situation Louis inherited was already poor financially due to previous wars.
  - Severe harvests in the mid-1780s created discontent and disturbances as bread prices rose, especially in Paris where they took up a significant share of poorer people's incomes.
  - The growing strength of the Enlightenment movement increased discontent amongst the literate whilst returning soldiers from French involvement in the American War of Independence brought back similar ideas of freedom and democracy.
- Some candidates produced, with varying levels of success, an analysis of the relative importance of the alternative explanations of the causes of the Revolution.

© 2026

Limited responses
- Described some of the longer-term issues and often identified some specific causes.
- Wrote mainly about Louis' failings.
- Wrote an account of the meeting of the Estates General in some detail.
- Often described the storming of the Bastille and the March of the Women.

Question 2

(a) Comprehensive responses
- Many responses showed awareness of the objectives of Chartism.
- Were aware of the self-interest of members of Parliament in maintaining limits on political freedom.
- Were able to account for the effect of internal divisions in the movement, for example between 'moral force' and 'physical force' Chartists.
- Were aware of, and able to explain the effect of, problems of leadership.
- Were clear about the attempts to gain acceptance of the demands and the fact that no matter how many signatures were collected, the petitions could simply be rejected.

Limited responses
- Suggested that Chartism was an attempt to improve working conditions.
- Generally wrote about how the government reacted to attempts to introduce new ideas.
- Sometimes confused Chartism with Trade Unions.
- Wrote about anti-government movements in general including Luddites and Captain Swing.

(b) Comprehensive responses
- Were able to make a clear distinction between willingness to invest and other factors that aided rapid industrialisation.
- Identified and explained a number of factors that encouraged and/or enabled investment in new and developing industries including increased profits from agricultural development created funds for further investment, perceived profits from new developments encouraged new investors to become involved, free trade encouraged investment in overseas trade, development of banking services made loans for investment more readily available.
- Established and analysed a range of other factors:
  - The development of agriculture freed population to work in other industries and provided food for a growing urban population. The development of new and more efficient machines, especially in the textile industry, encouraged the development of factories.
  - Transport developments made it easier to move large quantities of raw materials and finished goods.
  - The government's *laissez faire* attitude encouraged developments.
- Some developed responses recognised and explained the circularity of development – new processes produce more goods – need better transport – encourage investment – produce industrial growth – more goods – etc. These generally produced clearly reasoned overall judgements.

Limited responses
- Wrote general essays about factors that led to industrialisation.
- Sometimes wrote at length about the agricultural revolution.
- Often spent time describing the purpose and effect of specific inventions.
- Described important developments like the steam locomotive and the expansion of railways.

Question 3

(a) Comprehensive responses
- Were fully aware of the complexities of the Hohenzollern Candidature and subsequent events that led to war between France and Prussia.
- Provided clear analysis of the role and intentions of Bismarck throughout the crisis.
- Analysed the critical importance of the Ems Telegram.
- Demonstrated understanding of the position and reaction of Napoleon III.
- Were able to show how the causal connections between factors led eventually to open warfare.

© 2026

Limited responses

- Provided extensive narrative of the reasons for the crisis and the actions of some of the key characters with limited direct reference to the question.
- Sometimes described the events of the Franco-Prussian War.
- Spent time describing how Bismarck isolated France from possible support from other countries.

(b) Comprehensive responses

- Understood and analysed the development of Liberal ideas in the German states stemming from the Napoleonic period and were able to explain its survival and growth despite Metternich's repressive measures.
- Recognised the significance of liberalism in the expectations on and establishment of the Frankfurt Parliament.
- Were able to identify and analyse the significance of other factors in the revolutions of 1848 in Germany, including:
  - Poor harvests in 1847 led to a food crisis with rising prices and growing risk of starvation.
  - Increasing industrialisation in some states, especially Prussia, led to poor working conditions and increasing industrial unrest.
  - Growing economic cooperation in Germany, especially after the formation of the Zollverein in 1834, led to growing demands for closer political cooperation.
  - Resentment of Austria's controlling influence and reaction to the fall of Metternich in 1848.
  - The growth of nationalism fuelled by cultural and linguistic similarities which were enhanced by cultural festivals.
- Sometimes concluded with a balanced overall analysis and supported judgement.

Limited responses

- Often confused liberalism and nationalism and treated them as completely interchangeable political ideologies.
- Wrote about the events of the 1848 revolutions in Germany rather than their causes.
- Included Bismarck and his unification objectives.
- Sometimes wrote extensive descriptions of the Zollverein.
- Concentrated on why the revolutions were unsuccessful without providing much detail on why they happened.

Section B

Question 4

(a) Comprehensive responses

- Recognised that the Compromises of 1820 and 1850 had been based on the idea of creating a balance between slave and free states in Congress.
- Were able to offer some explanation of why this did not work and left an apparent imbalance between the two sides.
- Offered some limited explanation of why southern senators appeared to have more power.

Limited responses

- Showed limited understanding of how Congress worked.
- Wrote about the breakdown of relations between the 2 sides in Congress, sometimes describing quite fully some of the different areas of conflict.
- Sometimes wrote generally about matters leading to the outbreak of the Civil War.

