

HISTORY

Paper 0977/11
Paper 11

Key messages

Successful responses are dependent upon candidates reading the questions carefully before they begin, in order to understand exactly what is being asked and to give themselves the opportunity to write focused and balanced answers. Any given dates in the question should be carefully noted to help to ensure that their responses only include relevant details.

In more extensive responses candidates should be encouraged to organise their points into distinct paragraphs, otherwise points can become blurred together or alternatively candidates can lose focus on the question set.

In **part (c)** responses candidates should try to write evaluative, rather than purely summative, conclusions.

General comments

Successful responses were able to demonstrate good factual knowledge and understanding of both the Core and Depth Study questions. These responses included clear and accurate communication of ideas, whether explaining the reasons for past events and historical features or building an argument to reach a balanced historical judgement. Less successful responses, whilst often demonstrating sound factual knowledge, found it difficult to apply the knowledge to the question set. These responses tended not to be divided into paragraphs and were characterised by a descriptive list of facts lacking in explanation.

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

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

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

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

Part (c) requires facts, explanation and analysis. The most effective responses argue both for and against the focus of the question and reach a balanced judgement. When a question asks, 'Are you surprised a particular event happened?' it is important to include explanations on both sides of the argument. A valid conclusion should go beyond being a summary of what has already been stated by addressing, 'how far' or 'how successful', depending on the question set. Weaker responses often focused only on one side of the argument. These responses could be improved by including more contextual examples on both sides of the argument to produce a balanced response.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1, 2, 3 and 4

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

Questions 5 and 6

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

Question 5

- (a) This question was well answered and saw some very strong responses. These responses demonstrated a detailed knowledge of Clemenceau's aims at Versailles and included four relevant, concisely expressed points. Points made included: 'Clemenceau wanted Germany to pay for the damage caused to France during the war'. 'He wanted security for France and thus wanted to reduce Germany's armed forces'. 'He wanted Alsace Lorraine back from Germany'. Some weaker responses drifted away from the central focus of Clemenceau's aims to discuss what Clemenceau achieved at Versailles. Other less successful responses included incorrect details.
- (b) Some responses misunderstood the term 'self-determination' and interpreted the term as a personal quality or something to do with the League of Nations, rather than one referring to peoples of a colony or area of land wanting the right to rule over themselves. The most successful responses explained two reasons as to why Wilson's belief in self-determination was important. They explained that self-determination was one of Wilson's Fourteen Points, and that it meant that different peoples should have the right to rule themselves. It led to the formation of countries such as Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia and Poland. A second reason often explained was that Wilson's idea of self-determination caused conflict with the British and French representatives as both Britain and France ruled over large empires and if Wilson's plans were adopted this would threaten their control over their empires.
- (c) This question was well answered. There were a number of well-developed and balanced responses which discussed the extent to which loss of territory was the most serious consequence of the Versailles Settlement for Germany. Stronger responses identified the territory taken away from Germany and most commonly explained the economic impact this had on Germany. Examples of territory often included the loss of Alsace Lorraine and the temporary loss of the Saar Basin which both included valuable iron ore deposits and rich coal mines, the profits from which would have helped the Germans to pay the reparations. These strong responses then recognised other consequences for Germany and most commonly explained the impact of reparations, the War Guilt Clause and demilitarisation on Germany. Some weaker responses contained detailed knowledge of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles but lacked an assessment of the impact of these terms on Germany. Others did not identify any territories and wrote in general terms about the consequences. These responses could have been improved by explaining why the terms led to hardship for the German citizens.

