

HISTORY

Paper 9389/11
Document Question

Key messages

- Candidates should ensure that their answers address the questions. A significant minority of responses to **(a)** compared the sources without focusing on the specific aspect given in the question.
- In **(a)** questions the purpose of evaluating the sources is to explain the similarities or differences between the sources. Commentaries based on contextual information or discussions on reliability are not relevant unless they are used in this way.
- In **(b)** questions 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. In common with **(a)**, commentaries on the context or reliability of sources are not creditworthy unless they serve the question.
- It is important to use source content to support points made in both sections of the question paper. Short quotations are adequate. There has been an increasing tendency to use ellipses rather than providing evidence. For instance, in **Section C** some candidates quoted from Source D in the following way: 'Governments... retreat.' It is not clear from this approach that the candidate has understood the source and can see how it supports the point being made.
- Candidates should ensure that they look closely at the provenance of each source as they read and consider how far this is useful when analysing the statement given. Candidates should consider the nature (what type of source it is), the origin (who wrote or produced the source), and purpose of sources before commenting on generic reliability or placing in a particular context. However, comments about source evaluation should always be related to answering the question posed.
- Effective responses consider the overall message of each source to understand the argument or point of view of the author. This means that the source should be viewed in its entirety rather than divided into individual sentences or part sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to those which the source argues overall.

General comments

Most responses demonstrated understanding that the **(a)** question requires identification of similarities **and** differences, and that **part (b)** requires an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the statement or prompt in the question. Stronger responses were focused on the question and provided quotations or direct paraphrases from relevant sources to support their points.

The focus of the **(a)** questions is to identify valid similarities and differences of the content of the sources. In each of the **(a)** questions candidates were required to make comparisons of inferences based on 'motives' in **Question 1(a)**, 'response' in **Question 2(a)** and 'attitudes' in **Question 3(a)**. Where answers were weaker it was often because of ignoring these specific terms. Candidates sometimes wrote detailed comparisons of the sources which were not focused on the question. It is important that like-for-like comparisons are made. Several responses asserted similarities or differences for points which were not comparable. If the comparisons cannot be properly supported, they cannot be credited. In some cases, the similarity or difference was asserted with no support offered from the source.

To achieve marks in the higher levels, it is necessary to evaluate the sources by considering their nature, origin or purpose and the context in which they were produced. However, to be creditworthy the evaluation of the sources must relate to the question asked. One example of how this could be achieved was in **Section A**, Source D. Responses that dealt with this source successfully used their knowledge of the context of the Young Italy movement to explain why Mazzini was opposed to Italy becoming involved in a war with France against Austria. The most effective answers used their contextual understanding and the motive of the source to explain how this weakened the source as evidence in response to the question.

Effective time management remains an important skill to develop. A significant proportion of responses to **(b)** questions were incomplete or hurried with the final source receiving scant attention. Often this resulted from spending too long on **(a)**, writing lengthy sections on reliability or context which were not rewardable.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: European Option: France and Italy go to war against Austria

1(a) Compare and contrast the views given in Sources A and B on Napoleon's motives for entering a war against Austria in Italy.

Most responses succeeded in making relevant comparisons between the sources, the most frequent similarity being that it was clear from both sources that 'Napoleon intended to liberate Italy'. The majority supported this point with source details. It was argued that Napoleon was a 'supporter of Italian Liberty' as stated in Source A, linked with 'the liberation of Italy' being an 'urgent necessity' in Source B. Less common, but equally valid, was the connection between his experiences in 1831 referenced in Source B and his time 'as a conspirator in central Italy' in Source A. Identifying valid differences proved to be more challenging, the most commonly compared difference being Napoleon's desire to liberate Italy in Source A, contrasted with his desire to 'become master of the Mediterranean' in Source B. Others noted that the degree of Napoleon's motivation was different in both sources, having to be 'dragged' into involvement in Source A compared with the 'urgent necessity' of acting in Source B. Weaker responses generally resulted from overlooking the requirement to focus on motives. A few candidates used their contextual knowledge to account for the similarities of differences between the sources. However, a considerable number lost valuable time including background knowledge, or a commentary on the reliability of the sources, which was not linked to the question.

(b) 'There was full support amongst Italians for a joint French-Piedmontese attack on Austria.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?

Most candidates gave a two-sided response to the question, although some answers which claimed none of the sources supported the statement were seen. Most candidates identified Source A as a support source, referencing the statement that Napoleon's actions would be 'strongly supported by all in Italy'. Others made the valid argument that Italian nationalists in exile were 'dragging' Napoleon to be involved and this was not indicative of 'full support'. Some candidates found Source B more challenging and incorrectly concluded that it suggested that there was support for an attack. More astute responses recognised the importance of the phrase 'still remained to be seen' and argued that support for an attack on Austria was by no means certain. Likewise, there was some confusion over Source C. Some missed the point that Italians would 'support our joint enterprise', and therefore missed the support for the prompt in this source. Source D was identified as a challenge source, with most candidates referencing Mazzini's determined opposition to Napoleon's involvement in liberating Italy. Most attempts to evaluate were generic, often stating that the source was biased or unreliable because it was from a speech or letter. A few candidates linked their evaluation to the question. For instance, some suggested that Source C supported the prompt but Cavour's motive, to encourage Napoleon to act quickly, might have caused exaggeration of the level of support for an attack and this undermined the support element of the argument.

Section B: American Option: The Passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act, 1854

2(a) Compare and contrast Sources C and D as responses to the passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act.

Section B was the least popular option on this question paper. Many responses identified a difference by explaining that Source C showed a positive response to the passage of the Act whereas the response in Source D was negative. This was usually supported by evidence from Source C such as the meeting offering their 'heartfelt thanks' for the passage of the Act, whereas Source D saw the Act as 'destructive of confidence in the integrity' of 'state and national governments.' A significant proportion of responses compared the sources without focusing on 'response', instead comparing what they said about slavery. Only a few noted the obvious similarity that in both Vermont and Platte Country the response was to hold a meeting to discuss the passage of Kansas-Nebraska. Some candidates attempted to explain the differences and these

were successful when candidates were secure in their contextual knowledge, understanding that Vermont was not a slave state. The weakest answers described the content of the sources without focusing on the question.

**(b) 'The passage of the Kansas-Nebraska Act divided the country over the question of slavery.'
How far do Sources A to D support this view?**

A significant minority of candidates used only Sources A and D. As both supported the prompt this meant that such responses were one-sided and could only be rewarded in Level 2. Others misread the question and wrote responses which were not focused on 'divided over slavery', most frequently writing about whether the Kansas-Nebraska Act was popular. Most candidates used Source A to support the prompt, using the content to show that there was great opposition in the North and quoting the final sentence 'Will you, the falsely-called freemen, the gagged, insulted, robbed men of the North – accept this surrender?' as a rallying cry which would divide rather than unite. Many responses misinterpreted the message of Source B, claiming it supported rather than challenged the idea of division. This was usually based on using short phrases from the source, such as 'renewal of terrible sectional strife' as evidence to support the prompt and missing that the source argues that these were actually 'sheer falsehoods'. Most candidates correctly used Source C to challenge the hypothesis, referencing the source's assertion that the Act was the final settlement of the slavery question. Many understood that the decision to form a new party in protest, stated in Source D, suggested likely division in the future and therefore represented a support for the prompt. While some candidates attempted to consider the authorship of the sources and comment on their reliability, this often fell short of the mark, either with the use of stock evaluation or comments on reliability not being used to address the question.

Section C: International Option: The League of Nations in the 1920s

3(a) Compare and contrast Sources A and D as evidence about attitudes towards the League of Nations.

Section C proved to be the most popular question and elicited some high-quality responses. Candidates were asked to compare 'attitudes' towards the League of Nations and most recognised a similarity based on both sources having a positive attitude towards the League of Nations. There was plenty of evidence to support this and many based their comparison on the evidence of good works by the League, such as supporting refugees and rescuing Austria from chaos. A small number of responses missed the key word 'attitude' and simply compared what each of the sources said about the League. In terms of differences, the most common comparison was that Source A was entirely positive, believing that the League had ended bitterness between nations, while Source D contained a more cautious approach, believing that some governments were not fully committed to supporting the League. While many responses included contextual knowledge or comments on the reliability of the sources, fewer used this to good effect in explaining the similarities or differences between the sources. Those candidates who achieved this generally explained the differences with reference to the context of the sources and their possible motives. It was argued that Cecil's positivity was partly a result of his position, but also because the Corfu incident had not taken place when his book was written. By the time Nansen gave his speech, the League had failed to address Mussolini's aggression over Corfu and, as several candidates pointed out, any positive developments in relations between nations (such as the Locarno Treaties) had taken place outside the League. The best responses understood that this change in context accounted for the more tempered approach in Source D.

(b) How far do Sources A to D agree that the League of Nations was a success in the 1920s?

There were some highly effective responses to this question which made good use of the sources to support and challenge the prompt and properly related their evaluation of the sources to the question. Source A was generally used to support the hypothesis, quoting details on Austria or the humanitarian work of the League to show it was a success. Most responses used Source B to challenge, commenting on the passive response of the League in dealing with Mussolini over Italy's actions in Corfu and the undue anxiety this caused to small nations such as Sweden. Source C generated some perceptive responses from candidates who understood there was a level of sarcasm, if not direct criticism, aimed at the League in this cartoon. A few used their contextual knowledge of the League's reaction to the Greece – Bulgaria crisis to contrast their heavy-handed approach in that dispute with their lack of action over Corfu. It was possible to develop a nuanced conclusion from this source that the League was successful, but only in certain circumstances.

Source D could be used to support and challenge the prompt. Most used references to releasing prisoners of war and dealing with famine and refugees as evidence of success. Many used this source on both sides of the argument, understanding its warning that, for the League to succeed, governments should not wait passively but work 'to build up the power and strength of the League.' Evaluation was often generalised. However, some candidates successfully considered the motive of the author, for instance in Sources A and D, or used their contextual knowledge to evaluate the sources. To achieve Level 4, they used the outcome of their analysis to assess the weight of the source as evidence in relation to the question. Weaker answers often resulted from being short of time and missing out sources, or from not referring specifically to source content.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/12
Document Question

Key messages

- Candidates should ensure that their answers address the questions. A significant minority of responses to **(a)** compared the sources without focusing on the specific aspect given in the question.
- In **(a)** questions the purpose of evaluating the sources is to explain the similarities or differences between the sources. Commentaries based on contextual information or discussions on reliability are not relevant unless they are used in this way.
- In **(b)** questions 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. In common with **(a)**, commentaries on the context or reliability of sources are not creditworthy unless they serve the question.
- It is important to use source content to support points made in both sections of the question paper. Short quotations are adequate. There has been an increasing tendency to use ellipses rather than providing evidence. For instance, some candidates quoted only giving the first and last word of a section of text. It is not clear from this approach that the candidate has understood the source and can see how it supports the point being made.
- Candidates should ensure that they look closely at the provenance of each source as they read and consider how far this is useful when analysing the statement given. Candidates should consider the nature (what type of source it is), the origin (who wrote or produced the source), and purpose of sources before commenting on generic reliability or placing in a particular context. However, comments about source evaluation should always be related to answering the question posed.
- Effective responses consider the overall message of each source to understand the argument or point of view of the author. This means that the source should be viewed in its entirety rather than divided into individual sentences or part sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to those which the source argues overall.

General comments

Most candidates know that the **(a)** question requires an identification of similarities **and** differences, and that answers to **(b)** questions require an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the prompt in the question. Stronger responses recognised the need to support the points made with quotations or direct paraphrases from the relevant sources.

Weaker responses to **part (a)** were often rushed and in a significant minority of cases this was a result of the **part (a)** question being completed last. Although there is no required order for the question to be answered it should be noted that the **part (a)** question is designed to prepare candidates for the longer essay style question.

Candidates often made inappropriate points of comparison. They claimed similarities for points which were not actually similar and differences for points which were not different. If the comparisons cannot be properly validated, they cannot be credited. The focus of the **(a)** question is to identify valid similarities and differences of the content of the sources. Weaker responses often included large sections of contextual knowledge or stock paragraphs of 'evaluation' rather than tackling the focus of the question. There was also a tendency to include a quotation using one word and an ellipsis suggesting the remainder of the sentence/source. This is not an adequate way of using quotations which should be selected and deployed to support the point being made. Although there are marks in the top level for commenting on the usefulness of the sources, the focus of the question should be on making a developed comparison, i.e. identifying similarities and differences.

There is still a minority who interpret the **(b)** question, which always asks about Sources A to D, i.e. all four sources, as requiring examination of only Sources A and D. A minority of candidates ran out of time, usually

after writing long knowledge-based introductions which contributed little to their answer. If candidates are to do justice to their knowledge and conceptual understanding, effective time management and focus on the question asked is essential.

When analysing the sources many candidates confused themselves by picking out sections of text which ran counter to the overall message of the source. An example from this paper can be found in **Section C**, where more than one source spoke of the enthusiasm or excitement of the League. However, because these sources were written by different players in the events, they did not always mean the same thing. Some candidates were prone to just looking for similar words without thinking about their context. Thus, candidates should be careful to look at the whole source not dissected sections of it when making links to the questions and further judgements.