(b) Comprehensive responses

- Showed a clear understanding of how abolitionism was different from simply disapproving of slavery.
- Understood and were able to demonstrate how the Compromise of 1850, rather than resolving issues, simply exacerbated the growing division between slave and free states and thus threatened the Union.
- Were effective in explaining why each side felt threatened by the other and that this created an escalating atmosphere of distrusts. For example, the issue of states' rights which was so important to the south was seen as an attempt to remove the rights of Northern states as the application of the Fugitive Slave Act across northern states infringed their rights and was seem

© 2026

as an attempt to spread slavery throughout the Union. This was enhanced when Supreme Court judgements seemed to favour the South which increased support for the abolitionist perspective such as in the Dred Scott case.
- Balanced responses contrasted the rise of abolitionism with other factors that threatened the Union. The expansion westwards into new territories highlighted this as the Kansas Nebraska Act destroyed the Compromise of 1820 in terms of where slavery could be introduced.
- Consideration was also often given to the collapse of the Whig Party and the rapid rise of Republicanism which had the ending of slavery as one of its key political objectives.

Limited responses
- Often included some of the details used in **part (a)**.
- Wrote an account of how events in the 1850s led to the outbreak of Civil War including, sometimes, the effect of Lincoln's election.
- Described Lincoln's rise to power including events like the Lincoln-Douglas debates.
- Wrote extensively about 'Bloody Kansas' and the actions and fate of John Brown.

Question 5

(a) Comprehensive responses
- Correctly identified the Constitutional reforms introduced in the presidencies of Roosevelt, Taft and Wilson, specifically amendments 16 to 19.
- Were able to explain the differing factors involved in each of them including:
  - Reducing political corruption and the influence in government of big business and of party bosses.
  - Providing a regular and reliable stream of finance for the federal government.
  - Recognising the social concerns of key pressure groups like the Anti-Saloon League.
  - Responding to growing demands for women's suffrage.
- Were able to summarise how these amendments reflected the overall politics of Progressivism.

Limited responses
- Wrote generally about reforms of the Progressive era without focusing on the Constitutional Amendments.
- Described some of the policies and laws passed by Theodore Roosevelt.
- Wrote at length about prohibition and its effects.

(b) Comprehensive responses
- Provided detailed description of the housing situation in major cities with reasons for the situation, recognising the importance of overcrowded tenements, poor ventilation and generally insanitary condition, in causing poor health.
- Were able to provide details on some of the issues that this created for the lives of the poor, sometimes providing specific detail to support this.
- Identified and analysed the effects of a range of other factors affecting general health amongst the poorer sections of the population.
- Analysed the relative importance of some or all of factors like poor working conditions, limited health care and risk of spread of infectious diseases like smallpox and diphtheria, poor diet, lack of adequate water supplies etc.
- Some responses provided balanced and supported judgements on the relative importance of poor housing and often recognised the interconnectedness of all the factors discussed.

Limited responses
- Focused on one aspect of the question and included only limited detail on others.
- Described some of the housing conditions found in poor areas of industrial cities.
- Included description of factory conditions and how they had an effect on health.
- Sometimes wrote at length about the 'boss system' and control of the living conditions of immigrants.

© 2026

Question 6

(a) Comprehensive responses

- Recognised that the conservative right included a number of different groups, all of whom were united by a dislike of government interference in any aspects of American life.
- Were able to explain why the Republicans, even though some blamed them for the current depression, still believed in a *laissez faire* approach to economic policy and opposed the measures in the New Deal which they saw as too much interference.
- Explained why Industrialists and wealthy Americans were opposed to any measures that gave greater rights to workers like the Wagner Act and the Social Security Act.
- Understood that what united the different groups of the conservative right was a general opposition to any extension of federal power that reduced the rights of individuals, businesses or even states.

Limited responses

- Demonstrated limited understanding of the different groups that made up the conservative right.
- Described some aspects of the New Deal that were controversial.
- Wrote generally about Roosevelt's achievements with limited focus on opposition.
- Sometimes included examples of left-wing opposition like that of Huey Long.

(b) Comprehensive responses

- Recognised that this question required a comparison between aspects of American life that reflected increasing wealth and groups in American society that did not experience the benefits of increasing prosperity, like African Americans, farmers and rural communities generally, immigrant groups etc.
- Examined the effects the rapid growth in the American economy following the end of the First World War.
- Gave detailed accounts of how the stock market provided the impetus for a rapid growth in prosperity. Understood and were able to account for the rapid growth in consumerism with a rush of new, life-improving products becoming readily available.
- Understood the importance of increased advertising on the continued expansion of the American economy and resulting growth of general prosperity.
- Analysed the reasons why some groups did not benefit from the overall growth.
- Sometimes pointed to the Wall Street Crash as a symptom of the fragility of the apparent prosperity of Americans in general.
- Made valid judgements based on the differences between those who benefited and those who did not in order to reach a reasoned response to the question.

Limited answers

- Wrote about trading in stocks and shares using credit.
- Tried to explain buying on the margin with limited accuracy.
- Sometimes confused the use of credit with using credit cards (not introduced until 1950).
- Produced a one-sided answer with little on groups that did not experience increased prosperity.
- Included comments on the Wall Street Crash.
- Sometimes wrote about the Great Depression.

