

HISTORY

Paper 9389/11
Document Question

Key Messages

Candidates did well when they:

- Read the four sources with great care, noting with particular attention the key words or phrases
- For the **(a)** question, concentrated on comparing the content of the two sources, writing one paragraph on similarities and one on differences.
- For the **(b)** question, related each source to the given hypothesis and then evaluated the content of at least one source.
- Included contextual knowledge in answering the **(b)** question, where it provided evidence to help evaluate the sources.

General Comments

Assessment of candidates' answers uses a Levels of Response marking scheme. The **(a)** question has four levels of response, the **(b)** question five. To reach the highest level for either **(a)** or **(b)** questions requires the ability to make some kind of sustained judgement or reasoned conclusion based on the analysis and evaluation of the sources.

The **(a)** question requires the study of just two sources, not four. It requires a relatively simple comparison of those sources, identifying surface similarities and differences. For this question, candidates did well when they avoided describing what sources say at some length and focused on identifying and explaining similarities and differences.

For the **(b)** question, the vast majority of candidates could identify and explain how each of the sources addresses the hypothesis. The source evaluation was less well done. Source evaluation at AS Level needs to be specific, and focused on the content.

As for this particular examination, most candidates coped reasonably well with its specific demands. The most frequent weakness was to answer questions without carefully reading the sources first. In trying to write as much as possible, candidates often neglected the careful reading which almost certainly have resulted in higher quality answers. Specific examples will be given in the comments which follow.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A, the European Option: The role of Piedmont in Italian unification

Question (a)

The two sources were both from Cavour. One was a public speech made in the early days of the war, the other a private letter towards the end of the war. In the first line of Source a, which talks of a treaty taking Piedmont to war, many candidates assumed that the treaty was the Plombieres treaty, which took Piedmont to war with Austria. In fact, Plombieres was signed in 1859, not 1855. This shows the importance of accurate contextual knowledge. The differences were understood by most candidates: Source A saw the aim of war as being to help Italy, Source B to help Piedmont. The best answers identified similarities. In both sources Cavour is concerned with the position of Italy in Europe and accepts the need for a war to improve that position.

Question (b)

Candidates found both question and sources to be accessible. There were some confused responses to Source D. Most asserted that the source supported the assertion. If it does, the support is implicit rather than explicit. Rattazzi argues that the intention was to liberate Italy, which is not the same as unifying Italy, even if one will probably lead to the other. Most appreciated that Source C contained two contradictory accounts of Cavour's aims. Most argued that the non-nationalist view of Cavour was more convincing without providing any evidence to support their assertion. That evidence could have come either from the other sources, especially Source B, or from their own knowledge, which is likely to tell them that Cavour was an opportunist.

Section B, the American Option: Lincoln's views on slavery.

Question (a)

Source B, a letter from Lincoln, caused problems for a few because they thought it was a letter to Lincoln, overlooking both the end of the letter and its provenance. This again illustrates the point about the need to read sources with great care. This limitation apart, most candidates were able to identify similarities and differences. In both, Lincoln opposed slavery in some form while also in both expressing limits to that opposition. Neither source shows Lincoln as an abolitionist. By 1863, however, unlike his stance two years before, Lincoln was prepared to take action against those practising slavery – even if only within the confines of war. The very different contexts of late 1860 and mid-1863 suggest that both sources can be taken as reliable indicators of Lincoln's (changing) position on slavery. The Emancipation Edict of 1862-3 could be used as further evidence to support this analysis.

Question (b)

In this context, 'conservative' means keeping to the traditional ways, reluctant to change. It does not mean being in favour of minimal action and intervention by the federal government, which for many is the modern meaning of the term. There was no evidence that candidates did confuse old and new definitions of conservatism. Some, however, did find it difficult to make full use of Source A and simply because it made no explicit mention of slavery; Lincoln referred only to black and white races. The blacks must have included free blacks as well as slaves. However, most blacks within the USA were slaves. Slaves could never be equal. Lincoln was allowing no possibility of change. This was a conservative position. Source B was equally conservative; it showed Lincoln was no abolitionist. Neither does Source D, a most unusual source from a leading ex-slave and abolitionist. The very best answers evaluated in detail a source which criticised Lincoln for his stance on slavery. Lincoln was seen as the man who freed the slaves. Why then is a leading ex-slave so critical of him, especially in public, especially at an event in memory of Lincoln? Attempts to provide answers to such questions which were based on solid evidence were rewarded. The only source which showed Lincoln to be far from conservative was Source C, a measure forced on him by the necessities of war. Once this source is evaluated, it might also support the thesis or a modified version, e.g. that he was inconsistently conservative.

Section C, International Option: Britain and the Beginnings of the League of Nations

Question (a).

This is another example of an (a) question which shows the importance of concentrating on the focus of the question, in this case meetings prior to the World Disarmament Conference. Less successful candidates wrote either a general comparison of the two sources or one which focused on the actual Conference. Most relevant answers appreciated the difference between the negative view of Source A, the cartoon, and Source B from Einstein. The main similarity, identified by the best candidates, was that both showed that preparatory meetings were being held and that some kind of unity was being maintained – even in Source A the national representatives all stay in the meeting room. As for evaluation, Source A obviously exaggerates for effect and was not to be taken literally while Source B comes from a leading German scientist and pacifist.

Question (b) Most candidates could explain and illustrate how the four sources either supported or challenged the hypothesis. The usual divide was to see Sources B and D in support and Sources A and C in opposition. Source evaluation proved to be more of a challenge. The most straightforward to evaluate was Source D. The opening speech of an international conference by the leader of the conference could only be upbeat and positive. A careful reading of Source D, however, suggests a more realistic view. The international instabilities of 1932, especially in Manchuria, meant that it was important that the Conference **should** succeed, the President argued. He made no assertion that it was bound to succeed. The tone of the extract is far from upbeat. Source D's analysis of the situation was much closer to that of Source C than it was to Source B. Any consideration of contextual knowledge would show that in 1931-2 the prospects for

peace and thus for disarmament were far from good. Such evidence makes Source D more reliable than might initially be expected. The source which candidates were keenest to engage with was Source A, the cartoon. Many were keen to label the various figures shown. Woodrow Wilson was one such figure sometimes identified, which was incorrect as he had died in 1924. Some saw the two figures with their backs turned and their heads bowed as representing Germany but there is no evidence to support such an assertion. This is one cartoon for which there is little benefit in analysing its content in more detail. Source B is from Einstein, a leading German scientist. Some wanted to use either his occupation or his nationality to make assertions about the reliability of his argument. No-one considered his Jewishness and the impact that might have on him in the early 1930s, when German anti-Semitism was definitely on the increase. As for Source C, most evaluations saw it as reliable, in part because it was American, in part because its argument was based on contextual knowledge. The latter argument was more convincing than the former.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/12
Document Question

Key Messages

Candidates did well when they:

- Read the four sources with great care, noting with particular attention the key words or phrases.
- For the **(a)** question, concentrated on comparing the content of the two sources, writing one paragraph on similarities and one on differences.
- For the **(b)** question, related each source to the given hypothesis and then evaluated the content of at least one source.
- Included contextual knowledge in answering the **(b)** question, where it provided evidence to help evaluate the sources.

General Comments

Assessment of candidates' answers uses a Levels of Response marking scheme. The **(a)** question has four levels of response, the **(b)** question five. To reach the highest level for either **(a)** or **(b)** questions requires the ability to make some kind of sustained judgement or reasoned conclusion based on the analysis and evaluation of the sources.

The **(a)** question requires the study of just two sources, not four. It requires a relatively simple comparison of those sources, identifying surface similarities and differences. For this question, candidates did well when they avoided describing what sources say at some length, and focused on identifying and explaining similarities and differences.

For the **(b)** question, the vast majority of candidates could identify and explain how each of the sources addresses the hypothesis. The source evaluation was less well done. Source evaluation at AS Level needs to be specific and focused on the content.

As for this particular examination, most candidates coped reasonably well with its specific demands. The most frequent weakness was to answer questions without carefully reading the sources first. In trying to use the hour to write as much as possible, candidates often neglected the careful reading which almost certainly have resulted in higher quality answers. Specific examples will be given in the comments which follow.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A, the European Option: Bismarck, war and unification

Question (a)

The two sources were both from Bismarck and both from the same year, 1867. Candidates were able to identify both similarities and differences. The former included some sympathy towards France – or at least no obvious hostility - and a reluctance to go to war with France. Differences included a belief that no war would come for 10-15 years, by which time it would not be sought by either side, (Source A) and a belief that a Franco-Prussian war would occur 'before long' (Source A), presumably within 10-15 years. Source B was to prove more accurate. The difference between the two is explained mainly by the different people Bismarck is addressing: a British journalist in Source A, a fellow Prussian Conservative in Source B. Whether the interview was actually published is not made clear. Bismarck, however, was making sure that British public opinion was on his side. Source A is less reliable than Source B, especially as the latter shows Bismarck to be anything but a 'blood and iron' man. Competent answers compared and contrasted the content of the two sources, whereas the best answers evaluated them in detail.

Question (b)

In both Source A and Source B, Bismarck is quite clear that he did not want to go to war with France, the goal of such a war presumably being the completion of German unification – or at least the *Kleindeutsch* version of unity. Most answers made this point. In both sources, however, Bismarck also says that he might take Prussia to war if ‘German feelings’ (Source A) or ‘the vital interests of the Fatherland’ required it. Thus he was prepared to go to war to protect German interests, at the very least. German interests might not mean German unification but the difference between the two is thin; war against France, the most likely enemy, would unite the peoples of Germany. The best answers made a careful analysis of Bismarck’s words in 1867, reversing an initial identification of the Sources as supporting the quote. Contextual evidence provides further support for this reversal. In 1870, Bismarck did manipulate the Hohenzollern candidature to push France into declaring war with Prussia, much as he had manipulated Austria into going to war in 1866. Bismarck’s pacific protestations in Sources A and B are not supported by events. Candidates struggled more with Sources C and D, which were briefer and less obviously relevant. In many cases, however, these struggles were successful. Many saw the ambiguity in Source C, in which Bismarck’s treats Austria kindly in 1866 in order to avoid her allying with France in the future. Why would he do this? To isolate France in the event of a major crisis, perhaps even war, between France and Prussia. He was planning for the possibility of war. Source D was even more succinct and more tangential. It portrays Bismarck as a great planner, acting for the nation. Planning can include planning for war. If challenging in content, Sources C and D are more clear-cut when it comes to reliability. Neither is reliable. Source C comes from Bismarck’s memoirs, a notoriously self-serving work, while Source D is a letter from a strong supporter of Bismarck written at the time of Bismarck’s greatest triumph, 1866. The arguments of both need treating with the utmost scepticism.

Section B, the American Option: The Freeport Debate between Lincoln and Douglas.

Question (a)

The accounts of the meeting are similar in that both see Lincoln as having trounced Douglas. Virtually all candidates explained this point. There is also some similarity in that the sources are critical of Douglas, which was the converse of admiration for Lincoln. Their criticisms are different, however. Source B argues that Douglas is inconsistent – at least if his Freeport arguments are compared to his statements elsewhere – and hypocritical – saying one thing in the north of Illinois, another in the south of the state. By contrast, Source D sees Douglas as narrowly partisan. There is no similarly detailed contrast of the two sources’ accounts of Lincoln. As for evaluation, Source D is an old man’s account of his younger self’s account and thus open to grave doubt. Source B, a primary account supported in part by other evidence, is likely to be more reliable. That the newspaper was called the Semi-weekly Democrat should not be taken as evidence that it supported the Democratic party – though candidates who argued thus as part of their evaluation were not penalised for doing so. Douglas won the 1858 election, decided by votes of the Illinois legislature rather than the people, despite a narrow majority of those who voted doing so for Lincoln.

Question (b)

Most candidates could identify those sources which supported the hypothesis and those which did not, to reach Level 3. Sources A, B and D belonged to the former camp, Source C quite distinctly to the latter. Answers which used specific to evaluate a source reached Level 4e. Thus Source D’s recollections are supported by Source B but challenged by Source C. (Source A is about another of the debates.) Which should prevail? Neither the sources nor their provenance provide clear evidence either way. Here candidates needed to provide evidence from the sources to support their inconclusive assessment. So long as candidates made attempts to evaluate, asking the right questions as they do so, they were rewarded, even if the outcome of their evaluation was non-committal.

Section C, International Option: The League of Nations and the World Disarmament Conference 1932-33.

Question (a)

Both sources were American and both reported the views of Senator Swanson, the US representative at the World Disarmament Conference. Source A was a newspaper report of Swanson’s views, Source B, Swanson’s own account of his views. The differences were quite marked, as most candidates were able to explain. Source A maintained that Swanson’s attitude towards the Conference was quite negative while Source B, from Swanson himself, was more positive. This difference might be explained by different dates of publication, Source B coming three months after Source A. The two sources also have a different focus. Source A concentrates on naval armaments, which Source B hardly mentions. The latter concentrates on all other types of warfare: aerial, chemical, bacteriological and land-based. Competent answers mentioned most of these differences, and the very best also discussed similarities. The USA in the 1920s and 1930s was seen as isolationist. Yet here are two sources which show the USA as fully engaged in a high-profile

international conference. Neither source argues for disengagement. This is an important, if rather surprising similarity.