To achieve higher evaluation marks, it is necessary to explain why the nature, origin or purpose of the source makes it more or less useful when answering the question. One example of where this could be achieved was in **Section A, Source C**. Responses that dealt with this source successfully used their knowledge of the context to comment on the position taken by the Crown Prince of Prussia in the discussions taking place after the war and how it could be used to give weight to the source in relation to the wider question. As an opponent of Bismarck and the war the Crown Prince is not a source that holds a lot of weight when thinking about utility. As such, when using these ideas, it is important that candidates explain why this makes the source more or less useful for the question rather than just stating the date or type of source and saying it is unreliable.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: European Option: The Results of the Franco-Prussian War

1(a) Compare and contrast Sources C and D as evidence about the international consequences of the Franco-Prussian War.

The question focussed on consequences, so candidates needed to be clear that they were comparing views of the results, effects or aftermath in their answers. A small number wrote about causes of the war, but this was not credit worthy. The points being made also needed to be focussed on international rather than domestic consequences. Candidates generally made a good attempt at this question and were able to recognise that the Crown Prince and Disraeli took different views of the consequences. Whilst Source C suggests that Germany has lost all her friends and allies, Source D implies that Germany now has a new strength and is much more positive about the consequences of the war for Germany on the international stage. Many stronger responses also recognised the similarities here i.e., that there was a change in how Germany was viewed and that the balance of power was shifting. Some candidates struggled to recognise these points because they lacked the contextual knowledge to interpret what Source D was saying about the European situation. Overall, this question was generally well attempted but candidates but ensure that they focus on the demands of the specific question.

(b) 'The Franco-Prussian War brought few benefits to Germany.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?

This question was generally well attempted, and responses showed an ability to use the sources to support and challenge the assertion given in the question. Candidates used the phrase 'few benefits' in different ways but this was credit worthy as long as they were using the sources to support and challenge the meaning of the statement. Source A is a good example of this. Some candidates used it to show that Germany was threatened by the war because of the Crown Princess' concerns over what might happen if they were overrun. Many stronger responses used contextual knowledge to explain how the Alsace region was gained by Germany after the war and that this meant they were in a stronger position. Both approaches were acceptable providing they were accompanied by appropriate reasoning or contextual knowledge. Most candidates recognised the inherent link in Source B between success on the battlefield and the project of unification although this did confuse some. Again, candidates should be prepared to use their knowledge to contextualise the sources within the wider picture of the topic they have studied. The best responses were able to use their knowledge to test the sources for their utility in relation to the question. Some candidates used their knowledge of the author of Source C to evaluate that source whilst others contextualised the comments in Source D. Overall, the best responses focussed on the sources throughout the question and tried to weigh their utility in answering the questions.

Section B, the American Option: Southern Reactions to the Result of the 1860 Presidential Election

2(a) Compare and contrast Sources B and D as evidence of attitudes towards the election of Abraham Lincoln as President in 1860.

Candidates should be familiar with the geography and sympathies of the states in different sections and the border states before the Civil War. The major similarity between the sources studied in this question was that both reported on the opposition to Lincoln in these border states. Source B reports on the voters these states turning out strongly for Bell and Douglas; whilst Source D from Kentucky (itself a border state) shows its hostility to Lincoln. The most successful responses recognised and expanded on this similarity to explain responses to the election of Lincoln in 1860. Most candidates were able to recognise that Source B was largely pro Lincoln whilst Source D was unhappy about his election. Although, once again candidates should be careful not to pick out part phrases in the source to prove something that is not true. For example, the phrase 'he may be a patriot' in Source D was used by some candidates to show approval of Lincoln. Instead, of course, it is a plea to follow the policies they want in Kentucky. Overall, most candidates made a good attempt at this question, but some did not have the required knowledge to interrogate the sources accurately.

(b) How far do Sources A to D support the view that, following the election of Abraham Lincoln, the Southern states were united in their determination to secede?

Candidates who attempted this question were generally able to use the sources successfully and look for examples of support and challenge for the assertion. The main focus here was how much weight the sources could give to whether there was unity in the Southern states over the issue of secession. Some of the strongest responses were able to start by using Source A to support the source but also to question its veracity. The Charleston Mercury clearly feels that all the South are together and calls for joint action, but many candidates were able to temper the face value information in the source by using their knowledge to explain that South Carolina was the most secessionist of all the states and so this firebrand article may not give the full picture. Similarly, Source D from Kentucky gives a more nuanced picture by calling for 'conservatism' in the moment before secession began. The best responses were able to recognise the nuances in the sources and test them with own knowledge. Weaker responses often took the sources at face value which still meant they could support and challenge the assertion in some instances but did not allow them to move further up the mark scheme. Overall, most candidates were able to make a good attempt at this question, but contextual knowledge should be a priority when interpreting and evaluating sources.

Section C, International Option: The Great Powers and the League in the 1920s

3(a) Compare and contrast Sources A and C as evidence about the Corfu crisis.

This question required candidates to focus on evidence about the Corfu crisis rather than the rule of Mussolini or weaknesses of the League in this period. Some candidates did not focus on Corfu in their responses, so struggled to make valid points of comparison between the two sources. Both sources, although with different intentions, suggest that the Corfu crisis was an opportunity for the League to decide her own future and show the world her power. Most responses were able to recognise this similarity if they concentrated on the focus of the question. The strongest responses were able to tease out the differences in tone between the two sources as the American sources focussed on the impact on the crisis for the League and wider world, whilst Mussolini unsurprisingly focussed on the impact for Italy. It was important here for candidates not to get caught up in describing the actions of Mussolini in Corfu because this gained little credit here. Overall, this question was well-answered by most candidates.

(b) 'The Great Powers were determined to put their own interests before those of the League.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?

This question required some consideration of the 'interests' of the Great Powers and how they played out in this period. This relied on candidates using appropriate knowledge to contextualise the sources and test them against the assertion in the question. Many candidates were able to do this for some of the sources, picking out parts of Source A and C that showed both Italy and Great Britain acting in their own interests rather than in line with League rules. Some candidates struggled with

Source B that showed Poincare and Mussolini glaring at each other over occupations both their countries undertook in 1923. The best responses were able to recognise the message of this source, that both France and Italy were acting in their own interests, but also question the origin of the source from a British magazine that was perhaps looking down on the two countries whilst Britain was following similar policies. The main area of challenge came from reports of Briand's words in Source D and this was recognised by some responses. Candidates must be sure to take time to read all the sources to look for examples of support and challenge. Overall, many candidates responded to this question well although there were some who needed more knowledge to contextualise the sources.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/13
Document Question

Key messages

- Candidates should ensure that their answers address the questions. A significant minority of responses to **(a)** compared the sources without focusing on the specific aspect given in the question.
- In **(a)** questions the purpose of evaluating the sources is to explain the similarities or differences between the sources. Commentaries based on contextual information or discussions on reliability are not relevant unless they are used in this way.
- In **(b)** questions 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. In common with **(a)**, commentaries on the context or reliability of sources are not creditworthy unless they serve the question.
- It is important to use source content to support points made in both sections of the question paper. Short quotations are adequate. There has been an increasing tendency to use ellipses rather than providing evidence. For instance, some candidates quoted only giving the first and last word of a section of text. It is not clear from this approach that the candidate has understood the source and can see how it supports the point being made.
- Candidates should ensure that they look closely at the provenance of each source as they read and consider how far this is useful when analysing the statement given. Candidates should consider the nature (what type of source it is), the origin (who wrote or produced the source), and purpose of sources before commenting on generic reliability or placing in a particular context. However, comments about source evaluation should always be related to answering the question posed.
- Effective responses consider the overall message of each source to understand the argument or point of view of the author. This means that the source should be viewed in its entirety rather than divided into individual sentences or part sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to those which the source argues overall.

General comments

Most candidates know that the **(a)** question requires an identification of similarities **and** differences, and that answers to **(b)** questions require an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the prompt in the question. Stronger responses recognised the need to support the points made with quotations or direct paraphrases from the relevant sources.

Weaker responses to **part (a)** were often rushed and in a significant minority of cases this was a result of the **part (a)** question being completed last. Although there is no required order for the question to be answered it should be noted that the **part (a)** question is designed to prepare candidates for the longer essay style question.

Candidates often made inappropriate points of comparison. They claimed similarities for points which were not actually similar and differences for points which were not different. If the comparisons cannot be properly validated, they cannot be credited. The focus of the **(a)** question is to identify valid similarities and differences of the content of the sources. Weaker responses often included large sections of contextual knowledge or stock paragraphs of 'evaluation' rather than tackling the focus of the question. There was also a tendency to include a quotation using one word and an ellipsis suggesting the remainder of the sentence/source. This is not an adequate way of using quotations which should be selected and deployed to support the point being made. Although there are marks in the top level for commenting on the usefulness of the sources, the focus of the question should be on making a developed comparison, i.e. identifying similarities and differences.

There is still a minority who interpret the **(b)** question, which always asks about Sources A to D, i.e. all four sources, as requiring examination of only Sources A and D. A minority of candidates ran out of time, usually

after writing long knowledge-based introductions which contributed little to their answer. If candidates are to do justice to their knowledge and conceptual understanding, effective time management and focus on the question asked is essential.

When analysing the sources many candidates confused themselves by picking out sections of text which ran counter to the overall message of the source. An example from this paper can be found in **Section B**, Douglas ends with the words 'desire to legislate slavery into the Territories'. Some candidates used this part sentence to suggest that Douglas thought that slavery should be allowed in all the territories which is not what the extract says. Some candidates were prone to just looking for similar words without thinking about their context. Thus, candidates should be careful to look at the whole source not dissected sections of it when making links to the questions and further judgements.

To achieve higher evaluation marks, it is necessary to explain why the nature, origin or purpose of the source makes it more or less useful when answering the question. One example of where this could be achieved was in **Section C, Source B**. Responses that dealt with this source successfully used their knowledge of the context to comment on the position taken by Cecil, but also that of Churchill, and were able to apply that knowledge to test how viable disarmament really was in the context of the period. As such, when using these ideas, it is important that candidates explain why this makes the source more or less useful for the question rather than just stating the date or type of source and saying it is unreliable.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: European Option: The Revolutions of 1848 in Germany

1(a) Compare and contrast Sources B and D as evidence about the causes of the Revolutions of 1848.

The question focussed on causes of the revolution, so candidates were required to compare the sources by focussing on this rather than the processes or outcomes of the revolution. Weaker responses did not read the question closely enough and continued to compare other features of the sources. However, many candidates were able to make a good attempt at this question by recognising similarities and differences in the sources. The best responses recognised that both sources highlighted political problems i.e., those of 'arbitrary rule' in Source B and the consultative nature of the assembly in Source D. As well as recognising the economic issues also highlighted in both sources. The best responses were also able to highlight the differences by showing the reliance on socio-economic issues in Source B versus the political impasse in Source D. Some candidates were distracted by the author of Source D and this is an issue to be wary of. Whoever the source is written by it should be analysed and interpreted using the same skills as any other source. A minority of candidates used their time to write long descriptions/rejections of Marx and his ideas rather than interpreting the source with relevance to the question. Overall, this question was well attempted although there were areas for improvement.

(b) 'The main aims of the German revolutionaries of 1848 were political in nature.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?

This question was generally well answered, and responses showed a good ability to use the sources to support and challenge the assertion given in the question. Candidates used the phrase 'political' in different ways, but this was credit worthy if they were using the sources to support and challenge the meaning of the statement. Source A was generally well used to support the statement although some responses failed to recognise the link between political feeling and unification. Although unification was based on many ideas, which could be discussed to some extent, this source clearly linked the revolution with a political thirst for unification. Some of the best responses used the origin of this source to challenge its utility by highlighting the liberal authorship. The best examples of evaluation used contextual knowledge, the origin and purpose of the source, and then explained the impact of this in relation to the question. The other sources were generally well used, although some candidates once again got distracted by the authorship of Marx rather than highlighting how this provenance could be used to answer the question. Some of the best responses recognised and discussed the nuance of Source C. Overall, most candidates made a good attempt at this question.

Section B, the American Option: Popular Sovereignty and the Kansas–Nebraska Bill

2(a) Compare and contrast the opinions expressed in Sources A and D about the Kansas–Nebraska Bill.

Candidates were often familiar with the authors of both sources and in some ways, this helped them to get a feel for the message of the sources. Douglas was clearly an advocate of the Bill whilst Lincoln maintained his opposition to it. However, there were some candidates who appeared to let their knowledge, or opinions, of the two men override their reading of the sources. Irrespective of who is the author, when assessing a source, it is important to read and compare what is there and combine that with contextual knowledge. This question was generally well answered with responses recognising that both men could see that the Bill was designed to save the union whilst having quite different opinions of it. Some of the best responses also commented on what each man thought the outcome of the Bill would be which enabled them to analyse each text in closer detail. Overall, there were many strong responses which focussed on the question asked.

(b) How far do Sources A to D show that the passage of the Kansas–Nebraska Bill divided the United States along sectional lines?

Candidates who attempted this question were generally able to use the sources successfully and look for examples of support and challenge for the assertion. The big issue here was how much weight the sources could give to it being the Kansas–Nebraska Bill which divided people. Many candidates started by using Source A to challenge the question. The best of these responses used Douglas' quote that the Bill 'will destroy all sectional parties and sectional agitations' and then go onto contextualise and challenge it. Some were able to use contextual knowledge to challenge the utility of the source by pointing out that Douglas had huge political capital relying on the Bill and so was not a neutral witness to what might be its effectiveness. Use of the other sources was also generally strong, although some candidates were distracted by the authorship of Lincoln. Long sections of description or narrative on a particular historical actor are unlikely to gain marks as they are not focussed on answering the question. Overall, many responses were able to see the nuance in some of the sources and use this to come to a balanced argument related to the question.