Section C

Question 7

(a) Comprehensive responses

- Were able to explain what the Great White Fleet was and link it to the emergence of the USA as a significant world power.
- Identified and explained the significance of the role of Theodore Roosevelt and his policy toward international expansion, sometimes with specific reference to the effects of the closing of the frontier.
- Understood that the purpose of the visits was to serve several purposes:
  - To demonstrate the strength of the new US fleet.
  - To improve links with the countries visited.

© 2026

- To give officers and sailors training in operating in international waters.
- To gather intelligence that might be of use in future situations.

- Some recognised the significance of Mahan's book on the importance of naval power in global influence in shaping this new direction in policy.

Limited responses

- Simply described the naval improvements carried out by Roosevelt.
- Considered the effect of the fleet on other naval powers rather than focusing on Roosevelt's motives.
- Described the American use of naval power in the Spanish-American War and the subsequent takeover of the Spanish overseas territories.
- Wrote mainly about the Monroe Doctrine and the 'Big Stick' policy.

(b) Comprehensive responses

- Understood the need to offer a comparative analysis of Russian weaknesses compared to other factors, in particular Japanese strengths.
- Were able to account clearly for the Russian weaknesses by considering all or some of a range of factors including poor leadership both by the Tsar and his commanders, logistical difficulties in reaching the Russian far east, outdated equipment and underestimation of Japan's capability because they were not a European country.
- Were able to provide equally strong analysis of the positive advantages of Japan. These might include modern equipment, well trained and well-armed troops, short lines of communication, effective planning, a modern navy and the advantage of surprise that enabled them to quickly overwhelm local Russian forces.
- Sometimes recognised the importance of the international factors like the Anglo-Japanese Treaty of 1902 which led to Britain closing the Suez Canal to the Russian fleet and which restrained Russia's main European ally, France, from supporting action.
- Were sometimes able to use a range of information like the above to reach a reasoned judgement on the issue of Russian weaknesses.

Limited responses

- Simply described key events.
- Tended to focus on either Russia or Japan without providing a balanced view of the conflict.
- Were often confused about the order of events involved in the movements of the Baltic fleet and its subsequent sinking at the Battle of Tsushima.

Question 8

(a) Comprehensive responses

- Were able to explain the competing claims of Poland and Lithuania on Vilnius and the action of the Polish government to take control of the city.
- Understood why this might be a difficult matter for the League to resolve.
- Were able to explain the difficulties the League faced in terms of:
  - The refusal of Poland to withdraw from the city when they were ordered to do so by the League.
  - The League's inability to respond with any sort of force in the wake of the recently ended World War.
  - The unwillingness of France (and to some extent Britain) to antagonise the Poles who they looked upon as a potential ally in resisting the spread of communism from Russia to other parts of Europe.
  - The matter was handed, for solution, to the Conference of Ambassadors which awarded the city to Poland – a result the Lithuanians never accepted, leading them to close their borders with Poland.
- Were able to link the factors to show how they collectively led to a failure for the League.

Limited responses.

- Described, with varying degrees of accuracy, the events of the conflict.
- Wrote about several issues dealt with, with or without a successful resolution, in the 1920s.
- Simply produced a response about the generic weakness of the League with limited references to Vilnius.
- Sometimes spent time explaining the absence of the USA from the League and its effect.

© 2026

(b) Comprehensive responses

- Were able to explain why reparations were a problem and offer some analysis of why it was a difficult problem to resolve.
- Were aware of a number of conferences and agreements in the 1920s, some of which had a positive effect on the reparations issue and others which had limited, or even negative, effects.
- Recognised that in asking about the 'problems caused by reparations', the question expected an analysis of wider issues than the simple matter of the size of reparations and how they were to be paid. A few answers, for example, dealt with the failure of the Genoa conference to deal with this issue because of the intransigence of France on this and other related matters.
- Similarly, the Dawes plan was often analysed as an attempt to resolve the issue and end the Franco-Belgian occupation of the Ruhr industrial area. Sometimes it was emphasised that this was only ever a temporary solution to allow for economic recovery in preparation for negotiation of a final settlement.
- Responses also highlighted the Young Plan as the intended final solution to the problem though not all recognised that it was never implemented because of the consequences of the Wall Street Crash and sudden withdrawal of American financial backing.
- Sometimes referred to the effort by Germany itself and the work of Gustav Stresemann in trying to rebuild the German economy to the point where payment was feasible.
- Many responses provided detailed factual support for their analysis.

Limited responses

- Sometimes wrote at length about the Paris Peace Conference which happened in 1919, not the 1920s.
- Treated the Dawes and Young Plans as a single response with little awareness of the timescale involved.
- Often included events which had little to do with reparations, like the Locarno Treaties.
- Occasionally focused mainly on the role of the USA in trying to solve the problem, including lengthy description of US foreign policy at the time.

Question 9

(a) Comprehensive responses

- Understood, and explained clearly, the different factors that influenced Hitler's involvement. These included some or all of:
  - It was a chance for him to test the effectiveness of new weapons and the tactics for using them in a war situation.
  - It was an opportunity to establish a third fascist state in Europe which at the least would be sympathetic, even if not in direct support of, Hitler's expansionist aims.
  - Sometimes recognised that Hitler gained access to vital raw materials and use of 'neutral' ports.
  - Demonstrated awareness that his encouragement of Mussolini's involvement was partly to distract him from involvement in other aspects of his plans, especially the achievement of Anschluss with Austria which Mussolini had blocked in 1934.
- Were sometimes able to integrate the differing political, military and economic factors to produce an overall analysis of Hitler's motives with some prioritisation of objectives.