Question 6

- (a) This question was answered well by most candidates, who were able to identify occasions on which Hitler broke the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles. Rearmament and the remilitarisation of the Rhineland were the two instances most commonly mentioned. Other ways cited included Hitler refusing to pay anymore reparations and his Anschluss with Austria in 1938. Some weaker responses described Hitler's aims without mentioning specific events. It is important that candidates read the question carefully. Other less successful responses included inaccurate information. Common misconceptions included the reunification of Germany and Austria through Anschluss (when the two had never been united) and the retaking of the Sudetenland in 1938 (which had never been part of Germany).
- (b) There were mixed responses to this question. Weaker responses identified the reasons for appeasement - usually the British desire to maintain peace, the need to buy time to prepare for war and the feeling in Britain that Germany had been harshly treated at Versailles. However, these responses were usually rather general and did not refer to specific examples of the policy of appeasement. Other responses made the argument that appeasement was all about trade, possibly confusing with Lloyd George's concerns at Versailles in 1919. Stronger responses were characterised by two explanations. Most commonly they considered the impact of the Great Depression on Britain and the threat of communism. The rationale behind the threat of communism was clearly explained. The spread of communism was considered a great threat after the First

World War. British politicians feared the power of the Soviet Union in helping spread communism to Western Europe. Hitler was known as an enemy of communism and he was acting as a buffer against the spread of Soviet communism. British politicians decided to appease Hitler to help strengthen his position against the Soviet Union and reduce the risk of communism spreading.

- (c) Stronger responses included contextual examples on how the increase in aggression from some states in the 1930s was caused by economic factors. They highlighted the effects of the Great Depression on usually Japan and Italy and explained their economic motivation to invade Manchuria and Abyssinia respectively. To produce a balanced response this was then contrasted with non-economic factors for the increase of aggression from some states such as the weakness of the League of Nations, Hitler's territorial ambitions, the counter-productive effects of appeasement and the political/nationalistic motives of aggressive powers. Some weaker responses did not restrict their answers to the 1930s and included events from the 1920s, such as the Corfu incident, to explain Italian aggression. They also sometimes included narrative on the reasons for the Great Depression. It is important to register the time limits in the question. Other less successful responses appeared uncertain of what the question meant by 'aggression'. These responses often included details on the unrest in Germany in the early 1930s and limited themselves to German domestic policies with no reference to the question.

Question 7

- (a) There were mixed responses to this question. Some candidates lacked knowledge of the Gulf of Tonkin incident and either did not answer the question or included incorrect information. Successful responses demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the incident. Credit was given for: American warships in the Gulf of Tonkin were attacked by North Vietnamese gunboats. As a result of this attack, the US Congress passed the Tonkin Gulf Resolution which gave President Johnson the authority to do what he thought necessary. Other relevant details most commonly cited were that the incident took place in August 1964 and that as a result of the attack, ground troops were sent to Vietnam in 1965.
- (b) This question was well answered. Strong responses demonstrated a good understanding of why US public opinion turned against the war. The two most common reasons identified were that the war was reported on American TV which had not happened before and the war was considered to be a waste of money and resources. The first identification was explained by developing the idea that American people were seeing the devastating effects of the USA's use of chemical weapons such as agent orange and napalm on Vietnamese civilians, as in the My Lai Massacre. This shocked the American people and resulted in massive protest against the Vietnam War. Other reasons identified and explained included the fact that the war had become unwinnable and thousands of young American soldiers were being killed. Weaker responses usually readily identified reasons but these needed to be fully developed into explanations.
- (c) There were mixed responses to this question. Candidates needed to produce a well-balanced answer to explain reasons why the US failed to contain the spread of communism and then provide examples to demonstrate the other side of the argument. Strong responses commonly used the war in Vietnam as an example of the US failing to contain the spread of communism. These responses included details from the war to explain how the US failed to defeat the Vietcong in South Vietnam and after the evacuation of US troops the South was overrun. As a result of Vietnam becoming communist the domino effect occurred whereby Laos and Cambodia also fell to communism. On the other side of the argument stronger responses then produced evidence and explanations from events in Cuba and/or Korea to prove US success in containing communism. Some weaker responses contained detailed accounts of events in Vietnam, Korea or Cuba without assessing of the impact of the actions towards containing communism. It is important to link points made to the question.