Question (b)

On one level, cartoons, having a strong and usually clear message, are easy to relate to a hypothesis. Source C in this set of sources was no exception. Portraying the Conference delegates as predators who blamed their own failings on their victims, the cartoon clearly supported the hypothesis. The message is clear irrespective of the identity of the specific animals. Some identified the 'common people of the world' as goats, others as sheep. Whichever they are, the point is that they are passive followers of their leaders attending the Disarmament Conference. The leaders blame the sheep's warlike passions for the failure of the conference, for their own failings. In this way, the cartoon employs the use of irony, stating one thing and meaning the opposite. Many candidates noted this contrast. Perhaps the key to evaluation of the cartoon is its date, May 1934. This was several months after Germany provided clear evidence of not wanting the Conference to succeed by withdrawing from both the Conference and the League of Nations. Germany publicly announced its decision to break the relevant clauses of Treaty of Versailles and rearm in March 1935. It might be argued that the common people of the time were less sheep-like than portrayed by Source C; in some countries they were active in wanting disarmament, such as Britain, in others they encouraged rearmament, such as Germany. When it came to analysing the three written sources, candidates usually identified Sources A and D as supporting the assertion while Source B opposed it. Source D was especially worth evaluating. It was the official report of the Conference, written in 1936, by which time German rearmament was well under way. It focuses on the context of the Conference in 1931-32, details which can be checked against candidates' own knowledge. That knowledge would show that the source is a realistic depiction of the political situation of the time. The report is reliable when it might have been expected to put a gloss on the Conference. Thus the argument it makes that nobody wanted the Conference to succeed is more convincing than the arguments of other sources. This kind of reasoned argument was rewarded generously.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/13
Document Question

Key Messages

Candidates did well when they:

- Read the four sources with great care, noting with particular attention the Key words or phrases.
- For the **(a)** question, concentrated on comparing the content of the two sources, writing one paragraph on similarities and one on differences.
- For the **(b)** question, related each source to the given hypothesis and then evaluated the content of at least one source.
- Included contextual knowledge in answering the **(b)** question, where it provided evidence to help evaluate the sources.

General Comments

Assessment of candidates' answers uses a Levels of Response marking scheme. The **(a)** question has four levels of response, the **(b)** question five. To reach the highest level for either **(a)** or **(b)** questions requires the ability to make some kind of sustained judgement or reasoned conclusion based on the analysis and evaluation of the sources.

The **(a)** question requires the study of just two sources, not four. It requires a relatively simple comparison of those sources, identifying surface similarities and differences. For this question, candidates did well when they avoided describing what sources say at some length, and focused on identifying and explaining similarities and differences.

For the **(b)** question, the vast majority of candidates could identify and explain how each of the sources addresses the hypothesis. The source evaluation was less well done. Source evaluation at AS Level needs to be specific and focused on the content.

As for this particular examination, most candidates coped reasonably well with its specific demands. The most frequent weakness was to answer questions without carefully reading the sources first. In trying to use the hour to write as much as possible, candidates often neglected the careful reading which almost certainly have resulted in higher quality answers. Specific examples will be given in the comments which follow.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A, the European Option: Different Approaches to Italian Unification

Question (a)

The differences between the two sources were more easily identified than the similarities. Source A was a private dispatch from a constitutional monarchist to his monarch about a very bold move, namely agreeing a treaty with France to go to war against Austria in order to redraw the map of Italy. Source B was a public statement from the leading Italian revolutionary in the period before the war with Austria about the Piedmontese alliance with France and its significance for Italy. Source A saw the alliance as a necessary move to eject Austria from northern Italy, Source B argued that a dependence on France would mean that Italy could not be truly independent. All candidates were able to explain and illustrate this contrast. Similarities proved harder to find. One was the belief that wars needed popular support. Thus, Source A asserted that the forthcoming war 'must be justified in the eyes of French and European public opinion' while Source B argued that 'any war for independence unconnected with liberty (of the people) would just led the

substitution of new masters for old'. Though the two differed on where that popular support should come from, they did agree that it was needed.

Question (b)

Two of the sources make no mention of Garibaldi, which caused problems for some candidates. Many took the line that if a source made no mention of Garibaldi, it did not support the hypothesis, which was a reasonable approach to take. Source D, the cartoon, caused more problems because it proved easier to be misinterpreted. Some failed to realise that 'Papa Pius' was Pope Pius IX. Some took him to be Victor Emmanuel II, others that the reference to Papa meant that the Pope was in fact Garibaldi's father. One candidate wrote that Garibaldi was a poor peasant who was being ignored by the Pope. This is a good example of the need to analyse the cartoon as a whole. It is British, which means it is likely to be sympathetic to the cause of Italian unity and especially to Garibaldi, who was mobbed when he visited Britain a few years later. It was published in September 1860, the dramatic year when Garibaldi conquered the kingdom of Naples and Piedmontese forces defeated a Papal army at Castelfidardo. The cartoon was published eleven days after the battle, a fact which candidates could not have known. Garibaldi is offering liberty to the Pope as a replacement for the burdens of Papal office, probably as a secular ruler of the Papal States. The precise offer is not clear. What is clear from Source D, however, is that Garibaldi, if he can offer the loss of power to the Papacy, was a major figure in the creation of Italy. Source C provides further support for the hypothesis. Here analysis turned on understanding 'counsel', as in 'I counsel you ...' Many took counsel to mean order when it actually means advise. The former makes Garibaldi subordinate to Victor Emmanuel, which was far from the case. As for evaluation, perhaps the most accessible source was Source A. Many argued that it was reliable because (a) it was private and (b) because Cavour would have to be honest with his king. The opposite was much more likely; Source A is most unreliable. Cavour was giving his own version of an even more private meeting with Napoleon III, an account which he would use to help further his own political objectives, whether the expansion of Piedmont or the unification of Italy. All source should be seen as unreliable at the start of the evaluation process.

Section B, the American Option: The Dred Scott Judgement 1857.

Question (a)

Many candidates confused the Declaration of Independence with the US Constitution. This perhaps resulted from a hurried reading of the first sentence of Source B which talks of 'the declaration of Independence or the Constitution of the United State', which could be seen as meaning that they are one and the same. They are not. The Declaration came at the start of the American War of Independence, the US constitution some eleven years later, after the war was over. Both are foundation documents of the USA and the starting point of any course on US history. The similarity between the two sources is that both see the Declaration of Independence as key documents in American public life as well as its history. They differ about how it has been interpreted, however. Source A, from a Northern Democrat, criticises Republicans, who claim that the Declaration includes blacks as well as whites, for failing to put their beliefs into practice. Source B, from a Northern Republican, argues that the Democrats pay such little regard to the Declaration that those who wrote the Declaration, if they were born again in 1850s America, would be shocked by that low regard. This results in another similarity: both accuse their opponents as ignoring the Declaration of Independence.

Question (b)

First of all, two points of factual detail and one point of approach need to be made clear. Sources A and B are not taken from the Lincoln-Douglas debates of 1858, as so many thought; Springfield is a Northern town, not Southern. Though neither Source A nor Source B explicitly refers to Dred Scott, they do so in all other respects. The absence of any direct reference to Dred Scott should not be taken as reasons for dismissing a source, as some candidates did. Some dismissed Source B because it did not specifically mention any political party. Good answers were able to infer that an author such as Lincoln, a leading Republican, was likely to make a speech defending the position associated with the party, which is what he did. Here, Lincoln attacks the view which excludes negroes from the benefits of the constitution, which is the Democratic view and which has been strengthened by the Dred Scott judgement of the Supreme Court. He uses a dissenting Supreme Court judgement in the Dred Scott case to support his argument. His argument is less reliable than is usually claimed for Lincoln because in this case he is a party politician using a minority Supreme Court judgement to make his argument. Source C asserts that neither party benefited from the judgement, which is to challenge the assertion – and is something of a surprise coming from a Southern source. Source D needs very careful analysis to fully appreciate its argument. It says that the judgement will force the law-abiding citizens in the North to separate themselves from the more fanatical abolitionists of New England. Thus, by implication, Black Republicanism will be weakened.

Section C, International Option: The League of Nations and the Aaland Islands.

Question (a)

Most candidates were able to identify the main difference between the two sources, Source A showing a positive Swedish attitude towards the League of Nations' efforts while Source D is much more critical. The main similarity was also relatively easy to find, namely that in both cases Sweden accepts the decisions of the League of Nations. Most candidates could also compare the two sources: one an American observer, proud of its impartiality, the other, the Swedish government, in a very partial mood as it responds to the decision which it believes harms its national interests. Weaker answers provided too much explanation of the findings of the League, which was not relevant, and featured minimal evaluation, which limited the marks which could be awarded.

Question (b)

This set of sources provided candidates with accessible opportunities for relevant analysis and evaluation. Most answers were focused and sound, at least at the level of source analysis. Sources A and D were usually seen as challenging the hypothesis, while Sources B and C were argued to be supporting it. The supporting sources were official League of Nations documents, the first from an Investigative Commission, the second from the Council of the League itself. When it came to evaluating the reliability of the two sources, the universal assumption was that they were reliable. This was because the reports were seen as being **(a)** factual, without obvious expression of opinions or emotions, **(b)** the product of a group which **(c)** was part of the League of Nations. All three aspects are open to question. Source B in particular, contained several assertions which were open to challenge, e.g. 'the Aaland Islands **might** lead the Finns to take vengeance on then Swedish minority living elsewhere in Finland' (emphasis added.). This danger was only a possibility. 'Vengeance' is itself a rather strong word. 'Action' would have been more neutral. Secondly, we have no idea who composed either the committee or the Council; each group would have been subject to considerable tensions and arguments. Finally, the League of Nations had its own interests to pursue, especially in its early days, so soon after its formation, and so would not have been neutral and even-handed. Thus Sources B and C needed to be treated with caution. Sources A and D were seen as challenging the hypothesis. Source D was perhaps the easiest of the four sources to evaluate as it was the immediate response of the Swedish government to having lost its case. Many argued that the source was highly emotional. This is perhaps to exaggerate slightly a response which expresses its feeling as one of 'profound disappointment' and no more. Overall, however, most candidates made sound attempts to answer 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 wide range of factors to show how they inter-reacted 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

In line with the requirements of the examination, most candidates attempted two complete questions from one Section of the paper. Generally, candidates deployed their time effectively, devoting an appropriate amount to each question. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in at least some of their answers, but many were unable to sustain consistent quality across all four of their responses. It was not uncommon for candidates to produce satisfactory or better responses to one part of a question, yet weak (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part. This may have been the result of unwise question selection or symptomatic of a wider problem relating to the range and depth of knowledge to which candidates had access. There is a fundamental difference in focus between Part **(a)** and Part **(b)** questions. Many candidates clearly appreciated this and attempted the two Part **(a)** questions consecutively, followed by the two Part **(b)** questions (or vice-versa).

Part (a) Questions – These questions are about causation. Effective answers require detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. Invariably, causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of a number of factors, both long and short-term. The most effective responses were clearly focused on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they inter-acted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance. Most candidates were able to identify and explain some relevant causal factors, but tended to drift into narrative/descriptive accounts of *how* something occurred rather than *why*. The weakest responses were characterised by mono-causal explanations, a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology; they were over-reliant on vague and generalised assertions lacking appropriate factual support.

Part (b) Questions – Historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways. For an interpretation to be valid, it must be based on a thorough analysis of appropriate and accurate factual material, and must show due consideration of alternative viewpoints. These questions require candidates to develop such interpretations, to make reasoned judgements and to justify their arguments in a clear, consistent and sustained manner. The most impressive responses were based on the development of consistent and balanced arguments, explicitly focused on the requirements of the specific question, leading to reasoned and fully-supported conclusions. The majority of responses fell into one of three categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question; unbalanced arguments based on consideration of only one interpretation of the issue; 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, 1789-1804

- (a) *Why did the Directory come to power in France?*

There was enormous diversity in the quality of responses to this question. The best answers were based on detailed understanding of the context in which the Director came to power in France, and were able to identify, explain and analyse a range of valid causal factors. The majority of responses adopted an essentially narrative approach, describing the structures adopted by the Directory and outlining some of its actions while in power. As a result, there was only limited (and usually only implicit) reference to the actual requirements of the question. The weakest responses, of which there were a relatively large number, were the result of factual confusion and inaccuracy. For example, several candidates assumed that the Directory was the government of Robespierre, while others wrote about Napoleon's rise to power as First Consul.

- (b) *How far would you agree that Louis XVI was responsible for the political crises between 1789 and 1793?*

In general, responses to this question were significantly better than those for Part (a). While there was a tendency to describe rather than analyse, most candidates were able to provide sufficient appropriate and accurate factual detail to sustain the development of viable arguments. The majority of responses, which focused almost entirely on ways in which Louis XVI could be seen as responsible for the political problems facing France, would, however, have benefitted from a more balanced assessment of the evidence. The best responses were characterised by a genuine attempt to evaluate Louis XVI's culpability in the context of other issues over which he had no real control.