Limited responses

- There were relatively few limited responses.
- Simply described German involvement, often focusing particularly on the bombing of Guernica and Blitzkrieg.
- Sometimes included other contributing factors in the Spanish Civil War factors like Mussolini's role.

(b) Comprehensive responses

- Were fully aware of, and explained, the reasons why Britain and France adopted a policy of appeasement towards Germany.
- Included clear and supported suggestions about why this seemed like a reasonable and sensible policy to adopt in the mid-1930's. Valid suggestions included lack of preparation, awareness of the severity of the original Treaty, adverse public opinion in Britain and political instability in France and a general feeling in the early stages that these were incidents happening in Germany's '...own back yard.'

© 2026

- Analysed what the western powers gained, in the short-term, from adopting a policy of appeasement and contrasted this with the long-term effects of the policy. Firstly, assessing the effect on Hitler's ambitions and expectations re: western responses to future actions and secondly considering the effect it had on the Soviet Union where Stalin suspected that the western allies were hoping for a war between communism and Nazism, which led him to sign the Nazi-Soviet Pact in August 1939.
- Sometimes generated a supported overall judgement on the balance between short-term gains and longer-term disadvantages of appeasement as a policy.

Limited responses

- Provided a chronological account of some of Hitler's actions and how they challenged the Versailles settlement.
- Sometime explained Hitler's foreign policy objectives.
- In some cases, suggested that appeasement was a policy adopted by the League of Nations.
- Sometimes described international issues where appeasement was not a significant factor, like the Manchurian Crisis.

© 2026

HISTORY

Paper 9489/31
Interpretations Question

Key messages

What candidates did well

- Many candidates demonstrated careful consideration of the extract before beginning their answer.
- Such answers maintained a clear focus on the extract and the argument of the historian who wrote it throughout.
- Many answers were well explained and illustrated with relevant quotations from the extract.
- Many answers maintained a focus on who or what the historian held responsible for the First World War, Holocaust or Cold War.
- Most answers engaged with sub-messages of the extract and many identified at least one element of the main argument.

What candidates needed to improve

- Some answers took a paragraph-by-paragraph approach to the extract which limited the possibilities for grasping the main argument.
- Some responses claimed there was a different approach in each paragraph rather than seeing the interpretation as a whole.
- Some answers contained lengthy descriptions of the context or discussions of the work of other historians when the extract should be the focus of the response.
- It is not necessary to evaluate the extract by writing about other elements of the topic which have not been mentioned in the extract.
- In some responses, the use of ellipses weakened illustration of the argument.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Comprehensive responses

- Some responses were focused on the overall argument of the extract and recognised that Germany was blamed for the outbreak of the First World War.
- Some responses recognised the importance of the Schlieffen Plan for the main argument and developed their argument from the extract to show why, in 1914, the deterrent failed to work.
- Many responses identified elements of the main argument.
- Many responses understood sub-messages of the interpretation and illustrated these with detailed reference to the extract.

Limited responses

- Some responses were inconsistent, for example arguing that Germany was not blamed in the first paragraph but was blamed in the final paragraph.
- Many responses contained contextual knowledge about the arms race, militarism and the alliance system which were less directly relevant to the interpretation in the extract.
- Some candidates speculated about the name of the historian instead of focusing on the interpretation.
- In some instances, candidates worked through the extract, explaining what was written rather than who or what was being blamed for the outbreak of the First World War.

© 2026

Question 2

Comprehensive responses

- Many responses recognised that there was an intentionalist element to the argument and understood that genocide was implied in Nazi plans to restructure European society.
- Some responses understood that part of the argument could be labelled as a structuralist approach and recognised the importance of the technocrats.
- Some excellent answers illustrated and explained elements of the main argument and understood the link between them.
- Many answers were supported with detailed references to the extract and clear explanation.
- Some answers explained why the extract could not support a functionalist label.

Limited responses

- Some answers identified elements of the main argument without using the extract to support these.
- Some answers contained detailed reference to the work of other historians or the wider context of the Holocaust and needed a closer focus on the extract.
- In some answers, candidates attempted to make the extract fit a pre-determined idea about an approach. For example, some tried to make the extract fit a chaotic bureaucracy/working towards the Fuhrer version of structuralism which could not be supported from the extract.
- Some answers attempted to use the labels of structuralism and functionalism as if they meant the same thing or were interchangeable.

Question 3

Comprehensive responses

- Most answers understood that explaining the causation of the Cold War was the focus of the task.
- Many responses recognised the revisionist interpretation presented in the extract.
- Many answers identified at least one element of the main argument.
- Many responses understood that the United States was blamed for refusing to negotiate with Stalin over the Berlin Crisis.
- Some responses understood that the division of Berlin was portrayed as a deliberate choice by the Americans and recognised the importance of this for the main argument.
- Many answers made a valid distinction between the main argument and sub-messages.

Limited responses

- Some responses misread the first paragraph as the historian's view of the Berlin Airlift rather than the way in which the United States chose to portray it.
- Some answers argued that the extract was post-revisionist and attempted to blame the USSR in a way not supported by the extract.
- Some responses needed to focus on the extract rather than the context.
- Some answers tried to apply a standard revisionist approach by either blaming Truman or economic imperialism and needed to focus on what was argued rather than what they expected to find.