Question 8

- (a) This question was answered well by most candidates who had a good understanding of the events in Hungary in 1956. Successful responses included a number of concise and relevant events including: demonstrations resulted in Stalin's statue being removed, Nagy was announced as Prime Minister, he announced that Hungary was to leave the Warsaw Pact and on 4 November Soviet tanks invaded Budapest. Weaker responses included events after 1956.

- (b) This question was well answered. Strong responses were characterised by the explanation of two reasons why Czechoslovakia was invaded in 1968. The most common reason explained was that the Soviets were afraid that Dubcek's ideas would spread to other Communist countries in Eastern Europe. His reforms included a free press, freedom of speech and reducing government control over industry. If these reforms were allowed in Czechoslovakia there was a worry that people in other communist countries would demand the same freedoms. Other factors identified and explained included the fact that the USSR would look weak if they did not take decisive action and they were worried this would weaken the Communist Bloc in the Cold War against the USA. Weaker responses shifted the focus of the question and described Dubcek's reforms, rather than emphasising why Czechoslovakia was invaded.
- (c) Stronger responses were characterised by demonstrating a good understanding of Gorbachev's policy in the Soviet Union from 1985 to 1991. Successful responses explained how Gorbachev made little effort to defend Soviet power in Eastern Europe. He was a new type of leader in the Soviet Union who realised that the Soviet Union was in economic trouble and spending too much on arms in the unwinnable war in Afghanistan. He believed in different policies such as Glasnost and Perestroika. He made it clear that he would not oppose attempts at democracy in Warsaw Pact countries and he would not send Red Army troops into these countries to stay tied to the Soviet Union. He would let Eastern European countries decide their futures. These responses then produced a balanced argument by identifying and explaining other reasons for the collapse of Soviet power in Eastern Europe, most commonly the rise and impact of Solidarity. Weaker responses were characterised by a narrative of Gorbachev's reforms, with no reference to the collapse of Soviet power.

Section B: Depth Studies

Questions 9 and 10

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

Question 11

This question received the most responses from candidates in the Depth Studies section.

- (a) The majority of candidates showed a good understanding of what happened on the Night of Long Knives, demonstrating their knowledge of the involvement of the SS, Hitler's granting of a period of leave to the SA and the fate of Rohm and leading SA figures, as well as the murder of former Chancellor von Schleicher. Some responses sought to explain the nature of Hitler's anxieties about Rohm and the SA and the position of the German army at this time. This was obviously relevant to Hitler's course of action but it was not central to the thrust of the question which required an account of the events. Other responses confused the Night of Long Knives with Kristallnacht.
- (b) There were many strong responses to this question in which the success of the Weimar Governments in the 1920s and the lack of appeal of extremist parties were identified and explained as reasons why the Nazi Party had little success before 1930. Responses tended to be stronger on the strength of German industry and culture in the Stresemann years. They often included evidence of the successes of Stresemann in economic and foreign affairs, resulting in the German population seeing little reason to change to an untested, extreme right-wing party. Less successful responses were weaker on the Nazi side, limiting their response to identifications such as, 'they were an extreme party' and 'the Munich Putsch was a failure'. These identifications needed to be explained by emphasising the violent nature of the Nazis and the resulting lack of appeal. A minority of candidates drifted away from the question by outlining the factors that propelled Hitler into power between 1930 and 1933 and arguing that they were absent in the 1920s.
- (c) There were mixed responses to this question. Most candidates were secure on the events surrounding the Reichstag Fire and explained how Hitler exploited this event to attack and effectively destroy the communists as political rivals, arresting and imprisoning many of them. More could have referred to how this impacted on the elections of March 1933 which would have supported this side of the argument. On the other side of this question stronger responses appreciated that the time span was limited to 1933 and explained the impact of the passing of the Enabling Act as an important event in Hitler's consolidation of power in 1933. They detailed the terms of the Act and how he used the act to consolidate his power providing examples such as:

creating a one-party state, destroying the power of the trade unions and purging the civil service. Weaker responses saw the Enabling Act and the Decree for the Protection of People and State as the same thing, following on immediately in the aftermath of the Reichstag Fire. These responses therefore asserted or implied that the crackdown on the communists immediately after the Fire was carried out under the Enabling Act when in fact this was still to come. Other weaker responses included details of Hitler's rise to power which lacked relevance to this question, for example ignoring the limits of the question which was solely concerned with 1933. There were knowledgeable explanations of the Night of Long Knives, the death of Hindenburg, the army oath and the increasingly hostile anti-Jewish policies and actions. It is important that candidates read the question carefully to ensure the correct time span and note the key words in the question, in this case 'events' which led to Hitler's consolidation of power in 1933.

Question 12

- (a) A significant number of responses included details on the events of Kristallnacht when Jews suffered personal attacks by the Nazis and attacks on synagogues, shops and private houses. However, Kristallnacht happened in 1938. Successful responses included details of actions taken by the Nazis against Jewish businesses in 1933. Credit was awarded for non-violent methods such as 'the boycott of Jewish businesses', 'Jewish businesses were identified with the Star of David', 'posters on shop windows told people to stay away' and 'SA men stood outside the shops deterring entry'. Other responses drifted from the focus of the question to explain why Hitler hated the Jews.
- (b) Strong responses identified and explained two reasons why mass rallies were important. The most common explanation was that it was an excellent propaganda opportunity to show the power and strength of the regime, with leading Nazis such as Goebbels and Hitler making persuasive speeches whilst emphasising Nazi ideals. These reinforced the personality of Hitler and encouraged support for the Nazi regime. Successful responses also explained that the rallies associated with the Nazis brought excitement to the Germans, such as those at Nuremberg with military bands, marching and displays often at night by torchlight, to create interest, support and loyalty. A small number of candidates struggled to understand the term 'mass rallies'.
- (c) There were some good responses to this question which were well organised and included carefully selected and relevant details. In agreement with the hypothesis, responses explained the control that the Nazis had over German society. They commonly explained this in terms of the terror and force used to suppress any opposition, discussing the Gestapo who had unlimited powers to search houses, arrest people on suspicion and send them to concentration camps without trial or explanation. Many Germans were frightened to speak out against the regime even if they wanted to. Control was also exercised through the media, and evident in the control over women and education. The strongest responses fully explained how and why this control took place and the resultant impact. These strong responses also gave consideration to ways in which the Nazis were not in control of all German people. They explained how many young people believed in freedom of expression and values which conflicted with those of the Nazis. They used the Edelweiss Pirates as an example and showed how they shared a strong distaste of the strict regimentation and sexual segregation of the Hitler Youth, so they often beat them up. During the war they carried out acts of sabotage, helped army deserters and even assassinated a Gestapo chief. The activities of the Swing Movement, the Kreisau Circle and members of the Church were also often used as examples of areas where the Nazis faced challenges to their ability to control German society. Weaker responses often adopted a narrative approach on the control exercised by the Nazis. It is important that reasons are identified and then supporting information linked to the question is given in answers. Other responses were one-sided and would have benefitted from identifying and explaining the few areas which the Nazis did not fully control.

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

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

HISTORY

Paper 0977/21
Paper 21

Key messages

- Candidates should avoid describing or summarising the source at the beginning of an answer. They should try to provide a direct answer to the question in the first sentence. The rest of the answer should be used to explain and support.
- Contextual knowledge should only be used to improve the quality of the answer – to explain and support it.
- When answering **Question 6**, the sources must be used. This question is primarily about the sources.
- When quoting from a source, the quotation in full should be given.
- Impressions and inferences from sources should always be supported with detail from the sources.
- When asked about the message of cartoons, candidates should try to focus on the point of view of the cartoonist.