Section C, International Option: The League and Disarmament

3(a) Compare and contrast Sources B and D as evidence of opinions about disarmament.

This question was generally well attempted, and candidates had demonstrated sound knowledge of the discussions around disarmament. The main issue that prevented responses making clear comparisons was distraction caused by the author of Source D. There were some responses who dismissed Trotsky out of hand because of his background rather than reading the source and comparing it with Source B. It is important to remember that although authorship can be discussed in relation to the question, it should not be used in place of comparing the sources which is the focus of the task. Many candidates were able to recognise similarities and differences between the two sources. Most candidates were able to recognise that whilst Source B supported the policy of disarmament, even if it were gradual, Source D saw it as a 'tragic farce'. The best responses were also able to recognise the similar issues which each source discussed such as the issues surrounding naval disarmament and their common hope for a peaceful future. Overall, the question was well attempted although some candidates were distracted in their analysis of the extracts.

(b) 'The League's aim to disarm was unrealistic.' How far do Sources A to D agree with this view?

This question required some consideration of what might be realistic or unrealistic in relation to disarmament and the discussion surrounding it in this period. Many candidates demonstrated good contextual knowledge in order to place the sources provided within their context. Many candidates used Sources A and B to both support and challenge the premise of the question. Both showed belief and concern over the prospects of disarmament. The best responses were able to set these extracts in context by showing that Lloyd George was commenting from a hopeful time but where it was too early to tell how realistic disarmament would be, and the differing views of Cecil and Churchill. The remaining two sources were clearer in their negative views of the likelihood of disarmament and many candidates used the cartoon in Source C to explain this view. The strongest responses were able to contextualise the views of Trotsky in Source D, with weaker responses

becoming distracted by trying to 'disprove' what he was saying. Overall, there were some excellent responses to this question.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/21
Outline Study

Key messages

- In Part (a) questions, candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a range of factors to show how they interacted and reaching a judgement regarding their relative significance.
- In Part (b) questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.

General comments

Most candidates, in line with the requirements of the examination, attempted two questions from one Section of the paper. In general, candidates used their time effectively, devoting an appropriate amount to each question. Candidates, for the most part, were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in at least some of their answers, but less in successful responses the candidates were unable to sustain consistent quality across all four of their responses. Some candidates produced satisfactory or better responses to one part of a question, yet weaker (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part.

Part (a) questions are about causation. Detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action distinguished effective answers. This is because causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of several factors, both long and short-term. The most effective responses focused clearly on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they interacted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance. The following is an example of relative significance from a response to **Question 4(a)**:

In conclusion, the most significant reason for the ineffectiveness of opposition is that the Tsar had the support of the army because even if the opposition groups could agree, the army would still use force to stop their opposition.

The identification and explanation of some relevant causal factors was made by most candidates, but less successful answers tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. The weaker responses were also characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology.

In **Part (b)** the awareness that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways was a characteristic of good answers. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Less successful responses fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question; relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance (often by ignoring timeframes given in the question).

Comments on specific questions

Section A: EUROPEAN OPTION; Modern Europe, 1789 – 1917

Question 1: France, 1789 – 1814

(a) Why was Napoleon able to overthrow the Directory?

Good responses provided a very thorough explanation of the reasons why Napoleon was able to overthrow the Directory. Responses attributed Napoleon's success to a combination of factors (e.g. exploitation of his military reputation/aid provided by his brother, Lucien/manipulation of elections by the Directory undermined its legitimacy). Such responses could have been improved by outlining the inter-relations between the factors/relative significance of factors. Less successful responses described the events of 1799 whilst weaker responses confused the overthrow with the events of 1789.

(b) 'Louis XVI was responsible for the political instability of 1789 to 1792.' How far do you agree?

Good responses were able to assess Louis XVI's contribution to political instability (e.g. his failure to deal effectively with the issue of voting in the Estates General/the flight to Varennes) against several other issues (e.g. increasing radicalisation/the impact of war). Responses which were less successful provided a narrative of events, often focusing on 1789 and weaker responses focused on events post-1792.

Question 2: The Industrial Revolution, c.1800 – c.1890

(a) Why had many canals been built by c.1800?

Some very good responses were able to explain a range of factors, such as the ability to transport goods in bulk and the attendant lessening of costs to the industries which used the canals. Weaker responses showed confusion in stating that the water flowed fast in canals and so provided the power to operate factory machinery.

(b) 'The lower classes suffered as a result of industrialisation.' How far do you agree?

Successful answers to this question were able to outline both the benefits of, and the problems caused by, the Industrial Revolution for the lower classes. Topics commonly included were working conditions and the Factory Acts, health and hygiene, overcrowding, the effects of the transport revolution on food and opportunities, and the political developments. Some candidates drifted away from the requirements of the question by outlining benefits which the middle classes gained because of the Industrial Revolution. Weaker responses were characterised by vague and generalised assertions, unsupported by appropriate factual evidence.

Question 3: The Origins of World War I, 1900 – 1914

(a) Why did the Naval Race have serious consequences?

The most effective responses were based on a clear understanding of the serious consequences of the Naval Race (e.g. growing aggressiveness of public opinion/Britain sought alliances with France and Russia, increasing tension in Europe). Less successful responses needed greater focus, tending towards narrative/descriptive accounts of the Naval Race.

(b) 'The members of the Triple Entente had different reasons for going to war with Germany.' How far do you agree?

Good responses displayed a clear understanding of French, Russian and British motives for going to war with Germany and were able to comment on the ways they were different or like each other. For example, candidates understood that Britain, France, and Russia shared a common fear of the growing power of Germany, especially after its adoption of a more aggressive foreign policy under Kaiser Wilhelm. This was set against Britain's commitment to uphold the treaty of London (1839) once Belgium was invaded by Germany, France's long-standing desire for revenge after the defeat in the Franco-Prussian war and Russia's determination not to back down in the face of German

pressure as she had done in 1908 over Bosnia. Less focused responses described the reasons behind the creation of the Triple Entente rather than why the powers in the Entente went to war with Germany.

Question 4: The Russian Revolution, c.1894 – 1917

(a) Why was opposition to the Tsar ineffective in the period from 1906 to 1914?

Successful responses demonstrated good knowledge and understanding of the reasons why the opposition which faced the Tsarist regime was ineffective throughout the given timeframe. This involved focusing on issues such as, for example, army loyalty, Stolypin's reforms and methods, divisions within the various political groups. Weaker responses lost sight of the timeframe and provided unfocused narrative accounts of the events of 1905 and the period after Russia's entry into the First World War.

(b) 'Poor leadership by the Tsar was the main cause of the Revolution in February 1917.' How far do you agree?

The strongest responses were characterised by the development of fully focused and balanced arguments, supported by appropriately selected factual evidence. Such responses achieved this required balance by analysing the relative significance of other factors (e.g. disruption to Russian society and economy by the war, the role of the Tsarina and Rasputin in undermining support for the Romanovs, and/or the loss of the military's loyalty to the Tsar), enabling well-reasoned judgements to be made. Less successful responses wrote in general terms about the weaknesses of the Tsarist regime and wrote a description of failings, often rooted in the events of 1905 rather than the immediate causes of collapse in February 1917.

SECTION B: AMERICAN OPTION; The History of the USA, 1840 – 1941

Question 5: The Expansion of US Power from the 1840s to the 1930s

(a) Why did the USA decide to play a minor role in European affairs in the 1920s?

Good responses displayed an understanding of the disillusionment felt by many in America by 1920 about their country's recent involvement in the First World War and the desire to focus on internal issues by avoiding entanglements in European affairs. Responses which were less successful described American actions in the period (e.g. not ratifying the Treaty of Versailles/not joining the League of Nations), without relating these back to the question.

(b) 'An unnecessary series of wars.' How accurately does this describe the Indian Wars of the later nineteenth century?

Responses which were successful assessed the necessary nature of the wars, by the standards of the time, in terms of the expansion west, the benefits to settlers, the discovery of gold and other mineral resources and the elimination of the Indian 'threat'. This was then set against the effects of the war upon the Native Americans way of life to provide a balanced argument. Some responses turned this around and noted that from the Native American viewpoint the wars were necessary to try and maintain their way of life. Less successful answers provided a general narrative of certain aspects of the wars (e.g. Sand Creek Massacre, Battle of the Little Big Horn, Wounded Knee).

Question 6: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861 – 1877

(a) Why did the 1876 presidential election lead to a political crisis?

Good responses showed a clear understanding of the disputed election between Rutherford B. Hayes and Samuel J. Tilden regarding the Electoral College votes of Oregon, South Carolina, Louisiana, and Florida. Weaker responses showed confusion with references made to Lincoln being a candidate and placing the issue in the context of the 1860 election or wrote a descriptive account of Reconstruction after 1865.

- (b) **‘The Emancipation Proclamation ensured that the North would win the Civil War.’ How far do you agree?**

The best answers assessed the Emancipation Proclamation’s role in ensuring victory for the North in terms of the motivation of Union forces, the effect on the black population and the impact on potential foreign intervention. Good answers were able to deal with all of these, demonstrating how the Proclamation made a significant impact in each key area which cumulatively gave the North a clear advantage. This was then balanced with an assessment of a range of other factors such as the creation of a more determined resistance by the South against what they saw as an existential threat to their way of life, the military ability of Grant and Sherman and the industrial power and manpower reserves of the North. Responses which were less successful provided a narrative of what happened in the Civil War.

Question 7: The Gilded Age and the Progressive Era from the 1870s to the 1920s

- (a) **Why did Theodore Roosevelt return to contest the presidency in 1912?**

Successful answers were clearly aware that Roosevelt was dissatisfied with the actions taken by his nominated successor as president, Taft. The reasons for this dissatisfaction were well understood, as was the fact that Roosevelt had not broken the unwritten two term rule. These responses showed the factual and analytical depth required to address the question effectively. Weaker responses described Roosevelt’s previous actions when he was in office and/or the platform adopted by Wilson in the election of 1912.

- (b) **How far do you agree that the development of the railroads made little difference to industrialisation in the late nineteenth century?**

Good answers were fully focused on the requirements of the question, a balanced assessment of relevant evidence leading to a well-supported judgement/conclusion. Other responses were confined to an outline of the advantages of railways, often in generalised terms, with little attempt to explain or analyse their impact on industrialisation.

Question 8: The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal, from the 1920s to 1941

- (a) **Why was the First New Deal replaced by the Second New Deal?**

Successful answers were able to provide explanations of why the first New Deal was limited in its achievements and that Franklin Roosevelt had to act and do more. There were relevant references to the role of the Supreme Court in limiting the First New Deal, the growing pressure from critics on the left and the forthcoming election of 1936, all prompting Franklin Roosevelt to act and produce the Second New Deal. Weaker responses could have been improved by keeping a clearer focus on the question and avoiding descriptions of the various aspects of the Second New Deal.

- (b) **To what extent did the economic prosperity of the 1920s benefit Americans?**

Stronger responses demonstrated a good understanding of the ways economic prosperity benefitted Americans (e.g. wage growth/technological innovation leading to increased production and lower cost of goods/consumerism and the availability of credit). This was then set against those who did not benefit, particularly the African American population, poor farmers, some immigrant groups, and women. These answers then provided a fully supported judgement. Weaker responses described key features of the period, often focusing on the Crash of 1929, and then describing the situation in the 1930s.

SECTION C: INTERNATIONAL OPTION; International Relations, 1871 – 1945

Question 9: Why were there two crises over Morocco in the early twentieth century?

- (a) Good responses to this question showed a clear understanding of the respective reasons for the two crises and had a sound grasp of the chronology of event. Answers which were less focused described the crises and/or discussed their impact rather than explain the factors which led to the crises. Confusion between the two crises was a feature of weaker responses.

(b) How important was the Anglo–Japanese Alliance of 1902 in the emergence of Japan as a significant world power?

Successful responses were able to assess the importance of the 1902 alliance against Japan's rapid industrialisation, modernisation, and military development. Further depth and balance were seen in an assessment of the role played by Japan's successes in wars against China and Russia in giving her world power status. Many such responses claimed that Japan's victory in the war against Russia was as much a reflection of Russian weakness as Japanese strength, and that it was not until the First World War that Japan could truly claim to have become a major world power. Less successful responses tended to be essentially narrative in approach, describing the Russo–Japanese War and focusing mainly on the reasons for Japan's victory.

Question 10: International Relations, 1919 – 1933

(a) Why did the World Disarmament Conference of 1932 – 33 fail?

The most successful responses were characterised by detailed analysis of the context in which the Conference was held, demonstrating the significance of factors such as the economic problems resulting from the Wall Street Crash, Japan's takeover of Manchuria and Germany's more aggressive stance since Hitler's rise to power. There was an awareness that, except for Germany, no country had honoured the commitment which it made at the Paris Peace Conference to undertake disarmament, and that this had caused resentment in Germany. Weaker responses were unfocused and described the terms of the treaty of Versailles as it related to disarmament.

(b) To what extent was the creation of minority ethnic groups the main problem for the successor states of eastern Europe?