© 2026

HISTORY

Paper 9489/32
Interpretations Question

Key messages

What candidates did well

- Many candidates demonstrated careful consideration of the extract before beginning their answer.
- Such answers maintained a clear focus on the extract and the argument of the historian who wrote it throughout.
- Many answers were well explained and illustrated with relevant quotations from the extract.
- Many answers maintained a focus on who or what the historian held responsible for the First World War, Holocaust or Cold War.
- Most answers engaged with sub-messages of the extract and many identified at least one element of the main argument.

What candidates needed to improve

- Some answers took a paragraph-by-paragraph approach to the extract which limited the possibilities for grasping the main argument.
- Some responses claimed there was a different approach in each paragraph rather than seeing the interpretation as a whole.
- Some answers contained lengthy descriptions of the context or discussions of the work of other historians when the extract should be the focus of the response.
- It is not necessary to evaluate the extract by writing about other elements of the topic which have not been mentioned in the extract.
- In some responses, the use of ellipses weakened illustration of the argument.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Comprehensive responses

- Many responses were focused on the overall argument of the extract and recognised that the three authoritarian monarchs were blamed for the outbreak of the First World War.
- Some responses recognised that the monarchs felt vulnerable and that this encouraged them to engage in a show of national strength.
- Many responses identified elements of the main argument.
- Many responses understood sub-messages of the interpretation and illustrated these with detailed reference to the extract.

Limited responses

- Some responses argued that Germany was blamed rather than all three monarchs.
- Some candidates speculated about the name of the historian instead of focusing on the interpretation.
- In some instances, candidates worked through the extract, explaining what was written rather than who or what was being blamed for the outbreak of the First World War.
- Some responses attempted to evaluate the extract by commenting on what was ‘missing’ and these needed to focus on explaining and illustrating the interpretation which the extract contained.

© 2026

Question 2

Comprehensive responses

- Many responses recognised that the approach taken by the historian was intentionalist.
- Some excellent responses understood that the Nazis constantly looked for more radical ways to deal with the Jews but that subordinates were left to work out how a state policy of genocide would be carried out.
- These answers understood the link between the two elements of the main argument and recognised the importance of policy being centrally driven for the interpretation.
- Many answers were supported with detailed references to the extract and clear explanation.
- Some answers explained why the extract could not support a structuralist label.

Limited responses

- Some answers identified elements of the main argument without using the extract to support these.
- Some answers contained detailed reference to the work of other historians or the wider context of the Holocaust and needed a closer focus on the extract.
- In some answers, candidates attempted to make the extract fit an approach which could not be supported. For example, some claimed the extract was structuralist.

Question 3

Comprehensive responses

- Most answers understood that explaining the causation of the Cold War was the focus of the task.
- Many responses recognised that the approach used by the historian who wrote the extract was post-revisionist and there was some blame on both the US and USSR.
- Many answers identified at least one element of the main argument, most often blaming the USSR for its expansionist policy.
- Many responses understood that the United States was blamed for responding too slowly and too late.
- Many answers made a valid distinction between the main argument and sub-messages.

Limited responses

- Some responses misread the extract as justifying the behaviour of the United States.
- Some answers claimed that the extract was post-revisionist although they based their answer on a misunderstanding/neither side to blame argument which could not be supported.
- Some responses needed to focus on the extract rather than the context or historiographical debate.

© 2026

HISTORY

Paper 9489/33
Interpretations Question

Key messages

What candidates did well

- Many candidates demonstrated careful consideration of the extract before beginning their answer.
- Such answers maintained a clear focus on the extract and the argument of the historian who wrote it throughout.
- Many answers were well explained and illustrated with relevant quotations from the extract.
- Many answers maintained a focus on who or what the historian held responsible for the First World War, Holocaust or Cold War.
- Most answers engaged with sub-messages of the extract and many identified at least one element of the main argument.

What candidates needed to improve

- Some answers took a paragraph-by-paragraph approach to the extract which limited the possibilities for grasping the main argument.
- Some responses claimed there was a different approach in each paragraph rather than seeing the interpretation as a whole.
- Some answers contained lengthy descriptions of the context or discussions of the work of other historians when the extract should be the focus of the response.
- It is not necessary to evaluate the extract by writing about other elements of the topic which have not been mentioned in the extract.
- In some responses, the use of ellipses weakened illustration of the argument.

Comments on specific questions

Question 1

Comprehensive responses

- Some responses were focused on the overall argument of the extract and recognised that Germany and Austria were blamed for the outbreak of the First World War.
- Some excellent responses recognised that both countries had much to gain from war and much to lose from peace.
- Many responses identified elements of the main argument and illustrated these by using details from the extract.
- Many responses maintained a consistent focus on the extract throughout their response.

Limited responses

- Some responses needed to focus fully on the extract rather than the context.
- Some candidates speculated about the name of the historian instead of focusing on the interpretation.
- In some instances, candidates worked through the extract, explaining what was written rather than who or what was being blamed for the outbreak of the First World War.

© 2026

Question 2

Comprehensive responses

- Many responses recognised that there were functionalist and intentionalist elements to the argument and understood that Operation Barbarossa marked a turning point.
- Some responses understood that the plans for war against the Soviet Union included Jewish and non-Jewish people.
- Some excellent answers illustrated and explained elements of the main argument and understood the link between them, seeing how vague plans changed into the Final Solution.
- Many answers were supported with detailed references to the extract and clear explanation.
- The importance of developments in Poland for the shape of things to come in Russia was explained in some answers.