Question 2

The Industrial Revolution, c.1800-1850

- (a) *Why was the Agricultural Revolution important to the Industrial Revolution?*

There were relatively few effective responses to this question. There was a general tendency to describe aspects of the Agricultural Revolution, such as the invention of the seed drill and the development of enclosures, without reference to its impact on subsequent industrialisation. Many of these narrative accounts lacked factual detail and accuracy, largely relying on vague, generalised and unsupported assertions. Only a small number of responses addressed the question explicitly by demonstrating how changes in agriculture helped to create conditions in which the Industrial Revolution could occur. This involved understanding of issues such as rising population, improvements in transport and the significance of capitalism.

- (b) *To what extent did the Industrial Revolution challenge existing political structures? Refer to any two countries in your answer.*

As in Part (a), the majority of responses lacked focus on the precise requirements of the question and relied too heavily on generalised, unsupported and, often, inaccurate assertions. Most candidates wrote about the social and economic effects of the Industrial Revolution, for example by describing the harsh living and working conditions experienced by factory employees. The most effective responses, of which there were relatively few, were based on a genuine attempt to identify and analyse the political implications of the Industrial Revolution. This usually involved understanding of how the rise of the middle class challenged existing political structures, reference being made, for example, to Britain's 1832 Reform Act. Very rarely was the question's requirement to refer to more than one country addressed.

Question 3

The Origins of World War I, c.1900-1914

- (a) *Why was there a crisis over Bosnia in 1908-09?*

Most candidates were able to identify a number of factors which led to the crisis over Bosnia in 1908-09, although there was wide variation in the explanatory depth provided. The most effective responses were based on detailed contextual knowledge regarding the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and analysis of the various motives of countries such as Austria-Hungary, Russia, Serbia and Germany. The majority of candidates adopted a more narrative approach, in which the crisis itself was described with only implicit reference to its causes. The weakest responses were the result of chronological confusion, several candidates describing the events which occurred in the aftermath of the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo.

- (b) *'The system of alliances and ententes was the major cause of World War I.'* How far do you agree?

There were a number of high-quality responses to this question. These were characterised by the development of fully-focused and balanced arguments, leading to well-reasoned judgements supported by appropriate factual evidence. The majority of responses were based on a largely narrative approach, in which various causes of World War I (including the system of alliances and ententes) were described without analysis of their relative significance. Weaker responses described, often in considerable detail, how the alliances and ententes emerged, with limited, or assertive only, focus on their importance as causes of World War I. For example, a very common assertion was that Britain had to declare war on Germany because of its Triple Entente commitments to France and Russia.

Question 4

The Russian Revolution, 1905-1917

- (a) *Account for the growth of opposition to the Tsarist government between 1906 and 1914.*

The most impressive responses were characterised by the identification, explanation and analysis of a wide range of causal factors covering the whole period from 1906 to 1914. This demonstrated clear understanding of the Tsar's failure to keep to the promises made in the October Manifesto, the negative impact of reforms instituted by Witte and Stolypin, the implications of growing resentment amongst the middle classes and the on-going economic problems which adversely affected the peasantry and urban poor. The majority of responses, which tended to focus on the immediate aftermath of the 1905 revolution and the outbreak of war in 1914, would have benefitted from greater range and depth. The weakest responses did not adhere to the timeframe established by the question. For example, some candidates simply described the events of Bloody Sunday, while others wrote about the problems faced by the Tsar as a result of Russia's failures in World War I after 1914.

- (b) *To what extent was Russian involvement in World War I the reason for the fall of the Tsar?*

The most impressive responses were characterised by the development of fully-focused and balanced arguments, supported by appropriately selected factual evidence. A common conclusion was that many of the problems which confronted Russia in general, and the Tsar in particular, during World War I resulted from longer-term issues; therefore, the war may have conditioned the timing of the Tsar's departure, but was not the underlying cause of it. The majority of responses tended to be more narrative in style, describing the actions taken by the Tsar during the war and the impact of those actions on Russia and its people. This approach often created the impression that Russia's involvement in World War I was the only reason for the fall of the Tsar and, therefore, lacked balance.

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 was the Platt Amendment agreed in 1901?*

This question was attempted by a relatively small number of candidates, the majority of whom lacked the specific knowledge required. Most responses tended to describe the Platt Amendment rather than explain the reasons behind it. It was noticeable that some candidates who selected **Question 5** only provided responses to Part (b), missing out Part (a) entirely.

- (b) *'Mr Polk's war.'* How far do you agree with this opinion on the causes of the war with Mexico in 1846?

This question was attempted by a relatively small number of candidates. The majority of responses tended to be narrative in approach, describing the events which led to the outbreak of war with little focus on the role played by Polk himself, beyond unsupported assertions in conclusions. The most effective responses, of which there were relatively few, were characterised by detailed analysis of Polk's role in provoking the war, balanced against other causal factors, leading to more convincing arguments.

Question 6

Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861-1877

- (a) *Account for the formation of the Ku Klux Klan in 1865.*

The most effective responses were characterised by the identification and explanation of a range of factors which led to the formation of the Ku Klux Klan, demonstrating detailed contextual understanding. The majority of responses tended to describe what the Ku Klux Klan was and what it did, with focus on the reasons for its formation confined to generalised statements regarding the desire to uphold white supremacy. Responses generally, therefore, would have benefitted from more explicit focus on causation and the provision of greater range and depth.

- (b) *'The federal nature of the Southern system of government was the main reason for the South's weakness in waging war against the North'. How far do you agree?*

Most candidates were able to identify and describe various factors which set the South at a disadvantage against the North during the Civil War. Responses generally were narrative in approach, each factor outlined and explained in turn with limited analysis of its relative significance. The majority of responses lacked focus on the precise requirements of the question and there was often little or no reference to the 'federal nature of the Southern system of government'. The most impressive responses were the result of clear understanding of the question, enabling the development of fully-focused and balanced arguments.

Question 7

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

- (a) *Why did it take so long for the USA to give women the right to vote?*

The most impressive responses were fully-focused on the precise requirements of the question, based on the identification and detailed explanation of a range of factors which, despite various campaigns starting in the 1860s, delayed the granting of votes for women. The majority of responses, while identifying general factors (such as the commonly held belief that a woman's place was in the home), would have benefitted from greater range and depth. Responses generally tended to be narrative rather than analytical in approach, many outlining *how* women eventually gained the right to vote rather than focusing on *why* it took so long for them to achieve it.

- (b) *How important were technological innovations to rapid industrialisation in the 1870s and 1880s?*

While there were a few high-quality responses to this question, the majority would have benefitted from greater attention to one or both of the following issues. Firstly, there was a tendency to describe the impact of technological innovations generally, rather than those specific to the 1870s and 1880s; for example, most candidates outlined the ways in which railways encouraged industrialisation. Secondly, relatively few candidates appreciated that, in order to evaluate the relative significance of technological innovations, it was also necessary to analyse the impact of other factors, such as population growth. As a result, the majority of responses lacked both balance and focus on the precise requirements of the question.

Question 8

The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal, 1929-1941

(a) *Why did the Supreme Court oppose New Deal reforms in the mid-1930s?*

Responses generally tended to be descriptive rather than explanatory. Most candidates were able to demonstrate ways in which the Supreme Court opposed New Deal Reforms, providing examples of various cases which undermined Roosevelt's intentions. Similarly, Roosevelt's attempt to overcome Supreme Court opposition by developing the court-packing scheme, and the reasons why this scheme failed, were commonly outlined, often in great detail. The most successful responses were more explicitly focused on the reasons why the Supreme Court adopted such an antagonistic approach to New Deal legislation, identifying and explaining factors which directly addressed the requirements of the question.

(b) *How far did Franklin Roosevelt's economic and social policies depart from those of Herbert Hoover?*

Candidates generally were well aware of the different approaches adopted by Hoover and Roosevelt in their attempts to address the problems associated with the Great Depression. Hoover's laissez-faire beliefs were widely contrasted with Roosevelt's interventionist strategies, based on factual evidence which varied enormously in detail. The majority of responses simply concluded that Roosevelt's policies were, therefore, in complete contrast to those of Hoover. The most successful responses were characterised by a more balanced approach, demonstrating how, in the later years of his presidency, Hoover was prepared to adopt some relatively radical proposals involving government intervention.

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

Question 9

International Relations, 1871-1918

(a) *Why did European nations sign the Treaty of Berlin in 1885?*

Most candidates were able to describe the terms and implications of the Treaty of Berlin, often in considerable detail. Generally, there was less consideration of what the Treaty was intended to achieve and the reasons why European nations were prepared to endorse it. As a result, the requirements of the question tended to be addressed implicitly rather than explicitly. In the most impressive responses, contextual knowledge was deployed to support in-depth analysis of the motives of those who attended the meetings in Berlin.

(b) *To what extent was the outbreak of World War I caused by increasing rivalry between Britain and Germany?*

The most impressive responses demonstrated clear understanding of the reasons for, and impact of, growing tensions between Britain and Germany during the years leading up to 1914. The significance of this increasing rivalry was then measured against other factors which led to the outbreak of war, leading to the development of fully-focused and well-supported conclusions. The majority of responses, while often containing similar factual depth, tended to be descriptive rather than analytical. In most cases, this involved a general outline of the various causes of World War I, coverage of Anglo-German rivalry confined to narrative accounts of the naval race, followed by the unexplained assertion that it led to war.

Question 10

International Relations, 1919-1933

(a) *Why did France adopt a more friendly approach towards Germany in the period from 1924 to 1930?*

There were some exceptional responses to this question. These were based on a clear understanding that the French hard-line approach towards Germany, as exemplified by refusal to compromise at the Genoa Conference and the occupation of the Ruhr industrial area, had essentially backfired, leaving France even more isolated than before. The majority of responses tended to describe *how* French attitudes towards Germany became more friendly (e.g. acceptance

of the Dawes and Young Plans, the Locarno agreements) rather than *why*. This clearly demonstrated good factual knowledge, but needed to be more explicitly linked to the precise requirements of the question. A small number of responses, the result of chronological confusion, focused on French relations with Hitler's Germany.

- (b) *'The main cause of tension in Europe during the 1920s was the issue of German reparations.'* How far do you agree?

The majority of responses tended to focus almost entirely on the reparations issue, which was generally well known and understood. A common argument was that Germany's failure to meet its reparations requirements caused major tension in Europe during the early 1920s, but that these tensions were significantly reduced by the implementation of the Dawes and Young Plans. While this approach is clearly relevant, it does not consider other factors which led to disharmony in Europe during the period. The most impressive responses were characterised by greater balance, the impact of other issues (such as border disputes, the USA's refusal to ratify the Paris Peace Settlement and the threat posed by communism) being compared to the problems associated with reparations. The weakest responses, some of which focused on the tensions which followed Hitler's rise to power in Germany, were the result of chronological confusion.

Question 11

International Relations, 1933-1939

- (a) *Why did the Nationalists win the Spanish Civil War?*

Most candidates were able to identify a number of appropriate causal factors, although their explanations varied in terms of depth. For example, it was widely understood that, while the Nationalists benefitted from foreign military assistance, the Republicans were largely denied such support. The most effective responses were able to explain why Italy and Germany actively supported the Nationalists, while the League of Nations adopted a 'non-interference' policy which adversely affected the Republicans. Similarly, most candidates argued that the Republicans lacked unity, but relatively few provided factual evidence to explain why this was the case.

- (b) *'Hitler's destruction of Czechoslovakia in 1939 made a major European war unavoidable.'* How far do you agree?

There were many impressive responses to this question, characterised by fully-focused and balanced assessment of appropriate factual evidence, leading to the development of well-argued judgements. The majority of responses, while often containing similar factual detail, did not attain the same high standard for one of three main reasons. Firstly, many responses provided evidence to both support and challenge the statement without the analytical depth required to develop a reasoned judgement. Secondly, a number of responses lacked balance, their arguments either agreeing or disagreeing with the statement without consideration of the alternative viewpoint. Thirdly, there was a common tendency to drift into lengthy passages of unfocused narrative; for example, several candidates described at some length Hitler's motives for taking possession of Czechoslovakia in 1939.

Question 12

China and Japan, 1919-1945

- (a) *Why did collaboration between the Kuomintang and the Communists end after 1927?*

This question was attempted by only a small minority of candidates. Most were able to describe the methods used by Chiang Kai-shek in his campaign against the Communists after 1927, but there was generally less focus on his motives for ending a collaboration which had proved so beneficial in the KMT's rise to power. It was widely understood that Chiang saw the Communists as a threat, but only the most successful responses identified and explained the reasons for this.

- (b) *To what extent was the growth in support for the Chinese Communist Party during the 1930s caused by the Kuomintang's failure to resist Japanese aggression?*

This question was attempted by only a small minority of candidates, most of whom adopted a rather narrative approach. Reasons why the CCP grew in popularity during the 1930s were generally well-known and understood, but they were usually described without analysis of their relative significance. As a result, there was limited (and, usually, implicit only) focus on the precise requirements of the question.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/22
Outline Study

Key Messages

- In **Part (a) questions**, candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a wide range of factors to show how they inter-reacted 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

In line with the requirements of the examination, most candidates attempted two complete questions from one Section of the paper. Generally, candidates deployed their time effectively, devoting an appropriate amount to each question. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in at least some of their answers, but many were unable to sustain consistent quality across all four of their responses. It was not uncommon for candidates to produce satisfactory or better responses to one part of a question, yet weak (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part. This could have been the result of unwise question selection or symptomatic of a wider problem relating to the range and depth of knowledge to which candidates had access. There is a fundamental difference in focus between Part **(a)** and Part **(b)** questions. Many candidates clearly appreciated this and attempted the two Part **(a)** questions consecutively, followed by the two Part **(b)** questions (or vice-versa).