The most impressive answers were based on clear understanding of what the problems facing the 'successor states' were and why they occurred, together with specific examples to support the points being made. This then allowed for a balanced assessment to be made. The less successful answers were rather more generalised, with reference being made to relevant issues, such as ethnicity and economic problems, without specific examples to provide adequate factual support.

Question 11: International Relations, 1933 – 1939

(a) Why did Italy intervene in the Spanish Civil War?

Good responses showed a clear understanding of several factors which caused Italy to intervene in the Spanish Civil War (e.g. the desire to show Italy was a great power/ideological – foster a third Fascist state in Europe – oppose Communism/forging closer links with Nazi Germany following the tensions with Britain and France over Abyssinia/test weaponry on the battlefield). Other responses described what Mussolini did and weaker responses lost focus and set out why the Spanish Civil War broke out.

(b) How successful was Britain's policy of appeasement?

Stronger responses were able to show that, while hindsight undoubtedly suggests that appeasement was a misjudgement, and so unsuccessful, there were perfectly logical reasons why the policy was adopted in the 1930s. This approach facilitated the development of fully focused arguments based on balanced assessment of the evidence. Many responses were able to demonstrate good understanding of what the policy of appeasement entailed, supported by appropriate examples of the policy in action. The most common conclusion was that appeasement was a misjudgement because it allowed Hitler to destroy the Treaty of Versailles and develop a large, well-equipped military capability which threatened peace in Europe and, eventually, led to World War II. As a result, a number of responses tended to lack balance, appeasement being viewed as an unjustifiably weak and unsuccessful response to Hitler's aggressive actions.

Question 12: China and Japan, 1919 – 1945

(a) Why did the Japanese military decide that December 1941 was the best time to attack Pearl Harbor?

Good responses were based on a clear understanding of the impact of the USA's trade embargo on Japanese policy; while apparently willing to negotiate, Japan was continuing to expand in search of alternative supplies of vital resources, such as oil. The attack on Pearl Harbor was, therefore, perceived as an attempt to weaken the USA's Pacific fleet sufficiently to allow time for Japan to acquire these resources and develop its own naval power in the region. An understanding was shown of the role the German invasion of the USSR played in Japan's decision making, as it ended the fear of an attack from the north by the USSR. Other responses tended to focus on long-term factors, such as the USA's increasing concerns that Japanese expansion posed a threat to American interests in the Far East. As a result, there was only limited (and implicit) explanation of Japanese motives for attacking the American naval base in 1941. Weaker responses described the attack and subsequent events in the Pacific in World War II.

(b) How successful was the Kuomintang in establishing its control of China by 1928?

Successful answers were based on an assessment of the extent of the KMT's success in gaining control of China by 1928 through examining events such as the widespread appeal of Sun Yat-sen's Three Principles, Chiang Kai-shek's Northern Expedition, and relations with the CCP. This created fully focused and balanced arguments. Weaker responses produced narrative accounts or were unfocused, looking at events in the 1930s.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/22
Outline Study

Key messages

- In Part (a) questions, candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a range of factors to show how they interacted and reaching a judgement regarding their relative significance.
- In Part (b) questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.

General comments

Most candidates, in line with the requirements of the examination, attempted two questions from one Section of the paper. In general, candidates used their time effectively, devoting an appropriate amount to each question. Candidates, for the most part, were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in at least some of their answers, but less successful candidates were unable to sustain consistent quality across all four of their responses. Some candidates produced satisfactory or better responses to one part of a question, yet weaker (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part. **Part (a)** and **Part (b)** questions have a fundamental difference in focus.

Part (a) questions are about causation. Detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action distinguished effective answers. This is because causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of several factors, both long and short-term. The most effective responses focused clearly on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they interacted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance.

The identification and explanation of some relevant causal factors was made by most candidates, but less successful answers tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. The weaker responses were also characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology.

In **Part (b)** the awareness that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways was a characteristic of good answers. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Less successful responses fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question; relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance (often by ignoring timeframes given in the question).

Comments on specific questions

SECTION A: EUROPEAN OPTION; Modern Europe, 1789 – 1917

Question 1: France, 1789 – 1814

(a) Why was Napoleon interested in domestic reform?

Most candidates were able to offer a number of suggestions about the benefits Napoleon saw in domestic reform. Good responses provided detailed explanation of some of Napoleon's most important domestic reforms, highlighting the benefits that could be gained from them, e.g. *'He wished to ensure his own power which is why, in the Concordat with the Pope, he made sure that he could select bishops who would support him. This gave him massive power as he understood the importance of the Catholic Church to the people of France.'* Less successful responses made general comments about reform without reference to their benefits for Napoleon or gave no detail of the sort of reforms in which he might be interested.

(b) 'Division amongst the revolutionaries was the main cause of political instability in France between 1789 and 1795.' How far do you agree?

There was a wide range of responses to this question. Weaker responses struggled with the issue of deciding who the revolutionaries were. Good responses reflected on the difference between moderate and extreme groups and were able to trace how the changes in government reflected the balance of power in the struggle between them. They were then able to present alternative factors that contributed to instability such as the actions of the king and the threat of foreign intervention. The best responses were able to reflect on the overall effect of these: *'Overall the divisions between the revolutionaries did indeed bring about events like the Champs de Mars massacre and created changes in Government. But issues like the king's lack of cooperation and threats from abroad contributed to the tensions that destabilised the country.'* With proper support this sort of conclusion could reach the highest level. Weaker responses tended to be narrative accounts of part of the period, often presenting general information about the causes of the revolution which were not properly focused on the question set.

Question 2: The Industrial Revolution, c.1800–c.1890

There were too few responses to this question to provide more detailed comments.

(a) Why did the factory system develop?

Most of the responses to this were simply a retelling of the reasons for the industrial revolution with little reference to the specific issue of development of the factory system. Better answers did write about the development of machines and other possible factors.

(b) 'Who had benefitted more from industrialisation by c.1890, the higher class or the lower class? Refer to any two countries from Britain, France or Germany in your answer.'

Responses to this struggled with the definition of higher and lower classes. Responses that managed this then often found it difficult to define benefits. There were a few good answers which did manage to assess benefits and difficulties. These struggled with the international aspect of the question. Weak responses wrote generally about poor working and living conditions for the poor vs. a better quality of life for the rich.

Question 3: The Origins of World War I, 1900–1914

(a) Why was France intent on going to war with Germany?

Most responses managed to provide a solid basic answer to this based on the outcome of the Franco-Prussian War of 1870 – 71, easily identifying two potential factors *'...wanted revenge for their humiliating defeat.'* and *'...were determined to recover the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine which were rich in resources and had a predominantly French population'*. Good responses were able to offer a number of other factors, but few went on to assess the relative importance of these different factors. Weaker responses whilst mentioning the loss of Alsace and Lorraine then went on to write about why there were tensions in the relationship between France and Germany rather

than why France wanted to attack Germany. Some weaker responses just wrote about why the war broke out in 1914.

- (b) **'Its members only wanted to avoid war.'** How far does this explain the development of the Triple Alliance?

Many of the better responses showed a good understanding of the evolution of the Triple Alliance from the Bismarkian system of alliances that was meant to isolate France in order to prevent them attacking Germany in an attempt to gain revenge for the losses of 1871. Good responses showed a balanced view of the defensive aspect of the alliance which were set against the potentially more aggressive intentions of individual members; e.g. *'The Triple Alliance was indeed formed because its members wanted to avoid war but subsequent actions like the colonial policy adopted by Wilhelm II made the Alliance more aggressive (e.g. in Morocco) and fed into the outbreak of the First World War.'* Weaker responses were often unsure about exactly who were the members of the Triple Alliance and wrote only about Germany and Austria-Hungary. Some weaker responses provided detailed accounts of the Alliance system but did not relate it to the question.

Question 4: The Russian Revolution, c.1894–1917

- (a) **Why was Lenin's leadership so important to the success of the Bolsheviks in October 1917?**

Most candidates demonstrated good knowledge of the part Lenin played in the October Revolution and were able to explain several aspects of his role to show how important he was in the Bolsheviks' success. Weaker responses were mostly able to identify Lenin's policies 'peace, bread and land' as a key factor in his success while better responses went further. *'His decision that October was the right time to act proved correct. He was able to persuade other Bolshevik leaders which made them a cohesive group and his promises won the support of soldiers, peasants and workers. Winning support from all of these was key to success.'* Some weaker responses identified some significant features of Lenin's leadership, but gave confused accounts of the chronology of events without clear explanation of Lenin's role in the events.

- (b) **Russia's defeat in the Russo-Japanese War was the main cause of the 1905 Revolution.'** How far do you agree?

Many responses spent time describing the Russo-Japanese War in detail rather than considering its effects within Russia. Better responses showed a good understanding of the link between failure in the Far East and growing discontent at home. The best responses were able to effectively link long term discontent with the effects of the war to provide a complex analysis. Such responses generally scored well. For example, *'The key issues that led to revolution were government incompetence and resistance to reform. The motives of the different groups were only loosely linked to the war and at best it merely accelerated the outbreak of the revolution'*. Some weaker responses used part of their essay to write about the consequences of the 1905 revolution rather than the causes whilst other weaker responses confused effects of this war with the First World War, writing about events such as the Tsar taking control of the army and leaving the Tsarina and Rasputin in charge.

SECTION B: AMERICAN OPTION; The History of the USA, 1840 – 1941

Question 5: The Expansion of US Power from the 1840s to the 1930s

There were too few responses to this question to make meaningful comment.

- (a) **Why was the concept of Manifest Destiny important to the expansion of US power from the mid-1840s onwards?**
- (b) **'The United States did not become a great naval power until after the First World War.'** How far do you agree?

Question 6: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861 – 1877

(a) Why was the North slow to turn its superiority of resources into military victory?

There were few good answers to this question. The success of these was based on a clear understanding of the different strengths of the leadership of the two sides characterising Lincoln as inexperienced in military matters and his generals as over cautious, whilst in the South Jefferson Davis had direct experience as a hero of the Mexican–American war of 1846 and more proactive generals like Lee and Jackson. Weaker responses just described the different resources available to the two sides without directly considering the question.

(b) How successfully did the ‘White South’ resist rule by the North after the Civil War?

There were some very credible answers to this question. These usually made good use of the Reconstruction amendments as a basis of their consideration of white resistance and considered issues such as ‘Black Codes’ and the emergence of the KKK, set against the North’s use of military governors and new legislation to control the South. The best candidates were able to distinguish between short term and long term, suggesting that white resistance proved ultimately successful with the Compromise of 1877. Even weaker responses made some use of some of these details but provided simple description of events and actions.

Question 7: The Gilded Age and the Progressive Era from the 1870s to the 1920s

There were too few responses to this question to make meaningful comment.

(a) Why did American agriculture experience ongoing hardship in the late nineteenth century?

(b) ‘Effective at the state level, ineffective at the national level’. How accurate is this judgement on the campaigns to introduce votes for women?

Question 8: The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal, from the 1920s to 1941

(a) Why did President Roosevelt abandon his plan to ‘pack’ the US Supreme Court?

There were few good responses to this question. Most candidates did not get beyond the idea of general opposition from Congress and the Left and Right. A few better answers did comment on the change of attitude from the court itself but even these did not often get beyond the level of general comment.

(b) ‘President Hoover’s response to the Great Crash was consistently conservative.’ How far do you agree?

As with **part (a)** of this question there were few strong responses to this. Weaker responses tended to write descriptively about the effects of the Great Depression with better responses including some idea of the measures that Hoover took but with limited focus on the question, possibly because of a limited understanding of the term ‘consistently conservative’. Better responses recognised Hoover’s view of the downturn as part of ‘the normal business cycle’ and the importance of ‘rugged individualism’. A few candidates were able to explain specific measure taken during this period that support or challenge the idea of a conservative approach. *‘Hoover allowed the Smoot-Hawley Act to pass even though it actually damaged the economy and though he eventually set up a Reconstruction Finance Organisation in 1932 it was too little too late.’* Some weaker responses just used this as an opportunity to demonstrate some knowledge of the New Deal to show that Roosevelt did a better job than Hoover with little reference to what Hoover might have done.

SECTION C: INTERNATIONAL OPTION; International Relations, 1871 – 1945

Question 9: International Relations, 1871–1918

(a) Why did the Kruger Telegram increase tensions between Britain and Germany?

There were some good responses to this question that recognised the overall importance of this incident in the development of Anglo-German relations in the late 19th century. *‘It showed the*

Kaiser was not afraid of antagonising the British, creating a sense of insecurity in Britain that contributed to the development of the Naval Race in the early 20th century. Less successful approaches included general commentary about the Boer Wars and a few characterised the Boers as an indigenous issue to be dealt with after the defeat of the Zulu threat.

(b) To what extent was detailed military planning the reason for the outbreak of war in 1914?

Good responses showed a clear understanding of the question and provided detailed and relevant analysis of the role of military plans in triggering the First World War. These were compared with other factors that led to war so that a balanced response was created. Few responses went on to consider the relative importance of these but those that did scored well; e.g. *'the Schlieffen Plan was incredibly rigid and based on assumptions that were not necessarily true so the invasion of Belgium led to the unexpected involvement of Britain and turned a regional war into a world war. However rapid re-armament and the response of the Great Powers to the assassination in Sarajevo played a more significant short-term role in triggering conflict.'* Some weaker responses were accounts of the outbreak of World War One in which the Schlieffen Plan was one factor but there was no reference to wider military planning. Some weak responses were based on the idea that forming an alliance represented 'military planning'.