General comments

The majority of candidates answered on the twentieth century option, although a number of responses to the nineteenth century topic were seen. The overall quality was mixed but this included many strong scripts. Candidates' contextual knowledge was often sound but some candidates were unsure how to address some of the questions. This was particularly true of **Questions 3** and **6** in the twentieth century option. A number of candidates did not attempt **Question 3**, and **Question 6** proved challenging for some.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: Nineteenth century topic

Question 1

This question produced a wide range of answers. Some candidates just paraphrased the source and kept to description and surface detail, without forming any impressions about the relationship. A small number provided impressions but they were not about the relationship between William and Bismarck. Valid impressions that candidates suggested included: Bismarck needed William, Bismarck usually got what he wanted from William and the relationship was volatile. It is important to remember that impressions need to be supported from the source. A small number of candidates managed to explain the overall impression which is that the relationship was one of mutual dependency.

Question 2

The first step in answering this question is to identify agreements and/or disagreements between the two sources, for example Bismarck gets his way in both sources, while the sources disagree over William's attitude towards Austria. A reasonable number of candidates managed to use these agreements or disagreements as reasons for finding Source C not surprising or surprising. The best responses evaluated one of the sources. Weaker answers were based on the provenances of the sources and did not use the content.

Question 3

Many candidates paraphrased the source and in effect repeated the surface information contained within it. Candidates would have improved their responses by making inferences from the source, for example about the relationship between Bismarck and William in the decision-making process. The best answers evaluated Source D either by cross reference to their knowledge or by considering the provenance of the source.

Question 4

The best answers brought together the big message of the cartoon, its context, and its purpose. A good number of candidates managed to do this. Their answers greatly benefited from their contextual knowledge. They were aware of the importance of the Austrian defeat in 1866 and the following annexation of some north German states by Prussia. This knowledge enabled them to explain how the cartoon's purpose may have been to warn the French about the threat from Prussia. These answers were supported by references to details in the cartoon. Most candidates were able to explain either a sub-message of the cartoon, for example Prussia is aggressive, or explain the context. This question is about the reasons why the cartoon was published. It is important that candidates, whether they are writing about the message, context or purpose of the cartoon, make it clear that they are suggesting reasons for publication.

Question 5

This question produced a wide range of answers. The best showed an understanding that the cartoonist's big message is that William grabbed all the glory for the achievement of unification but it was Bismarck who was actually the architect of it. Big messages are based on putting all the main details in the cartoon together, using it as a whole, and asking oneself, what is the big point that the cartoonist wants to get across? The sub-messages that many candidates gave were based on just one part of the cartoon, for example William was conceited, William was a fool and Bismarck was responsible for creating a united Germany. All of these valid answers were informed, even if implicitly, by contextual knowledge. Misinterpretations offered by some candidates, for example Bismarck was insignificant, William was responsible for unification, and William had lost his crown, were made when candidates were unable to bring knowledge to their reading of the cartoon.

Question 6

This question was answered reasonably well. Most candidates were able to explain how some sources support the hypothesis, for example Source B explains how Bismarck managed to persuade William not to attend the conference in Frankfurt. Better answers also showed how other sources disagree with the hypothesis, for example Source C shows how Bismarck failed to win William over and had to depend on the Crown Prince doing this for him. When sources are being used in response to this question it is important to explain, with a clear and direct reference to the relevant part of the source, how the source supports, or does not support, the hypothesis. It is also important to use each source separately. Sources may be grouped, for and against the hypothesis, but then each source in each group needs to be used by itself.

Option B: Twentieth century topic

Question 1

This question was generally answered well. There are many agreements between the two sources, for example they both claim that US failure to join the League weakened it, that Britain and France acting together was important for the League and that the League was popular. Disagreements are also there, for example Source A claims that Britain and France were to blame for the League's problems, while Source B blames the USA. A number of candidates summarised both sources first but most then went on to produce proper comparisons. Only a very small number neglected to make any kind of meaningful comparison. Agreements and disagreements were identified and explained carefully but only a few candidates managed to compare the big messages of the two sources – Source A argues the League had little chance of succeeding, while Source B claims that it could have worked but for the events of the 1930s which destroyed it. It is important to remember that disagreements need more explanation than agreements. With agreements it is enough to state, for example 'Both sources state that the Depression harmed the League.' Disagreements, however, need to be unpacked a little more, for example 'Source A states that the League never had a chance, while Source B states that it did have a chance of succeeding.' It is not enough to state, for example, 'The sources disagree over whether or not the League of Nations ever stood a chance of succeeding.'