Part (a) Questions – These questions are about causation. Effective answers require detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. Invariably, causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of a number of factors, both long and short-term. The most effective responses were clearly focused on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they inter-acted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance. Most candidates were able to identify and explain some relevant causal factors, but tended to drift into narrative/descriptive accounts of *how* something occurred rather than *why*. The weakest responses were characterised by mono-causal explanations, a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology; they were over-reliant on vague and generalised assertions lacking appropriate factual support.

Part (b) Questions – Historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways. For an interpretation to be valid, it must be based on a thorough analysis of appropriate and accurate factual material, and must show due consideration of alternative viewpoints. These questions require candidates to develop such interpretations, to make reasoned judgements and to justify their arguments in a clear, consistent and sustained manner. The best responses were based on the development of consistent and balanced arguments, explicitly focused on the requirements of the specific question, leading to reasoned and fully-supported conclusions. The majority of responses fell into one of three categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question; unbalanced arguments based on consideration of only one interpretation of the issue; 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, 1789-1804

- (a) *Why did Napoleon become Emperor in 1804?*

Candidates clearly possessed good, and often very detailed, knowledge about Napoleon, but many found it difficult to apply this to the precise requirements of the question. Many responses outlined how and why Napoleon initially rose to power in France, rather than specifically why he decided to adopt the title of Emperor in 1804. Others described *how* he became Emperor rather than *why*. The best responses, of which there were relatively few, explained and analysed a range of appropriate factors which were fully focused on Napoleon's motives in 1804.

- (b) *'It provided effective government for France.' Assess this view of the Directory.*

There were a number of excellent responses to this question. Based on an analytical approach, supported by appropriate and accurate factual detail, these responses were characterised by the development of fully focused and balanced arguments, leading to well-reasoned conclusions. The majority of responses, while often containing similar factual information and offering evidence to both support and challenge the statement, required greater depth of evaluation in order to reach an effective judgement. Weaker responses, of which there were relatively few, resulted from inadequate factual knowledge or confusion regarding the nature of the Directory. Some candidates, for example, wrote about the ineffectiveness of Louis XVI's government, while others described Napoleon's actions as First Consul.

Question 2

The Industrial Revolution, c.1800-1850

- (a) *Why did changes in transport speed up the process of industrialisation?*

While there were some very high-quality responses to this question, the majority tended to describe changes in transport rather than explain their impact on industrialisation. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound knowledge regarding the development of railways, but relatively few recognised the significance of other improvements in transport, such as roads and canals. The most impressive responses, characterised by the identification and analysis of various ways in which improvements in transport facilitated industrial growth, were fully focused on the requirements of the question.

- (b) *'The Industrial Revolution improved the standard of living.' How far do you agree with this statement? Refer to any two countries in your answer.*

The majority of responses tended to be over-reliant on generalisations and assertions which lacked specific factual support. For example, it was commonly noted that the harsh and unhygienic conditions, initially prevalent in factories and industrial cities, were eventually overcome; such statements required supporting evidence by reference to the aims and impact of factory and public health legislation. The best responses, of which there were relatively few, provided fully-focused and balanced assessments, supported by appropriately selected evidence which met the question's requirement to refer to more than one country.

Question 3

The Origins of World War I, c.1900-1914

- (a) *Why did Germany's invasion of Belgium lead to a wider European war?*

Virtually all candidates appreciated that it was Germany's violation of Belgium's neutrality which led to Britain's involvement in World War I. The most effective responses were based on detailed contextual understanding, with particular reference to on-going Anglo-German tensions and the reasons why the German invasion of Belgium appeared to pose a threat to British interests and security. A significantly large number of candidates assumed, incorrectly, that Britain had to go to war in order to honour its commitment to support France, which was threatened by German aggression against Belgium, under the terms of the Entente Cordiale. Many responses were largely

narrative in style, and these tended to explain why Germany invaded Belgium (for example, by reference to the Schlieffen Plan) rather than focusing on the reasons for Britain's reaction to the invasion.

- (b) *To what extent was Austria responsible for the instability in the Balkans between 1900 and 1914?*

Most candidates were able to demonstrate good knowledge of the various factors which caused instability in the Balkans between 1900 and 1914, but many found it difficult to deploy this knowledge in order to address the precise requirements of the question explicitly. Responses generally provided narrative accounts, evaluation regarding the extent to which Austria should be held responsible confined to largely assertive comments in concluding paragraphs. The most effective responses were based on a more consistently analytical approach, so that concluding statements were both supported and followed logically from what had come before. A small number of candidates lacked understanding of the term 'Balkans', and wrote generally about the causes of World War I or irrelevantly about issues such as the Moroccan crises.

Question 4

The Russian Revolution, 1905-1917

- (a) Why did World War I have damaging effects on the Russian economy?

Virtually all candidates were able to identify a variety of ways in which the Russian economy was adversely affected by involvement in World War I. The quality of responses differed according to the explanatory and analytical depth provided. For example, the most impressive responses demonstrated how, despite the work of Witte and Stolypin, the Russian economy and its supporting infrastructure lagged far behind those of its major European rivals by 1914, and simply could not cope with the demands of war. There was a tendency in some weaker responses to drift away from the requirements of the question, many candidates describing events which led to the Tsar's abdication in 1917.

- (b) *To what extent was war with Japan the cause of the 1905 revolution?*

Candidates generally demonstrated sound knowledge of the social, economic and political factors which led to the 1905 revolution. The best responses analysed the relative importance of these various causes, with particular reference to the significance of Russia's surprising and humiliating defeat against Japan. This approach facilitated the development of fully focused and balanced arguments, leading to conclusions which explicitly addressed the requirements of the question. The majority of responses, while containing similar factual information, tended to be more narrative in style and would have benefitted from greater analytical depth. Weaker responses did not focus on the key issue; for example, it was not uncommon for candidates to write exclusively about the Russo-Japanese War and the reasons for Russia's defeat.

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, between 1901 and 1934, did the USA fight the 'banana wars' against the small states of Central America and the Caribbean?*

This question was attempted by a relatively small number of candidates. Most responses were indicative of a lack of detailed specific knowledge. While there was some understanding of what the 'banana wars' were, explanation/analysis of the motivation behind the USA's involvement in them was rare. As a result, responses generally tended to lack focus on the requirements of the question.

- (b) *How successful was US policy towards China in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries?*

This question was attempted by a relatively small number of candidates. Most responses were largely narrative in approach, outlining, without focused analysis, various issues concerning the USA's involvement in, and relations with, China during the period. The most effective responses

came from candidates who appreciated that it was necessary to explain the motives behind the USA's policy towards China, since this provided criteria by which to evaluate how successful it proved to be.

Question 6

Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861-1877

- (a) *Why did the North experience such limited military success in 1861-62?*

This was a popular, and generally well-answered, question. Most candidates were able to identify a number of factors to explain why Northern forces were largely unsuccessful in the early stages of the Civil War, despite the North's clear advantage in terms of resources. The quality of responses varied according to the explanatory and analytical depth provided. For example, while it was widely claimed that the North initially lacked a consistent strategy and strong military leadership, the most effective responses were able to provide detailed factual evidence to both support and explain these issues. Similarly, candidates who achieved higher marks were able to analyse the relative significance of the various causal factors, the most common conclusion being that Lincoln's lack of military experience was crucial.

- (b) *How far did Reconstruction achieve its aims?*

The best responses came from candidates who appreciated that it was vital to establish what the aims of Reconstruction actually were, since this provided the necessary criteria by which to evaluate the extent to which these aims were achieved. Candidates who adopted this approach found it easier to remain fully focused on the requirements of the question, and most were able to develop balanced arguments and make well-supported judgements. The majority of responses tended to be more narrative in style, various Reconstruction policies outlined (often in considerable detail) with limited (or implicit only) consideration of either what they were intended to achieve or their impact.

Question 7

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

- (a) *Why did Progressivism emerge as a major political force in the 1890s?*

While most candidates demonstrated sound understanding of the nature of Progressivism, there was a tendency to describe *how* it emerged as a political force rather than *why*. Similarly, many responses provided narrative accounts of various Progressive reforms. As a result of this approach, responses frequently strayed well outside the 1890s timeframe. The best responses, characterised by the identification and explanation of a range of causal factors, were fully focused on the requirements of the question.

- (b) *How effectively did industrial cities address the social and economic problems they faced in the late nineteenth century?*

The majority of responses would have benefitted from greater range and depth. There was a common tendency to generalise, describing social and economic problems without explicit reference to industrial cities. The most effective responses were able to provide specific examples of the problems facing cities and appropriate factual evidence to demonstrate how, and with what impact, these problems were confronted.

Question 8

The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal, 1929-1941

- (a) *Why was the Tennessee Valley Authority established?*

Most candidates appreciated that the TVA was established as part of the Roosevelt Administration's attempt to address the problems created by the Great Depression. In particular, the TVA was seen as a way of providing jobs at a time of rising unemployment. Some candidates were able to demonstrate understanding of how the TVA aimed to prevent flooding and provide

electricity, which would benefit areas of the USA which had been especially badly hit by the Depression. Relatively few candidates analysed the political motives behind the establishment of the TVA and, therefore, the majority of responses would have benefitted from greater range and depth.

- (b) *'By the late 1930s the New Deal had been destroyed by opposition.'* How far do you agree?

There were a number of high-quality responses to this question. These were characterised by the development of fully focused and balanced arguments, well-supported by accurate and appropriately selected factual evidence. The majority of responses tended to be more narrative in approach, outlining the nature of opposition to the New Deal rather than its impact. A significantly large number of candidates addressed the rather different issue of how successful the New Deal proved to be, so that reference to the precise requirements of the actual question tended to be implicit only. It was evident that the majority of candidates possessed good knowledge both of the New Deal and of the widespread opposition to it; the most effective responses came from candidates who were able to deploy this knowledge in a specifically relevant manner.

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

Question 9

International Relations, 1871-1918

- (a) *Why did Germany join the 'Scramble for Africa' later than Britain and France?*

Responses to this question varied enormously in quality. The most impressive were based on clear understanding that Bismarck's priority was to develop and secure the newly-unified Germany, and, therefore, he wished to avoid the distraction and possible risks involved in seeking overseas possessions. The majority of responses would have benefited from focusing more precisely on the requirements of the question. For example, many candidates were able to show how Germany eventually joined the 'Scramble' as a result of pressure from industrialists and businessmen, combined with the adoption of a more aggressive foreign policy under the Kaiser. Relevant though this is, it does not explain Germany's earlier lack of involvement. A significantly large number of responses provided narrative accounts of the 'Scramble for Africa' - while these confirmed that Germany did, indeed, join the 'Scramble' later than Britain and France, they did not explain why.

- (b) *'Japan became a world power because of the advantages it gained from World War I.'* How far do you agree?

There were some exceptional responses to this question, characterised by the development of fully-focused and balanced arguments based on detailed factual knowledge and understanding. Very different conclusions were reached, but all of them supported by accurate and convincing evidence. While some candidates agreed with the statement in the question, others argued that Japan had already become a world power prior to World War I and some suggested that Japan still lacked this status immediately after the war. The majority of responses, while also containing appropriate and accurate factual detail, tended to lack balance. For example, many candidates argued, with supporting evidence, that Japan had achieved world power status before 1914, but did not also analyse the advantages which it gained from World War I. Candidates need to be reminded that a convincing argument not only requires supporting evidence but must also consider alternative interpretations.

Question 10

International Relations, 1919-1933

- (a) *Why were German reparations reduced by the Young Plan in 1929?*

The best responses came from candidates who were able to give context to the Young Plan by analysing the impact of previous events, such as the Franco-Belgian occupation of the Ruhr, the USA's insistence on the repayment of war debts, the Dawes Plan, the signing of the Locarno Treaties and the improving relationship between France and Germany as exemplified by the work of Briand and Stresemann. This approach ensured the range and depth required to fully appreciate the rationale behind the Young Plan. The majority of responses tended to focus on a limited range

of causal factors, many simply asserting that reparations were reduced by the Young Plan because they had been set too high initially and Germany could not afford to pay them.

- (b) *'A peace which satisfied no one.'* How fair is this judgement on the Paris Peace Settlement?

Most candidates were able to identify appropriate evidence in support of the statement, although this varied enormously in terms of range and depth. A common approach involved discussion of the differing aims with which Wilson, Lloyd George and Clemenceau attended the Paris peace talks; this was not always followed by a more focused analysis of the extent to which those aims were achieved. More detailed responses went beyond the opinions of the 'Big Three' to evaluate the ways in which other countries, such as Germany, Italy, Russia and China, were dissatisfied with the outcome of the peace talks. The most impressive responses achieved balance by demonstrating that the statement is unfair because it takes no account of the difficult circumstances and constraints which confronted the peacemakers in Paris or, indeed, of their positive achievements.