Question 10: International Relations, 1919 – 1933

(a) Why was there an international crisis over the Ruhr in 1923?

Most responses provided a reasonable explanation of the crisis itself in terms of why the French and Belgians invaded and occupied the Ruhr, though weaker ones tended to simply present a narrative of events beginning with a lengthy account of the Versailles settlement, rather than explaining the intention to recover goods and capital equipment in lieu of reparation payments. Only the better candidates related events to the wider international context, considering the effect on Anglo-French relations and the return of the United States to an active role in international relations with the Dawes Plan. *'French action highlighted the different attitudes of Britain and France to German economic problems and led to tension between the two. The resulting crisis was only solved when US banker Charles Dawes came up with a plan to guarantee future payments and ease tensions.'* Development of this line of argument with supporting evidence produced some very good answers to this question.

(b) 'Increased tensions in Europe after 1929 were caused by the Wall Street Crash.' How far do you agree?

The question produced a range of responses from the well-focused and analytical to the general and descriptive. Good responses examined the economic consequences in terms of increasing concentration of domestic issues alongside the international effects of US withdrawal of loans and the collapse of international trade. From here they then considered other factors such as the rise of extremism and continuing fear of communism in the light of growing social unrest due to unemployment and economic hardship. The best responses linked these e.g. *'In Germany unemployment and fear of communism led to the rapid rise in popularity of the Nazis. Once in power Hitler's intention of destroying the Versailles settlement led to increasing tension in international relations.'*

Question 11: International Relations, 1933 – 1939

(a) Why did Mussolini oppose German intentions in Austria in July 1934?

Good responses were fully aware of the role Mussolini played in the crisis following the assassination of Dolfus and were able to offer several reasons for this opposition to Hitler's attempt to take over Austria. These ranged from the simple idea of countering the increasing threat on the border of Italy to an analysis of his relations with the western democracies at this time and of his own internal problems creating a need for international success and recognition. Weaker responses tended to stick to a *'make Italy great, respected and feared'* narrative about Mussolini's overall aims which did not really focus on the question being posed.

(b) How important was the outcome of the Munich conference in causing the outbreak of war in September 1939?

Many responses managed to maintain balanced to this though in weaker responses this was often in the form of a basic narrative of events leading from Munich to the outbreak of war with some general assertion about the role of each event. The better candidates were able to set the events of Munich in a wider context. They suggested that Munich might be seen as a change to a more aggressive policy by Hitler leading to the absorption of the rest of Czechoslovakia and later the invasion of Poland marking a change in direction in international relations as Hitler abandoned any pretence of reasonable revision to the limitations placed on Germany by the terms of the Versailles settlement. The alternative view that this was simply the latest step in a planned and deliberate escalation was less well explained but the best responses did achieve this.

Question 12: China and Japan, 1919 – 1945

There were too few responses to this question to make meaningful comment.

(a) Why did the Chinese Communist Party establish a base in Yen-an in October 1935?

(b) How far was the rise of militarism in Japan caused by the failure of democracy?

HISTORY

Paper 9389/23
Outline Study

Key messages

- In Part (a) questions, candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a range of factors to show how they interacted and reaching a judgement regarding their relative significance.
- In Part (b) questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.

General comments

Most candidates, in line with the requirements of the examination, attempted two questions from one Section of the paper. In general, candidates used their time effectively, devoting an appropriate amount to each question. Candidates, for the most part, were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in at least some of their answers, but less successful candidates were unable to sustain consistent quality across all four of their responses. Some candidates produced satisfactory or better responses to one part of a question, yet weaker (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part. **Part (a)** and **Part (b)** questions have a fundamental difference in focus.

Part (a) questions are about causation. Detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action distinguished effective answers. This is because causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of several factors, both long and short-term. The most effective responses focused clearly on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they interacted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance.

The identification and explanation of some relevant causal factors was made by most candidates, but less successful answers tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. The weaker responses were also characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology.

In **Part (b)** the awareness that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways was a characteristic of good answers. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Less successful responses fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question; relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance (often by ignoring timeframes given in the question).

Comments on specific questions

SECTION A: EUROPEAN OPTION; Modern Europe, 1789–1917

Question 1: France, 1789–1814

(a) Why did the working-class people in Paris play such an important part in the Revolution?

Many candidates based their accounts on the misapprehension that the working class were synonymous with the Third Estate and so much of their analysis was partially flawed. Good responses focused specifically on the Sans Culottes and their role in various events from the storming of the Bastille to the Reign of Terror accounting for their importance in these events, e.g. *‘Long-term problems created discontent among the peasants and workers that was expressed in the storming of the Bastille. This was the first truly violent act by the working class and showed their willingness to fight for change. Leaders like Robespierre used this to force through the changes they wanted.’*

(b) ‘Napoleon had the support of his army.’ How far does this explain the success of the Brumaire coup d’état of 1799?

There was a tendency in many responses to write a description of Napoleon’s successes as an army general and how this made him popular with both the army and the public in general but with no reference to the role of the army in the Brumaire Coup. Such responses often benefited from making a clear case for the influence of other factors such as the failings and unpopularity of the Directorate. Better responses also made specific reference to the role of Abbe Sieyes and Lucienne Bonaparte in managing the Coup, *‘The army’s support was important as it was able to step in and support Sieyes and Napoleon when the Directory showed resistance, but they were able to do this because the Directory was so unpopular because of its failings.’* Good responses gave a balanced analysis of the different factors but few made any significant judgements about relative importance.

Question 2: The Industrial Revolution, c.1800–c.1890

There were too few responses to this question to make meaningful comment.

(a) Why did working-class movements develop in this period?

(b) How important was technological innovation in bringing about the Industrial Revolution? Refer to any two countries from Britain, France and Germany in your answer.

Question 3: The Origins of World War I, 1900–1914

(a) Why were there wars in the Balkans in 1912–13?

Many responses to this question, while containing some elements of an appropriate answer, were weakened by a lack of focus on the Balkans Wars of 1912–13. This resulted in general accounts that focused on Austrian ambitions to expand and/or curb the growing power of Serbia and contrasted this with a summary of Russian involvement in supporting pan-Slavic nationalism. The result was a generic account of why there was trouble in the Balkans with little or no reference to why the Balkan League was formed and fought a war against the Ottoman Turks in 1912, or why some members of that League fought a second war against one other member, Bulgaria, in 1913. Candidates who did write about these conflicts and the reasons behind them generally scored well.

(b) ‘Its members wanted to protect their empires.’ How far does this explain the formation of the Triple Entente in 1907?

Weaker responses simply contained explanations of how the Triple Entente contributed to the outbreak of the First World War and so scored only low marks. Better responses showed an awareness of the different imperial ambitions of the three countries and were able to offer a considered view of their defensive intentions. Good responses balanced these against other factors such as Russian ambitions in the Balkans and the French desire for *revanche*. Some of the best candidates recognised that ‘protecting empires’ was not just about defending them from the members of the Triple Alliance but also about settling territorial differences between themselves,

mentioning Anglo-French disputes in Africa and Anglo-Russian problems on the borders of India for example. These candidates often went on to produce very competent answers. *'I think the statement is partly true because the Kaiser was constantly interfering in colonial affairs like the Boer War and the Moroccan Crisis which caused the British and French to grow closer. But there were other reasons for this.'*

Question 4: The Russian Revolution, c.1894–1917

(a) Why did the October Manifesto of 1905 produce little change in Russia by 1914?

Most candidates knew the circumstances in which the October Manifesto was produced, though some weaker responses were focused on events leading up to it rather than what happened afterwards. Most candidates recognised the importance of the Fundamental Laws of April 1906, though the amount of detail on these varied. Good responses identified several other factors such as the divisions of the opposition and the repressive measures used by Stolypin. Weaker responses tended to concentrate mainly on the failure of the Dumas, giving lengthy descriptions of each of the four Dumas that met in the period, without fully explaining why they met with such little success.

(b) 'Kerensky's government lacked popular support.' How far does this explain Bolshevik success in the Revolution of October 1917?

Most candidates demonstrated good knowledge of the weaknesses and failings of the Provisional Government and the majority of these were able to produce some justification for the assertion in the question. Sometimes this was little more than a narrative account of the performance of the Provisional Government (few distinguished between the early months of Lvov's leadership and the time when Kerensky led it). Better responses considered the negative effects of key actions and balanced this with an account of the rising popularity of the Bolshevik Party and the active role of Lenin in this, e.g. *'The provisional government lost support by continuing the unpopular and disastrous war and failing to meet any of the other demands of workers and peasants. Lenin exploited this with his 'peace bread and land' promises and by isolating the Bolsheviks from other groups who were more willing to co-operate with the government.'* Even the better responses usually ended with a restatement of key points and an assertion about Kerensky but with no supported judgement of relative importance.

SECTION B: AMERICAN OPTION; The History of the USA, 1840–1941

Question 5: The Expansion of US Power from the 1840s to the 1930s

There were too few responses to this question to make meaningful comment.

(a) Why did the peace settlement with Mexico in 1848 divide opinion in the USA?

(b) 'The United States' involvement in the First World War marked its emergence as a world power.' How far do you agree?

Question 6: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–1877

(a) Why, in 1867, did the US Congress divide the South into five military districts?

There were a few good responses that demonstrated a clear understanding of the situation after the war ended both in terms of moving forward with the 13th, 14th and 15th amendments in the wake of Lincoln's assassination and in terms of reintegrating the South into the Union and preventing any further outbreaks of resistance, as reasons for placing the Southern states under military control. This approach produced some detailed and analytical answers with clear focus. *'...it made it easier to see where ex-slaves were being poorly treated. Because the Southern states had introduced Black Codes there was still a lot of unfair treatment. As Johnson was doing nothing to impose Lincoln's reforms, Congress took charge and used military governors to impose their reforms including the 13th and 14th amendments.'* Some weaker responses were general accounts of the early years of Reconstruction and demonstrating knowledge of the Reconstruction Amendments. Other weaker responses were about the conflict between the Radical Republican Congress and Lincoln's successor, President Andrew Johnson. Both of these approaches did not focus sufficiently on the question.

- (b) **'The North's initial strategy, known as the Anaconda Plan, was a failure.' How far do you agree?**

Most candidates demonstrated some knowledge by describing the strategy and purpose of the Anaconda Plan. In good responses, this led into consideration of the contribution that the Anaconda Plan actually made to the outcome of the war for the North. These responses usually incorporated a critique of the Anaconda Plan showing full awareness of its weaknesses and failings but also setting against this the ways in which it did actually contribute to overall success of the North by weakening the South and giving time for the North to develop better strategies, *'...it seemed like a failure because it did not end the war, it simply restricted the South's ability to trade overseas. However, it was not a failure because the North knew the South were not going to be a push-over so they turned this into a war of attrition in which the North had far more resources at their disposal. Also the blockade laid the foundations for launching Grant's more aggressive campaigns in the later stages of the war, having weakened the South's capacity to respond.'*

Question 7: The Gilded Age and the Progressive Era from the 1870s to the 1920s

There were too few responses to this question to make meaningful comment.

- (a) **Why, by 1914, had some states granted women full voting rights?**
- (b) **How far did the domestic reforms of Presidents Theodore Roosevelt and Robert Taft fulfil Progressive goals?**

Question 8: The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal, from the 1920s to 1941

- (a) **Why did share prices increase rapidly in the 1920s?**

Most candidates were able to make a reasonable attempt at answering this, identifying the general conditions that led to the boom in share prices such as the availability of credit, the rise in consumerism and confidence in the continuing growth of the economy. Better responses were able to explain 'buying on the margin and 'bear markets', *'overall consumer confidence led to an increase in share prices as people borrowed money to invest. The psychological aspect of this is important as Americans felt comfortable with the reliability of the stock market and continued to buy shares pushing the prices up.'* A few weaker responses concentrated on details of the Wall Street Crash and gave little information about rising share prices.

- (b) **'President Franklin Roosevelt's domestic policies undermined free market capitalism.' How far do you agree?**

There were a few good answers, but many candidates struggled with this question specifically with the concept of 'free market capitalism'. Good responses succeeded by establishing a contrast between measures that were meant to alleviate social hardship and provide short term support to those who were struggling, and actions meant to support and rebuild industrial output and enterprise. The former usually included key alphabet agencies, for example the CCC and the PWA, whilst the latter included actions such as stabilising the banking system and the economic growth stimulated by the Tennessee Valley Authority. Good responses also often referred to the success of opponents of the New Deal in shutting down some of the alphabet agencies. Others argued on the basis that the social measures of the New Deal were necessary to enable the capitalist market to recover. *'His policies might be seen as undermining capitalism as they shifted the basis on which the US government interfered in the lives of its citizens. However, without government intervention people might never have returned to a free market capitalism whereas these policies, in the long run, provided a boost to individual confidence at being able to re-build a capitalist market economy.'*

SECTION C: INTERNATIONAL OPTION; International Relations, 1871–1945

Question 9: Why were there two crises over Morocco in the early twentieth century?

There were too few responses to this question to make meaningful comment.