Question 2

There were three valid approaches to this ‘purpose’ question and this made a wide range of answers possible. Candidates could focus on the context, the message of the cartoon, or its purpose. Many combined these approaches to produce very strong answers. Most candidates started their answers by using a contextual approach. They used their contextual knowledge to explain one reason why the cartoon was published in December 1917 was the fact that the US Senate had rejected the Treaty of Versailles (and therefore membership of the League) in the previous month. Many of these candidates also used the message of the cartoon as a reason for publication. For example, the cartoon suggests the League was going to be weak because the USA was not a member. Better answers considered the possible purpose of the cartoon as a reason for publication. Answers included: to criticise the USA for not joining and to put pressure on the USA to join. In the very best answers candidates either explained the big message of the cartoon or combined purpose, big message and context. The big message was taken as the League will fail because the USA refuses to join the League. It is important that candidates remember they are being asked for reasons why the cartoon was published. This makes it crucial that they do not just interpret the cartoon or explain its context or purpose, but that they use such analyses as reasons for publication of the cartoon. To help themselves do this, they should try to begin their answers with ‘This cartoon was published then because...’. Answers that did not provide a reason for publication could not achieve higher marks, no matter how good the analysis of the cartoon was. It is essential to answer the question set.

Question 3

Candidates struggled with this question. Some found it a challenge to find agreements or disagreements between the two sources. The essential agreements and disagreements are over Britain. They agree that Britain was trying to avoid its obligations but also disagree because of Baldwin’s claim that Britain was loyal to the League. A reasonable number of candidates found valid but less satisfactory agreements/disagreements, for example both sources suggest the League was weak, and Source D sees Britain as being to blame for the failure of the League, while Source E places the blame on the USA. Such agreements and disagreements could be used as the reason for arguing that Source D makes Source E surprising or not surprising. Few candidates went on to evaluate one or both sources. Less successful answers were based on the provenance of each source without making proper use of the content of the sources.

Question 4

Most candidates were more successful with this question. Only a small number limited their answers to describing surface details and there was much valid interpretation of the cartoons. Many candidates explained that both cartoons show the League to be failing. They were less successful on the disagreements but a reasonable number pointed out that in Source F the League is doing nothing, while in Source G, it is at least trying to get the USA to help. The best answers were from those candidates who focused on the opinions of the cartoonists and explained that they both were criticising the League for failing to act over Japan’s aggression in Manchuria.

Question 5

This question produced a wide range of responses. A small number of candidates struggled with producing impressions from Source H. Impressions are based on inferences from the source and give us something that the source does not directly state. These candidates tended to paraphrase the source and just described the actions of the USA. Better answers managed to produce impressions, for example that the USA was keen to be involved in international affairs but did not always go on to explain the overall impression from Source H – that the USA was keen to be involved in international affairs and that this was mainly from economic motives. The best answers went one step further and explained that the main impression we get from the source about the USA’s attitude towards international affairs is a good or a positive one (this had to be supported).

Question 6

It is crucial that candidates make careful use of the sources when answering this question. A number of candidates would have improved their responses by making use of the sources, rather than just writing about the failures of the League. The most common type of answer was where candidates used some of the sources to support the idea that the League’s failure was because the USA was not a member but they did not go on to also explain that other sources suggest other reasons for the failure. There were also a number of answers that referred to the sources very generally. When sources are being used in response to this

question it is important to explain, with a clear and direct reference to the relevant part of the source, how the source supports, or does not support, the hypothesis. It is also important to use each source separately. Sources may be grouped, for and against the hypothesis, but then each source in each group needs to be used by itself.