Question 11

International Relations, 1933-1939

- (a) *Why was the British Prime Minister, Neville Chamberlain, pleased with the outcome of the Munich Conference in 1938?*

This question was generally well-answered. Most candidates displayed detailed understanding of the context in which the Munich Conference was held, and were able to demonstrate how the agreements which emerged from it appeared to satisfy Chamberlain's primary aim, the prevention of another major war. The most impressive responses were able to identify several reasons why Chamberlain was so keen to preserve future peace, ranging from Britain's lack of preparation for war to justification for his policy of appeasement. A small number of responses, which relied too heavily on a largely narrative approach, would have benefited from more focused analysis of Chamberlain's motives at the Conference.

- (b) *To what extent was appeasement responsible for the outbreak of World War II?*

Virtually all candidates were able to provide valid, and often very detailed, evidence to demonstrate ways in which appeasement could be seen as responsible for the outbreak of World War II. Most were able to counter-balance this by identifying other causal factors, such as the harshness of the Treaty of Versailles and the impact of world-wide economic problems. Having identified appropriate and balanced evidence, the best responses reached well-argued and fully-focused judgements. For example, some candidates argued that appeasement was not the main cause of World War II because it was itself the result of other factors (such as Chamberlain's belief that Hitler simply wanted to 'right the wrongs' of the Versailles Treaty and the fact that Britain and France did not want to prepare for war at a time when they were suffering from the impact of the Great Depression). The majority of responses demonstrated clear understanding of both sides of the argument, but would have benefitted from the development of an overall judgement on the relative significance of appeasement.

Question 12

China and Japan, 1919-1945

- (a) *Why did support for communism grow in China during the 1930s?*

Although attempted by a relatively small number of candidates, responses to this question were generally good. That communism appealed to the largest sector of the Chinese population at a time of droughts, poor harvests and foreign incursions was widely understood, most candidates making reference to the CCP's use of propaganda, development of land reform and willingness to fight a guerrilla war against the Japanese. The best responses were also able to demonstrate how support for the CCP owed much to growing dissatisfaction with the KMT, in particular its failure to carry out socio-economic reform and its very open support for rich land and factory owners.

- (b) *To what extent was the world economic crisis responsible for Japan becoming a military dictatorship during the 1930s?*

Most candidates were able to deploy relevant factual knowledge, often in considerable detail. The majority of candidates adopted a largely narrative approach, outlining various factors which led to Japan's descent into military dictatorship. This approach meant that focused evaluation of the relative significance of the world economic crisis tended to be confined to concluding paragraphs. Greater analytical depth throughout would have ensured that such concluding statements had greater credibility. The best responses were characterised by the development of fully-focused and balanced arguments, leading to well-reasoned judgements based on appropriately selected evidence.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/23
Outline Study

Key Messages

- In **Part (a) questions**, candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a wide range of factors to show how they inter-reacted 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

In line with the requirements of the examination, most candidates attempted two complete questions from one Section of the paper. Generally, candidates deployed their time effectively, devoting an appropriate amount to each question. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in at least some of their answers, but many were unable to sustain consistent quality across all four of their responses. It was not uncommon for candidates to produce satisfactory or better responses to one part of a question, yet weak (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part. This could have been the result of unwise question selection or symptomatic of a wider problem relating to the range and depth of knowledge to which candidates have access. There is a fundamental difference in focus between Part **(a)** and Part **(b)** questions. Many candidates clearly appreciated this and attempted the two Part **(a)** questions consecutively, followed by the two Part **(b)** questions (or vice-versa).

Part (a) Questions – These questions are about causation. Effective answers require detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. Invariably, causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of a number of factors, both long and short-term. The most effective responses were clearly focused on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they inter-acted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance. Most candidates were able to identify and explain some relevant causal factors, but tended to drift into narrative/descriptive accounts of *how* something occurred rather than *why*. The weakest responses were characterised by mono-causal explanations, a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology; they were over-reliant on vague and generalised assertions lacking appropriate factual support.

Part (b) Questions – Historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways. For an interpretation to be valid, it must be based on a thorough analysis of appropriate and accurate factual material, and must show due consideration of alternative viewpoints. These questions require candidates to develop such interpretations, to make reasoned judgements and to justify their arguments in a clear, consistent and sustained manner. The most impressive responses were based on the development of consistent and balanced arguments, explicitly focused on the requirements of the specific question, leading to reasoned and fully-supported conclusions. The majority of responses fell into one of three categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question; unbalanced arguments based on consideration of only one interpretation of the issue; 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, 1789-1804

- (a) *Account for the failure of the counter-revolutionaries in France between 1789 and 1795.*

The most effective responses were characterised by clear understanding of who the counter-revolutionaries were and detailed explanation of a range of factors which account for their failure during the period. The majority of responses tended to focus almost exclusively on the actions of the king, frequently with only implicit relevance to the requirements of the question. Weaker responses tended to provide narrative accounts of the French Revolution, with no explicit reference to counter-revolutionaries or the problems they faced.

- (b) *To what extent was Napoleon's military ability the main reason for his rise to power by 1799?*

While there were some excellent responses to this question, the majority would have benefitted from greater depth and balance. Napoleon's military campaigns were commonly described, in varying degrees of accuracy, but frequently without detailed explanation of the part that these played in his rise to power. Many candidates, in an attempt to achieve a sense of balance, made reference to the policies and strategies which Napoleon employed once in power, thereby straying outside the timeframe established by the question. The most effective responses achieved balance by analysing the problems which confronted the Directory and the ways in which Napoleon was able to exploit its weaknesses.

Question 2

The Industrial Revolution, c.1800-1850

- (a) *Why did the Industrial Revolution begin in Britain before France and Germany?*

There was enormous variety in the quality of responses to this question. Many candidates were able to identify and explain the political, social and geographical advantages which Britain possessed, providing appropriate examples as supporting evidence. In the most effective responses, this was balanced against similarly well-supported coverage of factors which inhibited and delayed industrialisation in France and Germany. The majority of responses lacked such explicit focus on the requirements of the question, many simply describing the events which led to Britain's Industrial Revolution.

- (b) *'Industrialisation helped the working classes.' How far do you agree with this statement? Refer to any two countries in your answer.*

As in Part (a), responses varied greatly in terms of quality. The most impressive were characterised by the development of fully-focused and balanced arguments, supported by appropriate and detailed factual evidence. The majority of responses tended to be over-reliant on generalised assertions and would have benefitted, in particular, from greater chronological awareness. For example, many candidates argued that the lives of the urban working class were improved as a result of factory and social legislation, but did not explain when, why and with what short and long-term impact this legislation came about. A number of candidates wrote generally about the Industrial Revolution, with no direct reference to the requirements of the question.

Question 3

The Origins of World War I, c.1900-1914

- (a) *Why did Germany challenge Britain's naval supremacy in the years before World War I?*

The significance of Germany's adoption of a more aggressive foreign policy based on the Kaiser's desire for 'Weltpolitik' was widely understood. Most candidates were able to explain how expansion of the German Empire would be dependent on the development of a strong navy, and how the

Kaiser clearly resented Britain's supremacy in this area. The best responses were characterised by explanation of a wider range of factors, such as the growth of German nationalism and the influence of groups such as the military, industrialists and businessmen.

- (b) *To what extent should the Kaiser's support for Austria be seen as the cause of the outbreak of war in 1914?*

The majority of candidates adopted a largely narrative approach, outlining the causes of World War I in various levels of depth. Explicit focus on the precise requirements of the question was generally confined to conclusions, usually taking the form of a statement to the effect that, since there were many causes of the war, the Kaiser's support for Austria could not be seen as 'the cause'. The most impressive responses were based on an appreciation of the significance of the word 'outbreak'; this enabled the development of more focused and balanced arguments.

Question 4

The Russian Revolution, 1905-1917

- (a) *Why did the Tsar agree to the October Manifesto in 1905?*

This was a popular question, responses to which varied enormously in terms of focus, range and depth. It was widely understood that the October Manifesto was the Tsar's response to the threat posed by the revolutionary events of 1905, but the significant role played by Witte and the Tsar's other aristocratic advisers was less well known. Many responses were essentially narrative, describing the events of Bloody Sunday or the terms of the October Manifesto or both, with only implicit reference to the Tsar's motives for agreeing to concessions which would potentially undermine his autocratic authority.

- (b) *'The Provisional Government collapsed because it failed to make peace.' How far do you agree?*

The best responses were characterised by the development of fully-focused and balanced arguments, supported by appropriate and accurate factual evidence. The inherent limitations and weaknesses of the Provisional Government, and the magnitude of the problems which confronted it, were clearly understood and explained, leading to well-reasoned conclusions. The majority of responses, while often providing similar factual detail, adopted a largely narrative approach, and would have benefitted from greater analytical depth. Weaker responses were the result of factual inaccuracy; for example, several candidates assumed that the Provisional Government came under the Tsar's jurisdiction.

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 lead European powers to accept the Dawes Plan of 1924?*

The most impressive responses to this question were fully focused on the USA's motives for encouraging European nations to accept the Dawes Plan, in particular stressing how important a stable Europe had become to America's own economic well-being. The majority of responses were weakened by one or both of the following factors. Firstly, there was a general tendency to describe what the Dawes Plan actually was, rather than focusing on the key issue of why and how it was beneficial to the USA. Secondly, many candidates outlined, often in considerable detail, the problems which had occurred in Europe as a result of the reparations issue, and the reasons why European nations were prepared to accept the Dawes Plan; again, this approach lacked explicit focus on the USA's motives.

- (b) *How successful was 'dollar diplomacy' in Central America and the Caribbean in the early twentieth century?*

Many candidates were able to accurately define the term 'dollar diplomacy' and provide examples of it in practice. Relatively few were able to develop convincing arguments based on detailed analysis of how successful the policy proved to be. As a result, the majority of responses lacked

focus on the precise requirements of the question. Weaker responses were characterised by factual inaccuracies and unsupported assertions.

Question 6

Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861-1877

- (a) *Why were three constitutional amendments passed between 1865 and 1870?*

Although there were some misconceptions in weaker responses, most candidates were able to accurately describe the terms of the three amendments. Candidates generally seemed less assured on the reasons why the amendments were passed, most simply asserting that they were designed to enforce the victorious North's Civil War aim of abolishing slavery. The most effective responses, of which there were relatively few, were characterised by analysis of each amendment in context; for example, by demonstrating how the 14th amendment was designed to counteract the implications of the Black Codes.

- (b) *'Freed slaves were given no support in the Reconstruction era.' How far do you agree?*

In general, this question was well-answered. Although there was a tendency to describe rather than analyse, most candidates were able to identify appropriate evidence to both support and challenge the statement, thereby establishing a sense of balance. The most successful responses went beyond this to develop a clear and well-argued judgement. A common theme was that freed slaves were given support, but that, for a variety of well-explained reasons, this was not always effective.

Question 7

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

- (a) *Why did Theodore Roosevelt support the presidential campaign of Taft in 1908 yet run against him in 1912?*

The majority of responses to this question tended to rely on generalisations rather than specific factual detail. For example, most candidates appreciated that Roosevelt was disappointed by Taft's performance as president, but explanations of this were usually confined to assertions regarding the fact that Taft was not progressive enough. The detailed evidence required to substantiate this point was provided in only a small minority of responses.

- (b) *'The USA is the great melting pot, where all races are melting and reforming.' How accurate is this assertion about the place of immigrants in the USA in the early twentieth century?*

There were a number of high-quality responses to this question, characterised by in-depth analysis of the extent to which different nationalities were assimilated into American society, supported by appropriate and detailed factual evidence. The majority of responses were less focused on the requirements of the question, being largely confined to outline accounts of the causes and consequences of mass immigration into the USA in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

Question 8

The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal, 1929-1941

- (a) *Why did right-wing conservatives oppose the New Deal?*

The most impressive responses were characterised by detailed explanation of a range of political and economic reasons why various right-wing conservative groups opposed the increased power of federal government which accompanied the New Deal. It was evident, however, that the majority of candidates lacked understanding of the term '*right-wing conservatives*'. As a result, most responses outlined, to various levels of analytical depth, all aspects of the opposition which confronted the New Deal. Left-wing opinion that New Deal legislation did not go far enough was given as much attention as the right-wing argument that the federal government was deploying unconstitutional methods to enhance its own power.

- (b) *Evaluate the argument that the peacetime domestic achievements of Franklin Roosevelt were not as great as is often claimed.*

There were a number of excellent responses to this question. Analytical throughout, and supported by appropriately selected factual evidence, these responses developed fully focused arguments and reached well-reasoned conclusions. The majority of responses were more narrative in approach; Roosevelt's New Deal policies were described, often in considerable detail, with only limited reference to their effectiveness, usually confined to rather assertive statements in conclusions. Based on the assumption that the New Deal had been an unqualified success, most responses lacked balance.