Limited responses

- Some answers identified elements of the main argument without using the extract to support these.
- Some answers contained detailed reference to the work of other historians, or the wider context of the Holocaust, and needed a closer focus on the extract.
- In some answers, candidates attempted to make the extract fit a pre-determined idea about an approach. For example, some tried to make the extract fit a typical functionalist approach where the Holocaust developed through contingency.
- Some answers misread references to Heydrich as being indicative of a structuralist approach.

Question 3

Comprehensive responses

- Many responses recognised that a significant part of the interpretation blamed the Soviet Union for its expansionism.
- Many answers demonstrated sound understanding by explaining and illustrating the argument about the Soviet Union from the extract.
- Some excellent answers understood that the approach used by the historian was post-post-revisionist.
- Many responses understood that the United States was portrayed as reacting to pressure from other states which were alarmed by Soviet expansionism, and that this was not blameworthy.
- Many answers paid close attention to the extract throughout their response.

Limited responses

- Some responses recognised that the approach was post-post-revisionist and needed to focus on the argument rather than looking for typical characteristics such as Stalin's personality or ideology.
- Some answers argued that the extract was post-revisionist and attempted to blame the United States in a way not supported by the extract.
- Some responses needed to focus on the extract rather than the context.
- Some responses misread the elements of the extract and tried to argue that the historian was justifying Stalin's behaviour.

© 2026

HISTORY

Paper 9489/41
Depth Study

Key messages

What candidates did well

- Structured responses effectively, with clearly articulated introductions and conclusions. Separate factors were divided into discrete paragraphs.
- Provided balanced responses, often with an appropriate range of examples.
- Followed the rubric and answered two questions from the same section.

What candidates needed to improve

- Responses to a number of questions did not necessarily adhere to the chronological framework set out. Candidates should always aim to provide examples which are directly relevant to the dates provided in the question.
- Support arguments with a greater degree of supporting material.
- Use criteria to determine the basis on which judgements will be made.
- Provide a clear line of reasoning throughout the essay.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Comprehensive responses

- Explained that Mussolini held traditional attitudes towards women's roles in society and the economy.
- Contained specific examples of Mussolini's policies specifically aimed at women, such as those which aimed to limit women's employment opportunities and to promote domestic roles, for instance as part of the Battle for Births.
- Analysed the impact of these policies on Italian women's lives, using knowledge of birth rates and employment patterns to reach a clear judgement in response to the question.

Limited responses

- Tended to rely on examples of wider economic policies.
- Asserted that Mussolini's policies either succeeded or failed and needed to provide supporting material directly relating to their outcomes.

Question 2

Comprehensive responses

- Made clear reference to policies aimed towards non-Russian nationalities in the specified time period, giving precise examples of groups affected by the promotion of Russian culture and language at the expense of other groups.
- Used wider policies, such as Collectivisation, to explain consequences for non-Russian nationalities, such as Ukrainians.

Limited responses

- Used wider policies, not specifically related to non-Russian nationalities, and needed to link them securely to their impacts on these groups.
- Did not include examples of policies which were aimed directly at these groups.
- Strayed outside of the scope of the question by relating to examples from after 1941.

© 2026

Question 3

Comprehensive responses
- Understood and explained the reasons for the unpopularity of the Weimar government, including examples which related directly to the rise of Hitler and the Nazis from 1929, such as economic policies, clearly explaining how they contributed to the outcome.
- Provided alternative explanations, such as the economic context and the reasons for the appeal of the Nazis to different groups in German society.

Limited responses
- Gave examples of Weimar governments' unpopularity largely from the period 1919–1923 and needed to develop this context with examples from 1929 in order to convincingly explain Hitler's appointment.
- Went beyond the chronological timeframe of the question and needed to focus specifically on the period up to January 1933.

Question 4

Too few responses seen to allow for comments to be made.

Section B

Question 5

Comprehensive responses
- Clearly understood and articulated the meaning of social mobility and provided examples of which groups did, and did not, benefit from it.
- Used contemporary examples such as the GI Bill to explain how its provisions allowed for greater access to education and employment opportunities.
- Provided balance by considering how discrimination against groups such as African Americans hindered the extent of social mobility that they could enjoy.

Limited responses
- Described changes in American society and needed to demonstrate specifically how developments led to social mobility.
- Discussed geographical, rather than social, mobility, for instance through the Federal Highways Act.
- Focused specifically on African Americans discussing developments such as the Brown ruling and needed to link explicitly to social mobility and to discuss American society as a whole.

Question 6

Comprehensive responses
- Showed knowledge of President Nixon's domestic policies, for instance in areas such as economics, environmentalism and civil rights to allow for a clear judgement to be made.
- Discussed the impact of the Watergate scandal on his presidency and the extent to which his domestic policy programme was overshadowed by it.

Limited responses
- Focused mainly or exclusively on foreign policy to argue that domestic policy was unsuccessful and needed to directly address the conceptual focus of the question by providing examples of domestic policy.

Question 7

Comprehensive responses
- Provided detailed examples of gender inequality in the timeframe stipulated in the question, providing specific case studies relating to, for instance, inequality in employment or sexual harassment.