HISTORY

Paper 0977/41
Alternative to Coursework

Key messages

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

General comments

A small range of Depth Studies was undertaken in this examination session. Depth Study B: Germany, 1918 – 1945 was the most popular choice, followed by Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 1941. A number of candidates also attempted Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914-1918 and Depth Study C: Russia, 1905 – 1941. There were too few attempts at Depth Studies E (China), F (South Africa) or G (Israelis and Palestinians) to make any meaningful comments. Good responses had been well-planned and were able to use a wide range of material to give balanced responses with supported explanations. The best answers also gave supported judgements and conclusions, but few managed to provide a sustained line of argument throughout the response. There were very few rubric errors where candidates had attempted both questions from the Depth Study or multiple Depth Studies. Less successful answers contained much narrative or description or did not properly address the question that was set. These candidates wrote at great length about the topic or Depth Study in general, instead of focussing on the parameters set by the question. Some candidates missed the chronology set out in the question, which sometimes led to large sections lacking relevance. Candidates must read the question carefully before answering and ensure that their response focuses on importance/significance.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study A: The First World War, 1914 – 1918

Question 1 was more widely answered, though a good number of candidates attempted **Question 2**.

Question 1 was generally well answered. Candidates got to grips with the focus of the question and were deeply knowledgeable about the Schlieffen Plan and the resistance from Britain and France against the German advance in 1914. Most commonly cited were the key battles such as Mons and the Marne and some responses were able to provide a good level of detail in their descriptions and explanations. The main counterarguments seen examined the importance of Belgian resistance in slowing down the initial German advance westwards, as well as the speed of the Russian mobilisation in the East which helped cause a war on two fronts. The best answers provided some explanations, and a few were able to link factors together. Weaker responses tended to lack accurate or precise examples to support their arguments, with some answers getting confused about the exact chronology of the early stages of the war.

Question 2 was generally less well answered than **Question 1**. The stronger responses focused clearly on the causes of the stalemate on the Western Front and were able to provide reason why the machine gun was a significant weapon that pinned down enemy soldiers in the trenches due to its defensive capabilities. This was most commonly compared against other significant weapons in the early stages of the war that contributed to the stalemate, most notably artillery. Many candidates also examined the significance of the trench system itself and the lack of tactics used by military commanders to overcome the newer defensive style of warfare that was emerging on the Western Front in 1914 – 15. Weaker responses often confused machine guns with artillery, which led to inaccurate assertions about the significance of the weapon. A few candidates also made reference to the use of tanks on the Western Front which were only first used in 1916

in the Somme campaign- by this time the stalemate was well-established and the tank was an attempt to break the stalemate, and so was not a cause, which was the focus of this question.

Depth Study B: Germany, 1918 – 1945

Question 3 and **Question 4** were both popular choices among candidates, though more candidates opted for **Question 3**.

Question 3 was generally well answered. Candidates tended to have good knowledge and understanding of the importance of the invasion and occupation of the Ruhr, and many were able to describe or explain why this led to social and economic problems in Germany by 1924. Most responses examined the passive resistance, the French reactions to the strike action and the printing of money which led to hyperinflation in their arguments. This was then compared with other factors which led to socio-economic problems in Germany such as the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. Many candidates demonstrated an in-depth knowledge in this area and were able to provide some convincing arguments and reach supported conclusions on relative importance. Less successful responses made factual errors, some confusing the Ruhr region with the Rhineland, while a few answers gave inaccurate or partially accurate narratives of the causes of the hyperinflation. Some candidates went beyond the 1924 cut-off point for this question and examined events in the later 1920s. A small number of responses examined political problems such as the nature of the Weimar Constitution. This question asked candidates to focus on social and economic issues only.