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

Question 9

International Relations, 1871-1918

- (a) *Why did Germany declare war on France in 1914?*

Most candidates were able to explain Germany's fear of facing war on two fronts, against Russia in the East and France in the West, and how this led to the development of the Schlieffen Plan, which was frequently described in considerable detail. The most effective responses were based on the realisation that, in order to address the precise requirements of the question, it was also necessary to explain why the Schlieffen Plan was implemented in 1914. This was achieved by the identification and analysis of contextual knowledge relating to events in the Balkans and the implications of the Alliance system. The weakest responses, of which there were relatively few, relied on unsupported and, often, inaccurate assertions.

- (b) *To what extent was the Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902 responsible for Japan's victory in the war against Russia?*

Candidates generally displayed good knowledge and understanding of a range of factors which enabled Japan to defeat a major European country in the war of 1904-05. In many responses, there was a tendency to dismiss the significance of Japan's alliance with Britain without detailed consideration, or, in some cases, to ignore it completely. More effective responses were able to demonstrate how Britain had vested interests in preventing Russian expansion in the region, and how the Anglo-Japanese Alliance adversely affected Russia's ability to mount a more successful campaign. While this approach invariably led to the conclusion that other factors were more significant in explaining Japan's victory, it did ensure that judgements were made on the basis of balanced evaluation of the evidence.

Question 10

International Relations, 1919-1933

- (a) *Why did Germany sign the Locarno Treaties?*

Most responses were characterised by a narrative approach, in which the terms of the Locarno Treaties were described with various levels of detail and accuracy. While this approach clearly identified the commitments which Germany made at Locarno, in most cases it avoided the key issue of why it was prepared to make such concessions. The most effective responses were fully focused on the precise requirements of the question, identifying and explaining (by deploying appropriate contextual evidence) the reasons for Germany's desire to create improved relations with Western Europe, and particularly with France and Britain.

- (b) *To what extent was the period from 1919 to 1933 marked by international tension?*

As in their responses to Part (a), the majority of candidates adopted a largely narrative approach, outlining various issues which led to international tension during the period. In most cases, such responses lacked balance and, therefore, did not address the 'to what extent' element of the question. The most effective responses were more analytical in style, balancing evidence of strained international relations against examples of factors which served to reduce tensions. A common argument, well-supported with factual evidence, was that tensions were high between

1919 and 1924, eased in the latter half of the 1920s and then, following the rise of Hitler and the failure of the World Disarmament Conference, began to escalate again. A number of candidates drifted outside the timeframe established by the question, describing how tensions increased as a result of actions taken by Hitler and Mussolini after 1933.

Question 11

International Relations, 1933-1939

- (a) *Why did King Alfonso XIII of Spain abdicate in 1931?*

Candidates generally demonstrated good knowledge of the political, social, geographical and economic problems which confronted Spain in the early 1930s. This provided general background reasons for King Alfonso's decision to abdicate, but did not explain why this occurred in 1931 rather than before. The most successful responses explained how these long-term issues were enhanced by the impact of the Great Depression after 1929, Primo de Rivera's failure to maintain support from the army and the results of elections in 1931 which gave the Republicans effective control over Spain's major cities.

- (b) *'Hitler's desire for lebensraum was the main reason for the outbreak of World War II.' How far do you agree?*

Most candidates were able to demonstrate good factual knowledge and understanding regarding the causes of World War II. There was a general tendency to address a rather different and more general question – the extent to which Hitler should be seen as responsible for the outbreak of war. The most impressive responses came from candidates who appreciated the need to analyse the motives behind Hitler's foreign policy, and the extent to which it was conditioned by his ambition to gain *lebensraum*.

Question 12

China and Japan, 1919-1945

- (a) *Why was China so weak by 1919?*

This question was attempted by only a small number of candidates. There was general understanding that China's weakness by 1919 owed much to its inability to protect itself against foreign influence and domination. The best responses were able to explain why this was the case and provide appropriate examples of it, such as the Twenty One Demands imposed by Japan during World War I.

- (b) *To what extent did Japanese foreign policy change as a result of the German invasion of the Soviet Union in 1941?*

This question was attempted by only a small number of candidates. Responses generally were narrative in approach, providing generalised descriptions of Japanese foreign policy rather than analysing how it was affected by the German invasion of the Soviet Union. The most effective responses were fully-focused on the precise requirements of the question.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/31

Interpretations Question

Key Messages

Successful answers:

- consisted of two aspects: the identification of the historian's central argument, and an explanation, using the extract, of how the argument was identified
- avoided lengthy paragraphs not focused on the extract
- were based on a good overall understanding of the extract, based on a careful reading of the extract, identifying the most important aspects of the argument, before starting to write.

General Comments

The general quality of the answers was good. Most answers showed understanding of the extracts at face value, with the best detecting the particular nuances of an historian's argument. The level of knowledge of the topics was also good, but in some weaker answers, use of this knowledge to make sense of what the extract was saying was sometimes replaced by unfocused description of events.

Most candidates were able to identify aspects of the historian's interpretation, and the best were able to demonstrate sound or complete understanding by consistently focusing on the extract and using relevant material from the extract to explain their conclusions. There was a tendency for answers to stray into summaries of the historiography of the topic, or of events. Where the extract was used, candidates would often adopt an approach of commenting on each paragraph in turn, frequently reaching entirely contradictory conclusions from them about the historian's interpretation. The very best answers showed unambiguous understanding that the main message or central interpretation contained within the extract could only be derived from the extract as a whole, rather than from elements within it. Thus, on the Cold War, for example, a paragraph or even a sentence might be termed traditional, only for the next paragraph to be regarded as revisionist. On the Holocaust, an intentionalist paragraph would be followed by a structuralist sentence, and so on. The best answers were capable of synthesising apparently contradictory elements into an overarching interpretation.

For the Cold War and Holocaust topics, the historiography has developed within broad Schools that can be labelled in a form of shorthand summarising the historians' ideas and approaches (traditional, revisionist, post-revisionist, intentionalist, structuralist, synthesis, etc.). It was apparent that identifying an interpretation by applying a label to it was often unhelpful for candidates. For the approach to work, candidates had to understand what the labels meant, and this was by no means universally the case. Then the label had to be relevant to the extract, which again was not always an entirely straightforward matter. If an inappropriate label was used, immediate doubt was cast on the candidate's level of understanding of the extract. It should be stressed that there is no requirement to use such labels. Using the extract to identify and explain the interpretation within it is sufficient, though of course a label appropriately used can be an effective way of showing understanding.

Some candidates attempted to evaluate the extract, and comment on its reliability. The question does not demand this, and attempts to do it were not merely unnecessary, but usually counter-productive. Candidates will almost certainly have no valid grounds for accusing individual historians of bias, incomplete research, looking for evidence to support pre-determined arguments, or other crimes against good historical method. This tended to happen when candidates thought they had identified the author of an extract, but even when an extract is taken from a highly controversial work, such as Dawidowicz on Hitler's intentionalism, the focus of this paper is on what the historian is saying and not on whether the historian is correct to say it. Candidates are not expected to identify who the author of an extract is, and this year's examination

suggested that, where candidates thought they had, it did them more harm than good as it distracted them from writing about the extract and on to writing about the historian.

Although the syllabus draws no specific distinction between the historian's approach and the interpretation in the extract, there are times when considering the approach first can be a significant help to identifying the interpretation. If the historian has obviously focused, for example, on developments at the periphery (in the Imperialism topic), then the interpretation will reflect that, and will not have a main message about the role of the government in driving imperial developments. Some less successful answers included conclusions about the interpretation which were not based on this obvious point. The Cold War extract on Paper 33 had a clear focus on Stalin, yet many candidates reached a conclusion that the main interpretation was that responsibility for increasing tensions after 1945 was shared between him and the West. This kind of misinterpretation occurs when minor aspects of the extract are mistaken for the 'big message', and looking first at the approach can be a way of avoiding it.

Comments on Specific Questions

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote the extract is that it was economics that drove the expansion of empire, and that the force behind this was 'gentlemanly capitalism', not manufacturing interests. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation, and illustrated them using material from the extract. Mid-range answers recognised some of the overall interpretation, whilst missing other aspects of it, though still offering valid support from the extract. The recognised aspect would invariably be economics; it was a feature of answers that 'gentlemanly capitalism' appeared not to be a well-known interpretation. Other answers concentrated on explaining the approach, often on whether the extract focused on the metropole or the periphery (actually both), or on sub-messages (i.e. points of interpretation, but not those central to the historian's overall view), for example that the historian did not think manufacturing interests were significant in driving imperialism. Weaker answers fell into two broad categories. First, those that repeated or paraphrased points in the extract without engaging with the historian's interpretation, and second, those that wrote about Imperialism with no reference to the extract.

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that Hitler intended the destruction of the Jews from the start, and that Germany provided 'fertile soil' for his ideas. The best responses recognised both these aspects of the interpretation, and illustrated them using material from the extract. Most candidates recognised the intentionalist nature of the extract, and to a great extent the quality of the answer was then determined by how consistently and coherently this interpretation could be illustrated. Some candidates searched for 'functionalist' aspects or strove for a 'synthesis', usually by arguing that the whole extract did not simply focus on Hitler but also considered the nature of German society after the First World War. Others paid too much attention to references to the anti-Semitism of the German people, and tried to draw connections between this extract and the work of Goldhagen. These diversions missed or underplayed the extent to which the interpretation focused on Hitler; insofar as other factors were mentioned, it was only to illustrate how he was able to succeed in his 'war against the Jews'. However, better answers understood that 'intentionalism' does not simply mean that Hitler was to blame for the Holocaust, but that he intended it *right from the start of his career*. The extract was explicit about this, marking it out as an example of extreme intentionalism, so any answer showing sound understanding used the extract to make this point. Weaker answers fell into two broad categories. First, those that repeated or paraphrased points in the extract without engaging with the historian's interpretation, and second, those that wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

Section C: The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941-50

The central argument of the historian who wrote the extract is that the breakdown of the wartime alliance was more or less inevitable because of the nature of Great Power relations, and that 'security dilemmas' were at the root of ever-deepening suspicions between the two sides. The best answers recognised both these elements of the interpretation, and were able to illustrate them using material from the extract. More commonly, candidates recognised that the extract was post-revisionist in nature, not blaming either side, and used the security dilemmas aspect to support this, but failed to appreciate the argument about Great Powers. These answers were still showing sound understanding of the nature of the historian's interpretation. Where sound understanding began to be questionable was when candidates thought they could also detect orthodox aspects within the interpretation, based on the points made by the historian in the second

paragraph. At this point in the extract the historian was developing the idea that, whilst the two sides shared similar hopes for the future, they had different visions on how to bring this about. Candidates commonly saw what was said about the two sides as vindicating the West and blaming Stalin, whereas the historian was actually setting up the argument that these different visions were what produced the mutual suspicions described in the final paragraph. In short, the interpretation was post-revisionist, and suggesting that part of it was not indicative of a lack of understanding of the extract *taken as a whole*. Nonetheless, interpreting the second paragraph *on its own* as orthodox was understandable, and was rewarded as a sub-message (i.e. understanding an *aspect* of the extract). However, arguing that the extract was both post-revisionist and traditional still rested on the fallacy of seeing the extract as comprising two interpretations, rather than seeking to integrate its aspects into a single interpretation, which is the only way that sound understanding can be shown. Weaker answers fell into two broad categories. First those that repeated or paraphrased points in the extract without engaging with the historian's interpretation, and second those that wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/32

Interpretations Question

Key Messages

Successful answers:

- consisted of two aspects: the identification of the historian's central argument, and an explanation, using the extract, of how the argument was identified
- avoided lengthy paragraphs not focused on the extract
- were based on a good overall understanding of the extract, based on a careful reading of the extract, identifying the most important aspects of the argument, before starting to write.

General Comments

The general quality of the answers was good. Most answers showed understanding of the extracts at face value, with the best detecting the particular nuances of an historian's argument. The level of knowledge of the topics was also good, but in some weaker answers, use of this knowledge to make sense of what the extract was saying was sometimes replaced by unfocused description of events.

Most candidates were able to identify aspects of the historian's interpretation, and the best were able to demonstrate sound or complete understanding by consistently focusing on the extract and using relevant material from the extract to explain their conclusions. There was a tendency for answers to stray into summaries of the historiography of the topic, or of events. Where the extract was used, candidates would often adopt an approach of commenting on each paragraph in turn, frequently reaching entirely contradictory conclusions from them about the historian's interpretation. The very best answers showed unambiguous understanding that the main message or central interpretation contained within the extract could only be derived from the extract as a whole, rather than from elements within it. Thus, on the Cold War, for example, a paragraph or even a sentence might be termed traditional, only for the next paragraph to be regarded as revisionist. On the Holocaust, an intentionalist paragraph would be followed by a structuralist sentence, and so on. The best answers were capable of synthesising apparently contradictory elements into an overarching interpretation.

For the Cold War and Holocaust topics, the historiography has developed within broad Schools that can be labelled in a form of shorthand summarising the historians' ideas and approaches (traditional, revisionist, post-revisionist, intentionalist, structuralist, synthesis, etc.). It was apparent that identifying an interpretation by applying a label to it was often unhelpful for candidates. For the approach to work, candidates had to understand what the labels meant, and this was by no means universally the case. Then the label had to be relevant to the extract, which again was not always an entirely straightforward matter. If an inappropriate label was used, immediate doubt was cast on the candidate's level of understanding of the extract. It should be stressed that there is no requirement to use such labels. Using the extract to identify and explain the interpretation within it is sufficient, though of course a label appropriately used can be an effective way of showing understanding.