Limited responses
- Used examples from before the 1980s to illustrate gender inequality. Responses needed to address the question specifically through the use of examples relevant to the time period stipulated in the question.

© 2026

Question 8

Comprehensive responses

- Were able to provide a variety of examples for both political and military reasons in order to produce a balanced argument.
- Some candidates focused on the political dimension within the United States and illustrated their argument by discussing Nixon's pledge to achieve 'peace with honour.' Growing opposition was also commonly included. The political status of South Vietnam was also used in some responses.
- Military failure often related to the tactics of the Vietcong and American forces' inability to adapt to the conditions.

Limited responses

- Often covered these arguments in superficial detail. When identifying domestic opposition to the war as a factor, they could have included specific examples of why it grew, such as the Tet Offensive, and examples of protest, such as Kent State University.

Section C

Questions 9 – 12

Too few responses seen to allow for comments to be made.

© 2026

HISTORY

Paper 9489/42
Depth Study

Key messages

What candidates did well

- Structured responses effectively, with clearly articulated introductions and conclusions. Separate factors were divided into discrete paragraphs.
- Provided balanced responses, often with an appropriate range of examples.
- Followed the rubric and answered two questions from the same section.

What candidates needed to improve

- Responses to some questions did not necessarily adhere to the chronological framework set out. Candidates should always aim to provide examples which are directly relevant to the dates provided in the question.
- Use criteria to determine the basis on which judgements will be made.
- Provide a clear line of reasoning throughout the essay.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Comprehensive responses

- Provided a clear and detailed explanation of the nature and extent of repression, for instance through the OVRA.
- Compared the stated factor with alternative explanations, commonly propaganda and popular policies such as the OND or foreign policy successes.
- Reached a clear judgement about the relative significance of the different examples used.

Limited responses

- Used examples from before 1925 to exemplify repression, which better explained how Mussolini gained power.
- At least partially focused response on acquisition rather than maintenance of power. Candidates needed to maintain their attention on the period after Mussolini's personal dictatorship had been established.
- Provided a narrow range of alternatives, which did not always explicitly explain how they contributed to the maintenance of power.

Question 2

Comprehensive responses

- Demonstrated knowledge of the aims of the plans, most commonly to rapidly industrialise the Soviet Union for security purposes, to create a socialist society and to establish Stalin's legacy.
- Provided a balanced analysis of the extent to which these aims were achieved, weighing up the achievements against the human cost, including that of collectivisation.

Limited responses

- Sometimes lost sight of the need for analysis and provided descriptions of events such as dekulakisation or of the Stakhanovite Movement. Candidates should always tailor their knowledge to the specific demands of the question.

© 2026

Question 3

Comprehensive responses
- Were able to compare the influence of foreign policy on economic policy to the necessity of recovery from the Great Depression and the government's ability to keep Hitler's promises of work and bread.
- Analysed how influences might have shifted from the 1930s or that even responses to the economic crisis could be linked to foreign policy, as rearmament and conscription served both purposes.
- Employed detailed knowledge of economic policy, in conjunction with foreign policy goals.

Limited responses
- Sometimes focused on foreign policy actions, for instance describing the Remilitarisation of the Rhineland. Candidates needed to show the link between the two areas of policy.

Question 4

Too few responses were seen to allow for comments to be made.

Section B

Question 5

Comprehensive responses
- Demonstrated detailed knowledge of the reasons for Truman's popularity, with particular focus on a comparison of the differences of his and Dewey's personalities and presidential campaigns.
- Understood how Truman's policies appealed to different groups, such as union members, African Americans and Jews and were able to discuss the 'Truman Coalition'.

Limited responses
- Focused heavily on the reasons that the Democrats won and needed to be able to explore Republican weaknesses in more depth.

Question 6

Comprehensive responses
- Were clear about what they understood Black Power to represent and which organisations and key individuals were associated with it.
- Provided a balanced assessment of its achievements.
- Highlighted the focus on economic independence, racial pride and community programmes in healthcare and education as positives.
- Pointed out the lack of significant legal achievements, damage to relationships with white supporters of African American civil rights and controversy surrounding groups and figures like the Black Panthers and Malcolm X as counter arguments.

Limited responses
- Included material on groups and individuals not associated with Black Power, such as Martin Luther King and NAACP. Responses needed to focus on the group and time period specified in the question.

Question 7

Too few responses were seen to allow for comments to be made.

Question 8

Too few responses were seen to allow for comments to be made.

Section C

Question 9

Comprehensive responses
- Covered the whole period identified in the question and were able to provide detailed support for the various treaties signed during the period, including SALT I and the Helsinki Accords.

© 2026

- Provided balance through a discussion of the weaknesses of these agreements and continued flashpoints which contributed to continuing tension, most notably the Invasion of Afghanistan in 1979.

Limited responses
- Relied on a narrow range of examples and sometimes incorporated events prior to 1963. Candidates should maintain a clear focus on the time period stipulated in the question.

Question 10

Comprehensive responses
- Provided examples which covered the whole Cold War and were able to compare the significance of Taiwan to various other causes of tension such as the Korean and Vietnam wars.
- Also considered periods of improved relations, most notably as a result of the Sino-Soviet Split.
- Showed awareness of developments in the relations between the two nations in the 1980s.