Question 4 was generally less well answered than **Question 3**. Some candidates were able to accurately examine the significance of the Second World War in radicalising Nazi policies towards the Jews and commented on the use of the Einsatzgruppen and the decision taken by leading Nazis at the Wannsee Conference on the Final Solution. This was then balanced by examining the significance of events before the outbreak of war on anti-Semitic policies - most commonly cited were the boycotting of Jewish shops and businesses, the Nuremberg Laws and Kristallnacht. Some responses would have benefited from a deeper knowledge and understanding of anti-Semitic policies in Nazi Germany and Nazi occupied Europe. This would have helped to prevent generalised assertions and unsupported explanations.

Depth Study C: Russia, 1905 – 1941

A number of candidates attempted this Depth Study. **Question 5** attracted more responses, with only a small number attempting **Question 6**.

Question 5 saw some strong responses where candidates were able to examine a range of factors which weakened the Tsarist system of government by 1914. The best answers explained the importance of the 1905 Revolution in causing widespread riots and strikes across Russia after the Bloody Sunday incident, leading to many opposition groups demanding representation and even revolution. Candidates examined the terms of the October Manifesto and particularly the setting up the Duma and the limited democracy it created in Russia for the first time. This was then balanced against other factors such as the Russo-Japanese War, the policies of Stolypin and the actions and character of Tsar Nicholas II himself. However, many answers lacked detailed examples and tended to provide mostly generalised material, leading to unsupported explanations and limited descriptions. A few weaker responses went beyond the 1914 cut-off point and examined events that occurred later in the First World War, such as the Tsar assuming personal command of the Imperial Russian Army in 1915. It is vital to keep within the chronological parameters of the question.

Question 6 had fewer responses than **Question 5** and was generally less well answered. Some good responses were able to provide a good range of examples of how policies towards women were significant amongst the social changes in Stalin's Russia after 1928. The best answers recognised how policies towards women progressed and regressed in this period, especially as a possible war against Germany became more likely - most commonly cited was the reversal of laws towards divorce. This was then balanced against other social changes caused by Stalin's policies towards ethnic minorities, religious groups, and young people. A few of the best answers also examined the social changes caused by the Five-Year Plans and collectivisation. Other responses lacked in-depth knowledge and provided only limited descriptions of social changes in Russia under Stalin. Many focused their answers on economic issues or political developments in the period, which was not the focus of this question.

Depth Study D: The United States, 1919 – 1941

This was the second most popular choice of Depth Study among candidates.

Question 7 produced only a small number of strong responses, with many answers lacking examples and a general understanding of the problems faced by farmers in the USA in the 1920s. The best responses clearly identified and explained how the end of the war in Europe saw farmers lose their markets for selling foodstuffs, leading to overproduction and lower prices. Some responses also explained how government tariffs and foreign competition exacerbated this issue further in the 1920s and saw many farmers lose their farms, being unable to pay off their debts. This was then balanced against other factors such as Republican policies, the increasingly mechanised production methods used in agriculture and the changes in demand in the domestic market for fresh fruit and vegetables, which many smaller farmers were unable to meet. Other responses would have been improved by detailed knowledge and the greater breadth and depth necessary to write convincing arguments and explanations, allowing them to reach supported conclusions or judgements on relative importance. A few of the weaker answers refocused their answers on the economic boom or the Roaring Twenties, which was not the question.

Question 8 was less popular, but well answered in most cases. Candidates had a great deal of contextual knowledge about the significance of the Red Scare in the USA and how it led to intolerance. Many candidates cited the Russian Revolution in 1917 and the US fear of immigrants from Eastern Europe bringing radical ideas such as communism and anarchism with them to the USA. There were many mentions of the Palmer Raids and the Sacco and Vanzetti trial, which helped exemplify the nature of the Red Scare in the 1920s. This was then compared against other factors that led to intolerance such as racism (with the Ku Klux Klan and Jim Crow Laws most commonly cited) and religious fundamentalism. The best answers did manage to reach valid and supported conclusions based on relative significance, though more could have provided a sustained argument throughout their essay. Less successful responses often provided limited narratives of the period and listed events in the 1920s in no particular logical order.

Depth Study E: China, c.1930 – c.1990

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

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

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

Depth Study G: Israelis and Palestinians since 1945

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