Some candidates attempted to evaluate the extract, and comment on its reliability. The question does not demand this, and attempts to do it were not merely unnecessary, but usually counter-productive. Candidates will almost certainly have no valid grounds for accusing individual historians of bias, incomplete research, looking for evidence to support pre-determined arguments, or other crimes against good historical method. This tended to happen when candidates thought they had identified the author of an extract, but even when an extract is taken from a highly controversial work, such as Dawidowicz on Hitler's intentionalism, the focus of this paper is on what the historian is saying and not on whether the historian is correct to say it. Candidates are not expected to identify who the author of an extract is, and this year's examination

suggested that, where candidates thought they had, it did them more harm than good as it distracted them from writing about the extract and on to writing about the historian.

Although the syllabus draws no specific distinction between the historian's approach and the interpretation in the extract, there are times when considering the approach first can be a significant help to identifying the interpretation. If the historian has obviously focused, for example, on developments at the periphery (in the Imperialism topic), then the interpretation will reflect that, and will not have a main message about the role of the government in driving imperial developments. Some less successful answers included conclusions about the interpretation which were not based on this obvious point. The Cold War extract on Paper 33 had a clear focus on Stalin, yet many candidates reached a conclusion that the main interpretation was that responsibility for increasing tensions after 1945 was shared between him and the West. This kind of misinterpretation occurs when minor aspects of the extract are mistaken for the 'big message', and looking first at the approach can be a way of avoiding it.

Comments on Specific Questions

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote the extract is that the British Empire was not made by the state but by individuals at the periphery, and that these people had material motives. The best answers recognised these elements of the interpretation, and were able to illustrate them using material from the extract. Mid-range answers recognised some of these central elements, whilst missing others, but nonetheless offered appropriate support from the extract. Some candidates were able to make valid comments about the historian's approach, for example, the concentration on the periphery, but without linking this to the interpretation. Adequately supported, such answers would receive credit, but at a lower level. Similar in quality were answers that looked at valid sub-messages (i.e. points of interpretation, but not those central to the historian's overall view – for example, that the British government was not particularly interested in supervising imperial expansion). Weaker answers fell into two broad categories. First those that repeated or paraphrased points in the extract without engaging with the historian's interpretation, and second those that wrote about imperialism with no reference to the extract.

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote the extract is that the war almost automatically made Hitler's anti-Jewish policy genocidal, and that Hitler himself needed to do little because there were plenty of people willing to carry out the genocide for him. The best answers recognised these elements, and were able to illustrate them using material from the extract. Mid-range answers recognised some of these central elements, whilst missing others, but nonetheless offered appropriate support from the extract. A characteristic of many answers was an attempt to label the interpretation, generally, as functionalist (brought about as a response to war, subordinates willing to do Hitler's work without him being involved etc.) or intentionalist (Hitler at the centre of it all, ideological motive of eradicating 'Jewish Bolshevism' etc.), but most often as a synthesis of these. As always, what determined the quality of these answers was less the label applied than the quality of support brought from the extract to support the argument. One distracting element of the extract was the reference to 'willing helpers', which tempted some candidates to launch into their Goldhagen material. Some candidates were able to make valid comments about the historian's approach, for example, that this was essentially a 'from above' view on the Holocaust, concentrating on the views and actions of the Nazi leadership, but without linking this to the interpretation. Adequately supported, such answers would receive credit, but at a lower level than those engaging with the interpretation itself. Similar in quality were answers that looked at valid sub-messages (i.e. points of interpretation, but not those central to the historian's overall view – for example, that Hitler did not involve himself much in ideological matters). Weaker answers fell into two broad categories. First those that repeated or paraphrased points in the extract without engaging with the historian's interpretation, and second those that wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

Section C: The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941-50

The central argument of the historian who wrote the extract is that US suspicion of the Soviet Union led to them being determined to dominate the Eurasian landmass, and that a crucial motive behind this was the protection of US economic interests. The extract has a primary focus on the United States, and on how it perceived the post-war world. It says relatively little about the Soviet Union. An awareness of this aspect of the historian's *approach* (i.e. as distinct from the *interpretation*) would have steered candidates into a much more informed use of the extract. Instead, candidates looking for an interpretation on who was to blame for

the Cold War had difficulties finding an answer. Many concluded that the interpretation was traditional. Unfortunately, the attempted support for this view almost invariably depended on accepting Soviet expansionism as a fact, whereas the extract was far more concerned with American *perceptions* of the situation. A much more sustainable view was to perceive the extract as revisionist. The historian certainly views the US as highly suspicious and motivated by a desire to protect its own interests, but whether this amounts to actually blaming it for the Cold War is much more dubious. Nonetheless, better answers focused on the idea that the historian's interpretation had aspects that were critical towards the USA. Of course, there were also answers claiming that the extract was post-revisionist, but this conclusion was perhaps the hardest of all to justify, as the historian was so obviously focused on the USA rather than the USSR, whereas post-revisionists would have been trying to illustrate why both or neither can be blamed. Weaker answers fell into two broad categories. First those that repeated or paraphrased points in the extract without engaging with the historian's interpretation, and second those that wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract. Perhaps the most important lesson that can be taken from this particular extract is that historians can write about the Cold War without necessarily perceiving the issue of blame as being of primary importance. In the examination candidates should be prepared to use the extract as they find it, and to tease out the interpretation from what it says, without preconceptions on what it will deal with.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/33

Interpretations Question

Key Messages

Successful answers:

- consisted of two aspects: the identification of the historian's central argument, and an explanation, using the extract, of how the argument was identified
- avoided lengthy paragraphs not focused on the extract
- were based on a good overall understanding of the extract, based on a careful reading of the extract, identifying the most important aspects of the argument, before starting to write.

General Comments

The general quality of the answers was good. Most answers showed understanding of the extracts at face value, with the best detecting the particular nuances of an historian's argument. The level of knowledge of the topics was also good, but in some weaker answers, use of this knowledge to make sense of what the extract was saying was sometimes replaced by unfocused description of events.

Most candidates were able to identify aspects of the historian's interpretation, and the best were able to demonstrate sound or complete understanding by consistently focusing on the extract and using relevant material from the extract to explain their conclusions. There was a tendency for answers to stray into summaries of the historiography of the topic, or of events. Where the extract was used, candidates would often adopt an approach of commenting on each paragraph in turn, frequently reaching entirely contradictory conclusions from them about the historian's interpretation. The very best answers showed unambiguous understanding that the main message or central interpretation contained within the extract could only be derived from the extract as a whole, rather than from elements within it. Thus, on the Cold War, for example, a paragraph or even a sentence might be termed traditional, only for the next paragraph to be regarded as revisionist. On the Holocaust, an intentionalist paragraph would be followed by a structuralist sentence, and so on. The best answers were capable of synthesising apparently contradictory elements into an overarching interpretation.

For the Cold War and Holocaust topics, the historiography has developed within broad Schools that can be labelled in a form of shorthand summarising the historians' ideas and approaches (traditional, revisionist, post-revisionist, intentionalist, structuralist, synthesis, etc.). It was apparent that identifying an interpretation by applying a label to it was often unhelpful for candidates. For the approach to work, candidates had to understand what the labels meant, and this was by no means universally the case. Then the label had to be relevant to the extract, which again was not always an entirely straightforward matter. If an inappropriate label was used, immediate doubt was cast on the candidate's level of understanding of the extract. It should be stressed that there is no requirement to use such labels. Using the extract to identify and explain the interpretation within it is sufficient, though of course a label appropriately used can be an effective way of showing understanding.

Some candidates attempted to evaluate the extract, and comment on its reliability. The question does not demand this, and attempts to do it were not merely unnecessary, but usually counter-productive. Candidates will almost certainly have no valid grounds for accusing individual historians of bias, incomplete research, looking for evidence to support pre-determined arguments, or other crimes against good historical method. This tended to happen when candidates thought they had identified the author of an extract, but even when an extract is taken from a highly controversial work, such as Dawidowicz on Hitler's intentionalism, the focus of this paper is on what the historian is saying and not on whether the historian is correct to say it. Candidates are not expected to identify who the author of an extract is, and this year's examination

suggested that, where candidates thought they had, it did them more harm than good as it distracted them from writing about the extract and on to writing about the historian.

Although the syllabus draws no specific distinction between the historian's approach and the interpretation in the extract, there are times when considering the approach first can be a significant help to identifying the interpretation. If the historian has obviously focused, for example, on developments at the periphery (in the Imperialism topic), then the interpretation will reflect that, and will not have a main message about the role of the government in driving imperial developments. Some less successful answers included conclusions about the interpretation which were not based on this obvious point. The Cold War extract on Paper 33 had a clear focus on Stalin, yet many candidates reached a conclusion that the main interpretation was that responsibility for increasing tensions after 1945 was shared between him and the West. This kind of misinterpretation occurs when minor aspects of the extract are mistaken for the 'big message', and looking first at the approach can be a way of avoiding it.

Comments on Specific Questions

Paper 33

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote the extract is that by the later part of the nineteenth century the empire was at the heart of British cultural life, and that this was brought about by the encouragement of a cult of empire, fostered by the elite. The best answers recognised these elements, and were able to illustrate them using material from the extract. The social/cultural approach of the historian was perceived by almost all candidates, but this did not infallibly lead to a genuine grasp of the interpretation. It was important to see that the historian was arguing that something new was happening in this period, that British cultural life was *changing*. Many answers missed this. Others saw that the impact of empire on British society was important, but failed to explore why, or even how. Some saw the interpretation as being about the *causes* of imperialism rather than the *impact*. There was also much writing about the empire, without maintaining a proper focus on the extract. Many answers tried to evaluate the extract by pointing out what the historian had omitted – no mention, for example, of the impact of empire on those who were at the periphery. As mentioned elsewhere, candidates are not expected to evaluate; they should take the extract for what it is, rather than worrying about what it is not.

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote the extract is that, although the Nazis intended *some kind of* final solution from the start, the genocidal nature of this was not decided until war served to radicalise Nazi race policy. The best answers recognised these elements, and were able to illustrate them using material from the extract, whilst almost invariably concluding that the interpretation demonstrated a 'synthesis' viewpoint. Many candidates viewed the extract as functionalist, in that they noted the change to Nazi policy brought by war and the cumulative radicalisation brought about by the nature of the Nazi state. Others, less persuasively, saw the extract as intentionalist. There was certainly an aspect of 'No Hitler, no Holocaust' but this was not central to the extract, and making any satisfactory case for intentionalism had to incorporate the vital distinction made by the historian between a commitment to 'some kind of final solution' and the 'Final Solution' that eventually occurred. Many weaker candidates missed this, and simply claimed that the extract supported the idea that Hitler planned the extermination of the Jews from the start, which clearly it did not. Weaker answers fell into two broad categories. First those that repeated or paraphrased points in the extract without engaging with the historian's interpretation, and second those that wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

Section C: The Origins and Development of the Cold War, 1941-50

The central argument of the historian who wrote the extract is that Stalin did not want the Cold War, but that his actions, despite his intentions, were the main factor in bringing it about. The best answers recognised these elements, and were able to illustrate them using material from the extract. Mid-range answers opted instead for a more straightforward post-revisionist interpretation which spotted the first element in the 'big message', but reached a final conclusion that the Cold War was caused by mutual misunderstandings. There were clues in the extract of it coming from a post-Cold War text, which led perceptive candidates more easily to the overall conclusion that Stalin was mainly to blame, but the apparently overt post-revisionism of the first paragraph tended to dominate the responses of most candidates. Almost all answers used labels to identify the nature of the interpretation, but what was crucial was how the extract was used to explain these labels. It

was obvious from the use of labels that understanding of what they mean is by no means universal, with 'revisionism' in particular producing some wrong definitions. This was one of those extracts where pondering the historian's *approach* before teasing out the *interpretation* would pay dividends. The extract had a clear focus on Stalin, and had relatively little to say about the West. It should, then, have been apparent that the historian's interpretation would also be mainly on Stalin, yet many answers thought they saw, for example, an interpretation that the West was as much to blame as Stalin for the Cold War. This was particularly the case when it came to considering the role of 'miscalculations'. The extract reaches the conclusion that *Stalin's* miscalculations were the root cause of increasing tensions, but very frequently answers contained the conclusion that the cause was *mutual* misunderstandings. Weaker answers fell into two broad categories. First those that repeated or paraphrased points in the extract without engaging with the historian's interpretation, and second those that wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/41
Depth Study

Key Messages

Successful answers:

- Respond to the exact terms of the question set
- Support points with relevant evidence
- Show detailed knowledge of the topic, appropriate to a 'depth' study.