- (a) **Why did Russia begin a full mobilisation of its armed forces on 30 July 1914?**
- (b) **How important was the Panama Canal in the development of US foreign policy between 1890 and 1914?**

Question 10: International Relations, 1919–1933

- (a) **Why did Italy fail to achieve its aims at the Paris peace settlement?**

Many candidates demonstrated some sound knowledge of the position of Italy at the end of the War though weaker responses offered limited accurate detail usually based on the idea of Italy having not performed very well in the War and being less influential than the 'Big Three'. Stronger responses often included a more detailed consideration of issues such as the conflict between the gains offered to Italy in the Treaty of London and the issue of self-determination. The commitment to the creation of Yugoslavia was also included in stronger answers. Good responses offered a clear explanation of several of these factors, supported by relevant detail. *'Italy had joined the Allied side in 1915 in the hope of great gains promised in the Treaty of London but by 1918 the big 3 did not think Italy had done enough to earn these rewards. Also, their priorities for conquered territories had been changed by the emergence of Wilson's doctrine of self-determination.'*

- (b) **How successful were the Dawes and Young Plans?**

Most candidates were able to provide a description of the Dawes Plan and the Young Plan. Weaker responses did not go further than this. Better responses provided some clear argument about positive and negative aspects of the two plans arguing for example that the Dawes plan did not just bring economic relief and a resolution of the Ruhr Crisis, but also provided an opportunity for a general improvement in international relations leading to the Locarno Treaties. Discussion of the Young Plan tended to be more limited but again good responses identified the positive intentions of the plan set against its failure due to the onset of the Great Depression. The best candidates were able to draw a clear contrast between short-term success and long-term failure as part of a reasoned conclusion. *'The plans seemed like failure because the Dawes Plan had to be revised in the Young Plan which then collapsed because of the Great Depression but in the short run Dawes solved the Ruhr crisis and led to the Locarno Treaties and improved international relations and Young offered a solution which may have worked if it had not been for the Wall Street Crash.'*

Question 11: International Relations, 1933–1939

- (a) **Why did Britain and France fail to challenge Hitler's reintroduction of conscription?**

Many candidates were able to offer some reasons for the British and French response to this crisis. There was a general recognition that due to the Great Depression, military response was not very practical. Added to this, there was a widespread anti-war feeling plus a belief that the Versailles Settlement had been too harsh, especially when it came to German disarmament. Using a combination of these factors many candidates were able to build a credible answer. *'After World War One there was a strong anti-war feeling; add this to the idea that the Versailles Settlement was too severe and this placed the public firmly opposed to action against Germany. Also, because of the Great Depression Britain and France were in no position to go to war to stop Hitler'*. Less successful were general descriptions of appeasement which characterised weaker responses.

- (b) **'It was foreign intervention that determined the outcome of the Spanish Civil War.' How far do you agree?**

There were some good answers to this question. Weaker responses did not really go far beyond a narrative of the contribution made by Hitler and Mussolini to the Nationalist war effort, sometimes providing considerable detail but little else. Better responses considered the strengths and weaknesses of the foreign intervention and often also set this against internal factors such as the

strong leadership of Franco and the disunity between the various factions that made up the Republican side. *'Whilst Hitler and Mussolini gave a lot of aid to the Nationalists the fact that the Nationalists had a single strong leader in Franco and a united aim made it probable that they would have beaten the disunited and badly organised Republican forces anyway.'*

Question 12: China and Japan, 1919–1945

There were too few responses to this question to make meaningful comment possible.

- (a) **Why did the Chinese Communist Party survive Chiang Kai-shek's attempt to destroy it?**
- (b) **How significant was the war in Europe to Japan's decision to launch a series of offensive strikes in December 1941?**

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9389/31 Interpretations Question</p>

Key messages

- The question is about the historian's interpretation and approach. The candidate's answer must identify these and use the extract to explain how they have been identified.
- The historian's interpretation will be consistent with everything in the extract. Different parts of the extract will not have different interpretations. It is therefore vital for candidates to consider the extract as a whole.
- The extract has not been previously seen by candidates. They must, therefore, allocate time to read and think about it before starting their answers.

General comments

Most candidates produced a response which used the extract and provided an explanation of what they considered was the historian's interpretation, clearly understanding the demands of the question. Most answers were complete, reaching a reasoned conclusion. The strongest responses demonstrated a complete understanding of the historian's interpretation and showed a consistent focus on using details of the extract to support their arguments. More modest responses, which lacked this level of understanding, often still saw the extract as containing an interpretation and offered some support from the extract for the points they made. There were very few answers seen which made no reference to the historian's views, and merely paraphrased the extract.

As the question asks what you can learn from the extract about the historian's interpretation, candidates need to know how to detect the interpretation. It is not what the extract says; it will be in what one can learn from what it says. To learn this, you need to know where to look, and to recognise what is significant. The extract will contain a mixture of fact and opinion. The interpretation is not the facts. It will not, for example, be *'The historian's interpretation is that Hitler was anti-Semitic.'* That's just a fact. But the fact might lead to an opinion: *'Hitler's anti-Semitism was so profound that he was determined from the start of his political career to work to wipe out all Jews in Europe.'* That's an opinion; some historians would agree with it, others would not. So, what can you learn from it about this historian? Put all the statements of opinion in the extract together, and within them will be the overall message that the historian wishes to convey. Many answers write at length about aspects of the extract that do not contribute to the identification or explanation of the main interpretation, suggesting a lack of clarity on what the interpretation actually is.

Answers should be about the historian's opinions, and how you can use them to infer the overall interpretation. The best answers are well structured. They state an inference they have made about the historian's ideas, and then follow this with evidence from the extract to support the inference: *'I think this historian blames the Soviet Union for starting the Cold War (inference). I can tell this because the historian writes that the Allies had no choice but to resist Soviet expansionism (support from the extract).'* By keeping to this structure, candidates can avoid the most common weakness in answers – purposeless repetition of what the extract says. Two important pieces of advice flow from this. First, candidates should plan their answer carefully before they start writing so that it constitutes a full explanation, through using the extract as a whole, of what is seen as the interpretation. Many weaker answers work through the extract picking up on points as they arise, but these often suffer from lack of coherence or even contradictions. Second, the answer does not need to be lengthy to score well as the mark scheme is focused on the qualities of the response, not quantity. If candidates have decided what they want to write and have selected appropriate evidence from the extract to support their arguments, there will be no unnecessary 'padding' – no unfocused writing about events, no purposeless copying from the extract, no irrelevant summary of 'other' historians' views. Many of the best answers are no more than three or four pages long.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: The Causes and Impact of British Imperialism, c.1850 – 1939

There were insufficient scripts on this section for any meaningful comments to be made on them.

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that Hitler did not plan the extermination of the Jews from the beginning, and that the start of genocide was improvised in 1941. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. The strongest answers understood that the extract was an explicit refutation of extreme intentionalism. Whilst many candidates saw this, more modest answers missed the importance of the reference to improvisations at the end of the extract, a clear signal of a functionalist approach. Weaker answers were drawn into an assumption that Hitler had planned genocide from the beginning, based on the comments on Hitler's anti-Semitism at the start of the extract. They would then persist with this idea despite the contrary arguments on, for example, the emigration policy, that came later – a good example of the perils, mentioned in the General Comments above, of working through the extract before having decided what the overall shape of the answer should be. There were also some examples of misreading of the extract, such as assuming that *'mass murder of the Jews was a "logical" conclusion'* meant that Hitler planned genocide from the start, whereas the historian's clear purpose was to question the relationship between Hitler's anti-Semitism and the origins of the Final Solution. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

Section C: The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941 – 1950

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that by 1947 the West was seriously threatened by Communist expansion, and that the USA had no choice but to attempt to contain this through the Truman Doctrine. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. These answers identified the traditionalist approach of the historian, using the nature of the language used about the two sides (for example, the USA being perceived as *'historic champions of democracy'*) as well as the claims made about events and developments (e.g. on Communists *'deliberately sabotaging progress'* in Western Europe). Many candidates were misled into thinking that the extract's critical comments about the Truman Doctrine were an indication of blame being placed on the USA, but this was to miss the crucial disclaimer that, even though the Doctrine was *'fraught with peril, a course of dangerous "do-nothingism" was even more hazardous'*. Thus, those answers that detected a revisionist, or even post-revisionist, approach, were showing some lack of understanding. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9389/32 Interpretations Question</p>

Key messages

- The question is about the historian's interpretation and approach. The candidate's answer must identify these and use the extract to explain how they have been identified.
- The historian's interpretation will be consistent with everything in the extract. Different parts of the extract will not have different interpretations. It is therefore vital for candidates to consider the extract as a whole.
- The extract has not been previously seen by candidates. They must, therefore, allocate time to read and think about it before starting their answers.

General comments

Most candidates produced a response which used the extract and provided an explanation of what they considered was the historian's interpretation, clearly understanding the demands of the question. Most answers were complete, reaching a reasoned conclusion. The strongest responses demonstrated a complete understanding of the historian's interpretation and showed a consistent focus on using details of the extract to support their arguments. More modest responses, which lacked this level of understanding, often still saw the extract as containing an interpretation and offered some support from the extract for the points they made. There were very few answers seen which made no reference to the historian's views, and merely paraphrased the extract.

As the question asks what you can learn from the extract about the historian's interpretation, candidates need to know how to detect the interpretation. It is not what the extract says; it will be in what one can learn from what it says. To learn this, you need to know where to look, and to recognise what is significant. The extract will contain a mixture of fact and opinion. The interpretation is not the facts. It will not, for example, be *'The historian's interpretation is that Hitler was anti-Semitic.'* That's just a fact. But the fact might lead to an opinion: *'Hitler's anti-Semitism was so profound that he was determined from the start of his political career to work to wipe out all Jews in Europe.'* That's an opinion; some historians would agree with it, others would not. So, what can you learn from it about this historian? Put all the statements of opinion in the extract together, and within them will be the overall message that the historian wishes to convey. Many answers write at length about aspects of the extract that do not contribute to the identification or explanation of the main interpretation, suggesting a lack of clarity on what the interpretation actually is.

Answers should be about the historian's opinions, and how you can use them to infer the overall interpretation. The best answers are well structured. They state an inference they have made about the historian's ideas, and then follow this with evidence from the extract to support the inference: *'I think this historian blames the Soviet Union for starting the Cold War (inference). I can tell this because the historian writes that the Allies had no choice but to resist Soviet expansionism (support from the extract).'* By keeping to this structure, candidates can avoid the most common weakness in answers – purposeless repetition of what the extract says. Two important pieces of advice flow from this. First, candidates should plan their answer carefully before they start writing so that it constitutes a full explanation, through using the extract as a whole, of what is seen as the interpretation. Many weaker answers work through the extract picking up on points as they arise, but these often suffer from lack of coherence or even contradictions. Second, the answer does not need to be lengthy to score well as the mark scheme is focused on the qualities of the response, not quantity. If candidates have decided what they want to write and have selected appropriate evidence from the extract to support their arguments, there will be no unnecessary 'padding' – no unfocused writing about events, no purposeless copying from the extract, no irrelevant summary of 'other' historians' views. Many of the best answers are no more than three or four pages long.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: The Causes and Impact of British Imperialism, c.1850 – 1939

There were insufficient scripts on this section for any meaningful comments to be made on them.

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that Hitler and the SS envisaged the use of mass murder against the Jews from an early stage, and that contingent factors did nothing other than determine the timing of the implementation of the Final Solution. The strongest answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. The key was to understand that the extract was an explicit refutation of functionalism (*'the notion that Nazi Germany turned to genocide as a last resort...now looks simply ludicrous'*) and thus intentionalist in nature (*'His idea of destroying Jewry was at least as longstanding'*). Sound answers usually explained the intentionalism but missed the dismissal of functionalism. Weaker answers tended to be distracted by other aspects of the extract, such as the mention of technocrats or the SS, and thought they saw a structuralist approach, arguing that Hitler was a weak dictator, or decided that war was the crucial factor, based on what the extract said about Barbarossa and developments in the war in 1941. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

Section C: The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941 – 1950

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that Roosevelt's policies towards the Soviet Union were deluded, given that he had to deal with an expansionist and despotic adversary. The strongest answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Complete understanding was dependant on an explanation of how the interpretation dealt with both adversaries. Indeed, Roosevelt's policy could only really be thought deluded once the true nature of his adversary was taken into account. Sound, but incomplete, understanding could be demonstrated by basing the argument on Roosevelt alone. These answers had plenty of material from the extract to use, and usually concluded that the historian's approach was revisionist, in that it blamed the US President. Others were clearly uncomfortable attaching the revisionist label to an interpretation that did not accuse Roosevelt of bad intentions, and this sometimes produced interesting discussion of contrasts between this extract and more usual revisionist arguments. Weaker answers misunderstood the material on Roosevelt, and focused on what the historian said about Stalin, claiming either that the main interpretation was that he was to blame for starting the Cold War (given the amount the extract focused on Roosevelt, this was not the case), or even that the extract exonerated Stalin (which it clearly did not). The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9389/33 Interpretations Question</p>

Key messages

- The question is about the historian's interpretation and approach. The candidate's answer must identify these and use the extract to explain how they have been identified.
- The historian's interpretation will be consistent with everything in the extract. Different parts of the extract will not have different interpretations. It is therefore vital for candidates to consider the extract as a whole.
- The extract has not been previously seen by candidates. They must, therefore, allocate time to read and think about it before starting their answers.