Limited responses
- Tended to cover a narrower time frame and range of examples, typically stopping in the 1970s. Some consideration of Reagan's relations with China would have been helpful.

Question 11

Too few responses were seen to allow for comments to be made

Question 12

Comprehensive responses
- Were able to identify and explain a range of examples of Iraq's motives in declaring war on Iran and to support them in appropriate detail.
- Reasons put forward commonly included Saddam's personal ambitions, territorial demands, fears of an Islamic revolution in Iraq and the weakness of Iran.

Limited responses
- Used a range of examples without depth of supporting material.
- Lost focus on the causes of the war to discuss its course and the reasons for its length, sometimes referring to international support, which did not apply in 1980. Candidates should only include material of direct relevance to the question.

© 2026

HISTORY

Paper 9489/43
Depth Study

Key messages

What candidates did well

- Structured responses effectively, with clearly articulated introductions and conclusions. Separate factors were divided into discrete paragraphs.
- Provided balanced responses, with an appropriate range of examples.
- Followed the rubric and answered two questions from the same section.

What candidates needed to improve

- Responses to a number of questions did not necessarily adhere to the chronological framework set out. Candidates should always aim to provide examples which are directly relevant to the dates provided in the question.
- Use criteria to determine the basis on which judgements will be made.
- Provide a clear line of reasoning throughout the essay.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Comprehensive responses

- Argued that the Biennio Rosso alarmed elite groups and that the violent response of the Blackshirts attracted their support and were able to link this to the threatened March on Rome.
- Achieved balance through alternative explanations such as the impact of World War I, failure of trasformismo politics and the appeal of Mussolini and his Fascist movement.

Limited responses

- Provided a narrow range of examples and needed to add a greater degree of supporting material.

Question 2

Comprehensive responses

- Identified Stalin's aims in foreign policy as criteria and linked a range of examples of policy to them in order to reach judgements.
- Often compared his policies before the rise of Hitler to his search for Collective Security and subsequent decision to sign the Nazi-Soviet Pact having failed to do so.
- Widened their focus beyond Europe and considered Stalin's policies in relation to China and Japan.

Limited responses

- Provided a narrow range of examples and sometimes relied heavily on the Nazi-Soviet Pact. Candidates needed to consider a wider range and also discuss policies in the East.
- Drifted away from foreign policy to discuss Stalin's rise to power or industrial development. Responses should aim to focus securely on the question set.

© 2026

Question 3

Comprehensive responses
- Recognised that the phrase 'consolidation of power' related particularly to the period 1933–34 and were able to explore why the left-wing parties were not prepared to work together or the responses from the churches and Nationalist parties.
- Showed detailed knowledge of the key events of this period, including the Reichstag Fire, Enabling Act and Night of the Long Knives to explain how Hitler secured control.

Limited responses
- Described how Hitler acquired power and became Chancellor in 1933. Candidates needed to ensure that their focus was specifically on the period of consolidation.

Question 4

Too few responses were seen to allow for comments to be made.

Section B

Question 5

Comprehensive responses
- Displayed sound knowledge of the work of the SCLC in the 1950s, including the role of Martin Luther King and how it influenced the development of the civil rights movement in the 1960s.

Limited responses
- Tended to focus more on the NAACP and mistakenly credited the SCLC with a key role in the Montgomery Bus Boycott. Candidates needed to focus on the SCLC's work to coordinate Christian churches' anti-segregation action and development of peaceful protest.

Question 6

Too few responses seen to allow for comments to be made.

Question 7

Too few responses seen to allow for comments to be made.

Question 8

Comprehensive responses
- Made an explicit comparison between the ideological differences of each side and explored how they led to growing tensions, providing specific examples.
- Contrasted this with the USA and Soviet Union's attempts to seek security and economic influence, largely using Europe and Asia to exemplify this.

Limited responses
- Described ideological differences without providing an analysis of increased tension. Candidates should ensure that they explicitly link the material used to the question.

Section C

Question 9

Comprehensive responses
- Provided a detailed and balanced assessment of Khrushchev's attitudes and actions, supported by a range of examples.
- Argued that Khrushchev was committed to an improved relationship with the USA and gave specific examples to demonstrate this, such as the various summits in the 1950s.
- Highlighted Khrushchev's actions on occasions such as the Hungarian Uprising to identify and explain continuities with Stalin's approach.

© 2026

Limited responses
- Relied on a narrow range of examples, sometimes drawn from a relatively narrow timeframe, for instance the 1950s.
- Provided examples which did not relate to Khrushchev's time in office. Responses should employ material directly relevant to the question.

Question 10

Comprehensive responses
- Contained wide ranging and detailed information in order to explain how and why public knowledge played such an important role in bringing the conflict to a close, including specific examples and linking the increasing unpopularity to Nixon's policies.
- Provided a balanced argument by pointing towards military failures and the growing cost as alternative arguments, demonstrating the interaction between these arguments.

Limited responses
- Tended at times to become slightly narrative, describing the course of the war.

Question 11

Too few responses were seen to allow for comments to be made.

Question 12

Comprehensive responses
- Balanced argument by providing examples of how Nasser benefited in comparison to Israel, particularly in enhancing his personal position.

Limited responses
- Were often focused on the positive impacts on Egypt than Israel, for example, its subsequent relationship with Israel.

© 2026