General comments

Most candidates produced a response which used the extract and provided an explanation of what they considered was the historian's interpretation, clearly understanding the demands of the question. Most answers were complete, reaching a reasoned conclusion. The strongest responses demonstrated a complete understanding of the historian's interpretation and showed a consistent focus on using details of the extract to support their arguments. More modest responses, which lacked this level of understanding, often still saw the extract as containing an interpretation and offered some support from the extract for the points they made. There were very few answers seen which made no reference to the historian's views, and merely paraphrased the extract.

As the question asks what you can learn from the extract about the historian's interpretation, candidates need to know how to detect the interpretation. It is not what the extract says; it will be in what one can learn from what it says. To learn this, you need to know where to look, and to recognise what is significant. The extract will contain a mixture of fact and opinion. The interpretation is not the facts. It will not, for example, be *'The historian's interpretation is that Hitler was anti-Semitic.'* That's just a fact. But the fact might lead to an opinion: *'Hitler's anti-Semitism was so profound that he was determined from the start of his political career to work to wipe out all Jews in Europe.'* That's an opinion; some historians would agree with it, others would not. So, what can you learn from it about this historian? Put all the statements of opinion in the extract together, and within them will be the overall message that the historian wishes to convey. Many answers write at length about aspects of the extract that do not contribute to the identification or explanation of the main interpretation, suggesting a lack of clarity on what the interpretation actually is.

Answers should be about the historian's opinions, and how you can use them to infer the overall interpretation. The best answers are well structured. They state an inference they have made about the historian's ideas, and then follow this with evidence from the extract to support the inference: *'I think this historian blames the Soviet Union for starting the Cold War (inference). I can tell this because the historian writes that the Allies had no choice but to resist Soviet expansionism (support from the extract).'* By keeping to this structure, candidates can avoid the most common weakness in answers – purposeless repetition of what the extract says. Two important pieces of advice flow from this. First, candidates should plan their answer carefully before they start writing so that it constitutes a full explanation, through using the extract as a whole, of what is seen as the interpretation. Many weaker answers work through the extract picking up on points as they arise, but these often suffer from lack of coherence or even contradictions. Second, the answer does not need to be lengthy to score well as the mark scheme is focused on the qualities of the response, not quantity. If candidates have decided what they want to write and have selected appropriate evidence from the extract to support their arguments, there will be no unnecessary 'padding' – no unfocused writing about events, no purposeless copying from the extract, no irrelevant summary of 'other' historians' views. Many of the best answers are no more than three or four pages long.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: *The Causes and Impact of British Imperialism, c.1850 – 1939*

There were insufficient scripts on this section for any meaningful comments to be made on them.

Section B: *The Holocaust*

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that Hitler planned from the start for some kind of action to liberate Europe from the Jews, but for this to harden into a specific programme of genocide, the prospect of defeat in war was needed. The strongest answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. What marked out these answers from the rest was the precision with which they used the extract. They were clear on the point that, whilst Hitler had some sort of intention to take action against the Jews, the specific nature of this action was not fixed from the start. And they were clear on the point that, whilst the war was significant, it was specifically the downturn in the Russian campaign that determined when the decision for genocide was taken. More modest answers provided a precise explanation of one of these aspects but did not demonstrate complete understanding of the other aspects of the interpretation. Weaker answers did, for example, see that the war was important, but would miss the central point about the downturn. Alternatively, they saw Hitler's intent to take action against the Jews, but saw this as murderous from the start. Neither of these approaches demonstrated understanding of the central points of the interpretation. This extract provided a good example of where the use of an historiographical 'label' mattered much less than the ability to explain the interpretation properly. It was possible to label the interpretation as intentionalist, functionalist or synthesis, but what counted was how effectively the label was explained. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

Section C: *The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941 – 1950*

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that after Potsdam, the Soviet Union was to be blamed for the breakdown of trust, and the West could be exonerated from blame. The strongest answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Complete understanding of the historian's traditional approach was indicated by reference to the portrayal of the Soviet Union as threatening and expansionist (e.g. *'the followers of Moscow would, if they could, destroy the existence of free government'*) whilst the West's response was benign and blameless (*'The West could not bring itself to be as ruthless to the defeated Germans'*). Sound answers dealt with only one of these aspects, but still were able to use the extract effectively as support. Weaker responses were distracted by other elements of the extract and made false inferences about the interpretation. Some of these were more understandable than others. For example, the last sentence was taken by some candidates to be an indication of post-revisionism, blaming neither side but seeing the problem as mutual mistrust. Others incorrectly argued that the extract as blaming the West, based on quotes such as *'The Western Allies were standing out against both Soviet expansionism and Communist social ideas.'* The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/41
Depth Study

Key messages

- A sustained focus on the specific nature of the question asked is the key to accessing the higher levels of the mark scheme.
- Stronger answers are analytical throughout and attempt to address all aspects of the question.
- Analysis should be supported by relevant and accurate factual information, and this knowledge should be in-depth.
- Candidates must take note of the chronological timeframe of the question as assessment of events outside of the question remit cannot be credited.
- Stronger answers provide a balanced argument and evaluation.
- Candidates are advised to read the questions carefully and analyse what is required before starting to write their answers.

General comments

Higher quality answers were clearly analytical in approach and had a well-argued case that was supported with good levels of relevant subject knowledge and then reached a logical final judgement. A good example of this was **Question 2**, where candidates had to assess the given statement, ‘I intend to reform Italy.’ Mussolini 1922. How far had Mussolini achieved his objective by 1941? This question required a clear analysis of the success and failure of Mussolini’s policies to reform Italy.

Lack of subject knowledge sometimes hampered candidates, and this was illustrated in **Question 6**, where candidates did not always have enough subject material to answer the question on the impact of the feminist movement on Americans in the 1960s and 1970s.

Having a balanced answer is very important. **Question 10** highlighted this, where candidates had to evaluate the causes of the Second Cold War and assess the impact of the Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan alongside other causes and come to a well-reasoned judgement.

Comments on specific questions.

Depth Study 1: Europe of the Dictators, 1918–41.

1 Assess the importance of ideology to Bolshevik success by 1924.

This was a popular question choice, but not always answered in an analytical and factually well supported manner. This question required candidates to assess the role of ideology and compare and contrast this with other factors. Many weaker responses ignored the term ‘ideology’ within the question or demonstrated little knowledge of it, writing a more general answer on why the Bolsheviks were still in power by 1924. Bolshevik ideology and how it was used needed to be explained and indeed the changing ideology or pragmatism shown by the New Economic Policy. The April Theses and other ideological promises, winning the Civil War, War Communism and the New Economic Policy all needed examining as did the strengths of the Bolsheviks and the weaknesses of their opponents.

2 ‘I intend to reform Italy.’ (Mussolini 1922). How far had Mussolini achieved his objective by 1941?

This was a popular question and many responses were able to generally describe many of Mussolini’s policies. Weaker answers sometimes ignored the question and included a narrative

account of everything that happened, ascribing success or failure to it. Higher quality answers looked at what reform might mean and to what extent Mussolini had reformed Italy by 1941. These answers looked at Political changes, economic and social policies and also in some cases, foreign policy too. Nuanced answers looked at how far Italy had really been reformed by 1941 and the success and failure of policies to reform Italy. There was a great deal of factual support and candidates were able to recount Mussolini's aims and policies, although not always in a balanced manner.

3 'We have created a truly communist state.' (Stalin 1940). Evaluate this claim.

This question required candidates to explain what a truly communist state might look like and then assess how far the Soviet Union resembled this by 1940. This question was generally well answered, and answers showed a good grasp of what a communist state might look like and what policies Stalin had followed to bring this about. Collectivisation and the Five Year Plans featured heavily, as did educational policies and class war and the liquidation of the Kulaks. Several candidates suggested that Terror was not a communist ideal and there was also a good examination of the role of women. It was important to have a summative judgement and this was sometimes missing in more modest responses.

4 Assess the reasons why there was little effective opposition within Germany to Hitler's rule.

This was a popular question and often answered well. Candidates looked at the Nazi's use of Terror and the Police state in great detail and also at propaganda and education and higher quality answers also looked at how the Nazi programmes were popular and successful with some sections of the population. The area that was most often lacking was examining what opposition did actually exist such as the Edelweiss Pirates, the White Rose Group, and the Kreisau Circle. The answer required a clear examination of the way opposition was suppressed and how it still existed in certain parts of German, and certain sectors of society.

Depth Study 2: The History of the USA, 1945–90

5 Assess the progress made by the Civil Rights Movement between 1945 and 1960.

This was a popular question with some centres. Answers demonstrated a good range of factual material to deploy and did so at length. The Brown vs Board of Education case featured prominently as did Rosa Parkes and the bus boycott and the Little Rock High School forced integration by Eisenhower. Some talked about achievements under Truman and in particular the Supreme Court featured as the real agent of change. However, there was a tendency amongst some answers to give an extensive narrative of the events, but not to address the issue of progress as stated in the question. Higher quality answers looked at how De Jure segregation was being pushed back, but that De Facto segregation continued. Some answers were not confined to the dates of the question and talked about Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

6 'The feminist movement had little impact on the lives of Americans during the 1960s and 1970s.' How far do you agree?

This question was less well answered than others in this section. Responses were often not supported by sufficient factual knowledge and were also characterised by a narrative description rather than answering the idea of 'little impact'. Better structured answers did look at the achievements of the feminist movement, what it achieved, but also the differential impact depending on social class. Betty Friedan was often mentioned and the founding of the National Organisation for Women. The failure to pass the Equal Rights Amendment and Roe vs Wade in 1973 also featured regularly. Very good answers pointed out that this was in many ways a white middle class movement.

Questions 7 and 8 were too infrequently seen to be able to make a meaningful comment.

Depth Study 3: International History, 1945–91

9 'Economic problems were the main factor leading to the détente of the late 1960s and the 1970s.' How far do you agree?

This question was a popular one and answers showed a good understanding of why the policy of détente was followed by the USA and the USSR. There was a great deal of factual support and

description of the policies of détente, but this material was not always used in an analytical manner and sometimes sight was lost of the actual question and the causes of the policy. The sheer cost of fighting the Cold War was highlighted, the nuclear weapons programme and the strains it imposed on the economies of the USA and USSR, Vietnam and the OPEC Oil crisis were all usefully evaluated. Other causes such as the desire to avoid nuclear war, the impact of the Cuban Missile Crisis, the desire for non-proliferation and also Nixon's policy of splitting the USSR and China were all mentioned at times. As always, the most successful answers addressed the question analytically and argued a case with good factual support.

10 'The Second Cold War was the direct result of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.' How far do you agree?

This was a popular choice of question and generally well answered. Answers talked about the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and could explain the results of these actions. Most candidates were then able to look at other causes of the Second Cold War, such as Brezhnev's policy of spreading Soviet influence globally and in particular in Africa, Asia, and Latin America. Other factors such as the Soviet shooting down of Korean Airlines flight 007 and Operation Able Archer held by NATO were sometimes examined. There was a great deal of coverage on Reagan's election in 1980 and the influence of the Neo-Conservatives and the determination to win the Cold War by economic means and of course the Strategic Defence Initiative. The perceived weakness of President Carter's policies, the boycotts of the Moscow and Los Angeles Olympic Games and the non-ratification of Salt 2 were or could have been mentioned. Weaker answers were characterised by a lack of analysis and breadth of topic coverage. In some instances these responses also lost sight of the question which focuses on causation.

11 'The main objective of Deng Xiaoping's foreign policy was to promote China's economic development.' Evaluate this view.

This question was infrequently attempted, and the focus of the answers was not always clearly on economic development. The answers did focus on maintaining the position of China, increasing its global influence, and reducing its previous isolationism. He stressed his Open-Door policy and visited the United States in 1979. This cooperation was continued under President Reagan. Some answers highlighted his pursuit of a peaceful foreign policy as his focus was on the economy. Some responses lost focus on the question and talked about repression at home, which was not really relevant to this question. The main weakness was that answers did not always have sufficient factual basis to support their analysis, but equally some very strong responses were seen.

12 'It was the failure of the United States and Britain to honour their agreements with Egypt that caused the Suez Crisis.' How far do you agree?

Responses to this question were generally of a high quality. The main feature of weaker responses was that they tended to produce a lengthy answer on the causes of the Suez Crisis and not actually focus on the question asked. Stronger responses had plenty of factual underpinning and this aided the analysis. Answers demonstrated a very good understanding of British, French, and Israeli motives and actions, but were sometimes less familiar with the foreign policy worries of the United States. Higher quality answers were able to examine the aims and actions of the United States, Britain, France, Israel, and Egypt in depth and did so in a comprehensive manner.

Depth Study 4: African History, 1945–91

Too few responses were seen to be able to make a meaningful comment.

Depth Study 5: Southeast Asian History, 1945–90s

Too few responses were seen to be able to make a meaningful comment.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/42
Depth Study

Key messages

- A sustained focus on the specific nature of the question asked is the key to accessing the higher levels of the mark scheme.
- Stronger answers are analytical throughout and attempt to address all aspects of the question.
- Analysis should be supported by relevant and accurate factual information, and this knowledge should be in-depth.
- Candidates must take note of the chronological timeframe of the question as assessment of events outside of the question remit cannot be credited.
- Stronger answers provide a balanced argument and evaluation.
- Candidates are advised to read the questions carefully and analyse what is required before starting to write their answers.

General comments

Higher quality answers were clearly analytical in approach and had a well-argued case that was supported with good levels of relevant subject knowledge and then reached a logical final judgement. A good example of this was **Question 3**, where higher quality answers examined both Stalin's opponents and their actions but also assessed the tactics of Stalin in depth. They then drew up a balanced judgement, based on good in-depth factual knowledge. Weaker responses tended to just describe the events of the period and offered no real opinion or tended to focus on either Stalin or his opponents but not on both.

Lack of subject knowledge sometimes hampered responses. This was illustrated in **Question 4**, where some responses demonstrated little knowledge of Nazi propaganda, how it was used and its effectiveness or not. These answers tended to give a broad description of Nazi policies in totality.

Having an answer that looks at both sides of the question and is balanced is very important. **Question 9** highlighted this. Better responses examined how effective the US policy of containment was and looked at successes and failures across the time period. These responses avoided a narrative account of the key events of the specified period.

Comments on specific questions

Depth Study 1: Europe of the Dictators, 1918–41.

1 Evaluate the reasons why the Bolsheviks abandoned War Communism and introduced the New Economic Policy.

This was a very popular question and was often answered well. Weaker quality answers tended towards a narrative description of War Communism followed by one of the New Economic Policy. Stronger answers were analytical and examined the reasons for the change of policies from War Communism to the New Economic Policy. These responses highlighted economic reasons, military reasons and the end of the Civil War, and political reasons; namely the survival of the Bolshevik regime following Tambov and Kronstadt risings. The analytical answers, underpinned by good factual support, scored highly on this question. Candidates had a good depth and breadth of subject knowledge on this topic and how it was deployed differentiated the quality of the answers.

2 'Mussolini's economic policies left Italy's economy in a worse state in 1940 than it had been in 1922.' How far do you agree?

This was a popular question and responses showed a good understanding of the factual details of Mussolini's economic policies. However, there was tendency to resort to descriptive narrative and to describe each policy in turn and not to assess their impact on the economy as a whole. There was much focus on the various 'Battles' and also on the Corporate State as a concept. Higher quality answers were analytical in approach and looked to evaluate the state of the economy by 1940 and whether it was in a worse state or not. They looked at the defects in the economy, the problems of the South, lack of investment in industry and indeed the failure of many of the 'Battles'. The negative impact of the war was also mentioned. There was balance in these answers and successes such as lowering inflation, unemployment and improvements in transport, the railways, and the draining of the Pontine Marshes were addressed.

3 'He was underestimated by his opponents.' How far does this explain Stalin's rise to power?

Higher quality responses showed balance and a close examination of the hypothesis and also counter arguments. Weaker answers were often a description of the events, rather than analysis of why Stalin was able to gain ultimate power. Responses outlined the tactics used by Stalin very well as well as the weaknesses of his opponents and their tactical errors. Stalin's ambition and how he had quietly been allowed to amass power was often examined and the naivety of Trotsky, Zinoviev, and Kamenev. There were many high-quality answers seen, and the subject material was clearly well known and understood. Weaker answers tended towards descriptive narrative of the events with no real explanation or focus on the question.

4 Assess the importance of propaganda to the Nazi regime.

Although this was a popular choice of question, responses sometimes lacked the factual knowledge needed to be able to support an in-depth evaluation of the importance of propaganda. Some responses were in the form of an essay on the Consolidation of Power or the nature of the Nazi Police State, ignoring propaganda which was the focus of the question. Higher quality answers examined the various types of propaganda used and their effectiveness, but also looked at other means that kept the Nazi regime in power. These answers were balanced and included propaganda, but also looked at Education, Youth Organisations, the nature of Nazi support in Germany and indeed the role of terror and coercion as well as delivering on promises, such as revising the Treaty of Versailles and reducing unemployment.

Depth Study 2: The History of the USA, 1945–90

Too few of these responses were seen to be able to make a meaningful comment.

Depth Study 3: International History, 1945–1991

9 How effective was the US policy of containment in the period 1950-1962

This question was regularly attempted, and responses examined the Korean War as a clear example of the US policy of containment being tested and communism being successfully restrained. Hungary in 1956 was often used as an example whereby the USA was unable to stop the Soviet Union keeping Hungary in the Eastern Bloc. The Building of the Berlin Wall in 1961 as a means of the East German authorities strengthening their regime and the inability of the US to prevent this was sometimes mentioned. Cuba and the takeover by Fidel Castro was highlighted and then the actual Cuban Missile Crisis and how that had prevented further Soviet expansion, but also how Fidel Castro was to remain in power and that President Kennedy had to sacrifice missiles in Turkey as part of the overall de-escalation of the crisis. Some responses mentioned the involvement of the US in Vietnam in support of France and as advisors to try to prevent the spread of communism in Asia. Higher quality answers were analytical and not just descriptive of the events that took place and reached a balanced judgement.

10 'Détente in the 1970s gave the appearance, rather than producing the reality, of better relations between the United States and the Soviet Union.' How far do you agree?

This question was frequently attempted, but on occasion the focus of the question was neglected. These responses included a broad description of the policies and events of détente in the 1970s. The question asked candidates to explore the real success or failure of détente in the stated period answering with a balanced argument to be made on the stated hypothesis. Stronger responses examined the failure of the policy as epitomised by the invasion of Afghanistan in 1979, the failure of the United States to ratify SALT 2 and the election of Reagan in 1980, as a clear Cold War warrior and the rejection of the policies of President Carter. This was balanced by the negotiation of SALT 1, the Helsinki Accords of 1975 and President Carter's efforts at a real thaw in the Cold War. Higher quality answers looked to evaluate how successful détente really was in improving relations.

11 'The aim of Mao Zedong's Cultural Revolution was to gain the support of young people for his revolutionary ideology.' Evaluate this claim.

Too few of these responses were seen to be able to make a meaningful comment.

12 'The United Nations was responsible for the outbreak of the Arab-Israeli War in 1948.' How far do you agree?

This question was not attempted frequently, but there were some very high-quality answers. The strongest answers focused on the 'outbreak' of war as specified in the question. The actions of the United Nations in 1947 were explained well. Also, the role of the United States in applying pressure to the United Nations also needed explaining and was often done well. The historical and immediate role of Britain was also analysed, often in great depth. Stronger responses were analytical in nature and produced balanced answers looking at the culpability of the United Nations and also the role and responsibility of other key players, including the Zionists and the Arab Community. Weaker answers tended towards descriptive narrative of the events or at times rather ignored the United Nations and its role.

Depth Study 4: African History, 1945–1991

Too few of these responses were seen to be able to make a meaningful comment.

Depth Study 5: Southeast Asian History, 1945–1990s

Too few of these responses were seen to be able to make a meaningful comment.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/43
Depth Study

Key messages

- A sustained focus on the specific nature of the question asked is the key to accessing the higher levels of the mark scheme.
- Stronger answers are analytical throughout and attempt to address all aspects of the question.
- Analysis should be supported by relevant and accurate factual information, and this knowledge should be in-depth.
- Candidates must take note of the chronological timeframe of the question as assessment of events outside of the question remit cannot be credited.
- Stronger answers provide a balanced argument and evaluation.
- Candidates are advised to read the questions carefully and analyse what is required before starting to write their answers.

General comments

Higher quality answers were clearly analytical in approach and had a well-argued case that was supported with good levels of relevant subject knowledge and then reached a logical final judgement. A good example of this was **Question 4**, where higher quality answers examined repression and also many other factors that allowed the Nazi regime to survive. They then drew up a balanced judgement, based on very good in-depth factual knowledge. Weaker responses tended to just describe the events of the period and offered no real opinion or tended to focus either on repression or the other factors and did not offer a balanced approach.

Lack of subject knowledge sometimes hampered candidates, and this was illustrated in **Question 2**, where some responses demonstrated very little knowledge about the role and support of the King and how this might help explain why Mussolini was in power for so long. Sometimes answers just ignored the question and wrote a description of how Mussolini stayed in power.

Having an answer that looks at both sides of the question and is balanced is very important. **Question 10** highlighted this very well and higher quality candidates were able to look at the policies followed by Gorbachev, but also looked at other significant factors too.

Comments on specific questions.

Depth Study 1: Europe of the Dictators, 1918–41.

1 How far was the Russian Civil War caused by Lenin's refusal to work with other parties?

This was a very popular question and was often answered well. Stronger responses examined and analysed Lenin's approach to the other political parties and in particular the closing of the Constituent Assembly in 1918. Such answers then explained other causes of the Civil War, not least the actions of the Whites and Greens and divisions amongst political parties such as the Social Revolutionaries and the role of foreign powers. The fact that the Civil War was ultimately brought about as a struggle to secure power and secure the position of the Bolsheviks as the party that would control Russia was well explained. Weaker answers tended to follow the route of descriptive narrative of the Civil War and were not tightly argued or focused on the question asked.

2 'He had the support of the King.' How far does this explain why Mussolini was in power for so long?

Responses to this question sometimes demonstrated lack of knowledge regarding the support of the King and any steps he might have taken to support Mussolini. Here the King's support following the murder of Matteotti and also the fact that there was no serious opposition party that the King could have installed in power is very important. Divided opposition was key factor in maintaining Mussolini in power and some candidates argued there was no real opposition after the Acerbo Law was passed until the regime was clearly failing in 1943. The strongest answers looked at the support of the Roman Catholic Church, the Acerbo Law, the use of some terror through OVRA, and his manipulation of public opinion by appearing a man of action and trying to improve the general standard of living via the various 'Battles'.

3 How far did a Social Revolution take place under Stalin?

Higher quality responses showed balance and a close examination of the hypothesis and provided counter arguments. More modest responses gave a description of the events, rather than analysis of whether this was bringing about a Social Revolution. Stronger answers outlined the policies followed by Stalin such as Collectivisation and liquidating the Kulaks as examples of a Social Revolution. Women's roles were often cited as a clear example that there was no Social Revolution and that Stalin was in essence very traditionalist. Broadening access to education was often highlighted as a transformative policy and countered by the continuing and excessive use of terror. A key factor in writing a high-quality essay was to define Social Revolution and then argue a case. Weaker answers tended to be descriptive narratives of the events with no real explanation or focus on the question.

4 'Repression was the main reason for the survival of the Nazi regime.' How far do you agree?

This was a very popular question, and many candidates had a vast array of material to deploy in their answers. Some responses focused only on the consolidation of power, and a few looked at the rise to power, but overwhelmingly answers were analytical and attempted an argument as to the importance of repression as opposed to other factors. Strong responses explained repression in terms of the Nazi police state, the concentration camps, SA, SS and Gestapo and also looked at the control of education, the role of the Hitler Youth and the whole idea of a surveillance society. Scapegoating as a tactic was mentioned and the Jews and other persecuted groups were discussed. Answers also looked at why the Nazi regime might be popular, for example solving unemployment and providing 'Work and Bread'. Revision of the Treaty of Versailles and a successful foreign policy were also looked at. The best answers were balanced and clearly argued with good factual support.

Depth Study 2: The History of the USA, 1945–90

Too few responses were seen to be able to make a meaningful comment.

Depth Study 3: International History, 1945–91

9 Assess the extent to which there was a 'thaw' in US-Soviet relations in the period from 1953 to 1963.

This question was very regularly attempted, and candidates examined the end of the Korean War, the death of Stalin, Khrushchev's 'Secret Speech' and the new policy it appeared to usher in. The Berlin Crisis of 1953 and the wish to de-escalate tensions was analysed. Hungary 1956 and the Building of the Berlin Wall in 1961 showed the thaw was not universal and there was much discussion of the U2 spy plane crisis and then the Cuba crisis from the Bay of Pigs to the missile crisis in 1962. The stating of détente post the Cuban Missile Crisis was evidenced as a sign that the 'thaw' was real. Vietnam, the Space Race and the US continuing commitment to containment were all addressed in some answers. Higher quality answers looked at the question in a balanced way and showed that there was both 'thaw' and real cold war in the period and therefore addressed the 'to what extent' element of the question. Weaker responses tended to be either one sided in their approach or lack sufficient factual support.

10 'Gorbachev tried to do too much too soon.' How far does this explain the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991?

This was a very popular question and candidates demonstrated a great deal of knowledge about Gorbachev's policies. In some cases, this led to a very full description of policies but not an analysis and evaluation of them and their impact. Long term factors were sometimes ignored. Glasnost and Perestroika were examined and their failure to solve the problems of the Soviet Union well examined. The Sinatra Doctrine was also explained well. There was less focus on nationalism in Eastern Europe and then the Soviet Republics themselves. Few responses mentioned the tensions between Gorbachev and Yeltsin and also the inability of Gorbachev to realise that a fundamental reform of communism was needed. Some candidates looked at the longer-term problems and their role in the collapse of the Soviet Union. Clearly an argued judgement was needed and not just a very full description of the policies followed.

11 'Deng Xiaoping's political conservatism was the main reason for protest in China during his rule.' How far do you agree?

Too few responses were seen to be able to make a meaningful comment.

12 'It was Saddam Hussein's determination to remain in power that led to the Gulf War.' How far do you agree?

Too few responses were seen to be able to make a meaningful comment.

Depth Study 4: African History, 1945–91

Too few responses were seen to be able to make a meaningful comment.

Depth Study 5: Southeast Asian History, 1945–90s

Too few responses were seen to be able to make a meaningful comment.