General Comments

Two features stood out with the majority of the responses. The first was the willingness of most candidates to really try and tackle the question set. When they were asked 'To what extent...?' they genuinely tried to deal with 'extent'. There were some good debates and strong arguments. The awareness that there needed to be some balance was usually there and candidates responded appropriately to the requirement to 'evaluate' and 'discuss'. The second feature was a lack of depth of knowledge seen in many responses. Topics which were directly linked to both Key Questions and specified content were only considered in vague outline. For this paper topics cover a shorter time-span and are meant to be studied in depth and detail. To attain Level Five, the analysis has to be 'fully supported by appropriate factual detail' and there has also to be a 'very good understanding of the question'. Candidates who did less well showed limited textbook knowledge and no evidence of any wider, or independent, reading. All questions set will be clearly linked to the Key Questions and the specified content. While how many topics are studied is an issue for Centres, a minimum of two have to be done and they have to be done in real depth.

There were no serious rubric errors seen. However, there were some cases where candidates wrote the essay they knew best rather than answering the question, for example, when asked about how Hitler 'retained' power, candidates wrote instead about how he got into power, often in great detail. While in many cases the overall essay technique was good, there were still a fair number of responses where the cases 'for' and 'against' were listed, and there was no clear conclusion. Some also tended to come to a conclusion which seemed to be unrelated to the facts and points which preceded it. The best responses tended to avoid long 'introductions' which contained a lot of vague background, got on with a clear answer and then developed a case in depth.

There is no expectation that historians' views on a topic need to be given. Some candidates listed various historians' views rather than give their own. While a relevant quote or view from a Kershaw or a Gaddis can be appropriate, perhaps one from the author of a textbook written over sixty years ago is not.

Comments on Specific Questions

Depth Study 1: Europe of the Dictators, 1918–1941

1 To what extent does Lenin's use of terror explain the establishment of Bolshevik rule in Russia by 1924?

This was a popular and usually competently done question. The best answers reflected on a range of factors initially and then developed a balanced argument effectively. Some did feel that terror, the use of the CHEKA, the treatment of White prisoners, Kronstadt etc. was the critical factor, while other equally good responses made cases for the victory of the Red Army or the appeal of the Bolsheviks after the legacy of the Tsars and the war. The best made sure that there was ample detail to substantiate their points. Some got bogged down in the detail of 1917, really wishing to write an essay on why the Bolsheviks won in 1917.

There were a fair number of very 'outline' responses which made a reasonable range of valid points, but neglected to add the sort of detail required for the higher marks in a 'Depth' Study.

2 'He had limited aims and limited achievements.' Discuss this view of Mussolini's domestic policy.

The best responses were those which tackled the question in a systematic way, dealing with Mussolini's domestic aims before and after his acquisition of power, and then commenting on whether he actually achieved much or not. The key to success here lay in some careful planning and organisation. There was usually a fair amount known about his domestic policies and their impact, but in weaker answers knowledge was not well used. The best responses suggested that prior to attaining power his only domestic aim was the actual acquisition of power and that he had to develop some aims/policies once he got there. Less good responses tended to either write a list of the 'Battles' and add some comment about the Church, or try and deal with both aims and achievements together. Some went into too much detail on Abyssinia and Albania and there were a fair number who wanted to write about how he attained power in the first place. The only topic that really seemed to be developed in depth was his relationship with the Church and the Lateran agreement, but what its relevance to the question was, was rarely made clear

3 Assess the effectiveness of Stalin's industrialisation policy.

The key to success lay in working out what an 'effective' industrial policy was and then looking at what happened in Russia between 1928 and 1941 to see how it met the criteria stated. Some argued that it was, partly on the grounds of the sheer scale of innovation and productivity, while others suggested that enabling Russia to meet the challenges of the Nazi invasion was an indication of effectiveness. There was some awareness of the flaws in the process, with ludicrous targets, poor quality and the neglect of housing and consumer goods. For high marks, detailed knowledge about the scope and scale of industrialisation was needed, and this was often missing from answers. However, many showed a really detailed grasp of collectivisation and went in to great depth on it, even though it had only marginal relevance.

4 'It was the use of propaganda that allowed Hitler to retain power.' How far do you agree?

For success in answering this question, it was vital to note that it was about how Hitler 'retained' power and not how he 'got' in to power. There were a lot of responses which were excellent in many ways in terms of focus and depth, but they were all about the 1928-33 period and had nothing after 1933. The better responses kept the focus firmly on the 1933-1939 period. Some argued, effectively, that propaganda was the key, certainly until the opposition and potential opposition had been defeated, and a system based on terror then took over. Some good responses suggested that it was more a mix of his 'legality' and the popularity of his policies that was important. Less good responses tended to write very generally about propaganda or just generalised. In many cases little was known about events and policies in Germany after 1933, which is a central part of the specification. There were very few mentions of his successes in foreign policy or military achievements.

Depth Study 2: The History of the USA, 1945–1990

Questions 5-8

There were too few responses to make comment appropriate.

Depth Study 3: International History, 1945–1991

9 How far do you agree with the view that the Cuban Missile Crisis ended in victory for Kennedy?

The best answers really thought carefully about what a 'victory' might look like in this context, with some good comments arguing that as MAD did not occur, then all were victorious and not just Kennedy. There were some excellent responses which looked at the issue not only in the context of Cuba and the Caribbean, but showed a really good grasp of the wider issues. Good answers tended to be much better on Kennedy than on the other 'side'. Weaker answers were well aware of the issues raised by the question, but did not show a good enough command of the detail to be able to develop a sound case. In these answers, valid points were made but not substantiated. The only evidence of depth tended to come when the causes of the crisis were considered and there were some lengthy descriptions of the Bay of Pigs invasion, with no indication of its relevance.

10 To what extent did the USA benefit from the period of détente during the 1970s?

The better responses really reflected on what ‘benefit’ might mean in this context before embarking on an answer. Some less successful answers argued that there were economic gains, but not political ones, but could be very vague on both. There was some uncertainty about the dates of détente, and many drifted right out of the 1970s and wrote in detail on Reagan. There were a lot of responses which had a fair amount of detail, such as the terms of SALT or Helsinki, but the detail was not relevant to the actual question set. Where there was evidence of in-depth knowledge, it tended to be on the first part of the period only.

11 ‘The Cultural Revolution was simply Mao’s attempt to preserve his own political power.’ How far do you agree?

This was done by very few candidates. There was some confusion between the Cultural Revolution and the Revolution of 1949 and few seemed to know what the Cultural Revolution actually involved. The few candidates who had much detail at their disposal were well informed about the Great Leap Forward and wrote about that.

12 ‘A dangerous fanatic’. How fair is this assessment of Colonel Nasser of Egypt?

There were some outstanding responses which looked at Nasser and his policies from several different perspectives, such as his own people’s, other Arab States’, the ‘West’ and also the USSR’s, while at the same time having an idea of what a ‘dangerous fanatic’ might be. As one commented, ‘one man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter.’ What prevented some responses from getting the highest marks was too little detailed knowledge outside the crisis of 1956. Many answers said little about Nasser’s wider role with Arab states and even less about the actual geography of the region. Again it was often a real lack of depth that prevented otherwise good answers from attaining highly.

Depth Study 4: African History, 1945–1991

Questions 13-16

There were too few candidates to make comment appropriate.

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

Questions 17-20

There were too few candidates to make comment appropriate.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/42
Depth Study

Key Messages

Successful answers:

- Respond to the exact terms of the question set
- Support points with relevant evidence
- Show detailed knowledge of the topic, appropriate to a 'depth' study.

General Comments

Two features stood out with the majority of the responses. The first was the willingness of most candidates to really try and tackle the question set. When they were asked 'To what extent...?' they genuinely tried to deal with 'extent'. There were some good debates and strong arguments. The awareness that there needed to be some balance was usually there and candidates responded appropriately to the requirement to 'evaluate' and 'discuss'. The second feature was a lack of depth of knowledge seen in many responses. Topics which were directly linked to both Key Questions and specified content were only considered in vague outline. For this paper, topics cover a shorter time-span and are meant to be studied in depth and detail. To attain Level Five, the analysis has to be 'fully supported by appropriate factual detail' and there has also to be a 'very good understanding of the question'. Candidates who did less well showed limited textbook knowledge and no evidence of any wider, or independent, reading. All questions set will be clearly linked to the Key Questions and the specified content. While how many topics are studied is an issue for Centres, a minimum of two have to be done and they have to be done in real depth.

There were no serious rubric errors seen. However, there were some cases where candidates wrote the essay they knew best rather than answering the question, for example, when asked about how Hitler 'retained' power, candidates wrote instead about how he got into power, often in great detail. While in many cases the overall essay technique was good, there were still a fair number of responses where the cases 'for' and 'against' were listed, and there was no clear conclusion. Some also tended to come to a conclusion which seemed to be unrelated to the facts and points which preceded it. The best responses tended to avoid long 'introductions' which contained a lot of vague background, got on with a clear answer and then developed a case in depth.

There is no expectation that historians' views on a topic need to be given. Some candidates listed various historians' views rather than give their own. While a relevant quote or view from a Kershaw or a Gaddis can be appropriate, perhaps one from the author of a textbook written over sixty years ago is not.

Comments on Specific Questions

Depth Study 1: Europe of the Dictators, 1918–1941

1 To what extent had Lenin created a communist state in Russia by 1924?

This was a popular and usually competently done question. The better answers invariably spent some time considering what a communist state was, both in theory and in practice, giving some views on Marx's principal ideas. Having established an effective and clear definition, they went on to argue a case each way. Some very good answers suggested that a communist state was certainly Lenin's intention, perhaps one adapted to the particular needs of Russia, and that he did make specific steps towards that goal, as far as the circumstances of Russia between 1918 and 1924 permitted. Weaker answers tended to spend a lot of

time going into detail on War Communism and the NEP, without really explaining what the relevance of the two aspects of his 'economic' policy was. There were excellent responses which produced very different arguments. Some suggested that what with the utilisation of the CHEKA, Kronstadt, the dissolution of the Assembly and the NEP there was no sign of anything approaching a communist state. Other good ones, emphasizing the development of a command economy and state ownership of the 'commanding heights of the economy', suggested that he was laying a firm base for a Marxist future. There were some excellent discussions, but not always quite the requisite degree of depth.

2 Evaluate the reasons for Mussolini's popularity in Italy to 1941.

This question produced an interesting range of responses. The best really demonstrated the ability to reflect carefully on why Mussolini remained popular, suggesting a variety of reasons, ranging from his propaganda and ability to manipulate opinion, to pursuing policies that at least gave the illusion that he was doing good things for Italy and the Italian people. There seemed to be two routes to the highest marks. One identified a range of reasons and then dealt with each one in some depth, while at the same time commenting on its relative importance. The 'evaluation' was often impressive. The others tended to identify a specific reason and argue a case why it was most important, and why others were of lesser importance. The key always was evidence of 'evaluation'. The weaker responses tended either to have a focus on why and how he got into power, or have long lists of the various 'Battles' which did not seem to link in with what the question was looking for in any way.

3 'The main reason why Stalin remained in power was because of his use of terror.' Discuss this view.

This was a popular question and produced competent responses. There was usually some grasp in outline of his use of terror, but little evidence of how the system actually worked. Good responses considered not only how he got into power, but why he was able to retain it so effectively. Some argued that Russia had always had a strong authoritarian system and that is what the Russian people were used to. Others suggested that there was a genuine desire to attain socialist objectives, to make Russia a 'great' nation again and also attain the benefits of socialism and that this could only be done through Stalin and his methods. Clever and comprehensive propaganda, with total control of all the media, was also suggested as a major reason, as well as the lack of any tradition of opposition, bar that from the Left of which Stalin had himself been a part. Some responses did less well because they showed detailed knowledge of Stalin's rise, or on the Five Year Plans and collectivisation, but with no indication of what the relevance to the question was.

4 'The government of Nazi Germany was characterised by economic and administrative inefficiency.' Discuss this view.

There was evidence of detailed knowledge of the economic policies of the Nazis, and some good comments on the work of Schacht and Goering and the various plans, but less understanding of the administrative implications of Nazi government. Some showed awareness of the rival jurisdictions created after 1933, with the party hierarchy often clashing first with the existing civil service, and then with organisations such as the SS. Some had sound knowledge of the various policies undertaken to solve unemployment and a few commented on the economic implications of such policies. The over-riding impression was that there was in the majority of responses seen, just not enough 'depth' to tackle the question fully. The consensus was that the system was efficient as it solved the unemployment problem by building roads. There was a large number of prepared answers on the period 1919 to 1933.

Depth Study 2: The History of the USA, 1945–1990

Questions 5-8

This section had too few responses to make general comment appropriate.

Depth Study 3: International History, 1945–1991

9 How justified was President Truman's claim that the Korean War ended successfully for the USA?

There were some very good responses to this question, particularly from those who reflected carefully on what might be the criteria for 'success' in this context and whether just winning from a military point of view was the same as achieving some ideological and wider objectives as well. Some did suggest that, while from the containment perspective it was a success, it was not from the roll-back point of view. Communism had

not spread south in Korea, many had died, two countries were devastated and a dreadful regime was embedded in the North which has lasted to this day. There was also the issue of the Cold War getting a lot colder. Weaker candidates tended to write on the causes, and occasionally on the course of the war, while better responses showed detailed knowledge of the implications of the war. In many cases, adequate outline knowledge was seen, but often not nearly enough for a 'Depth' paper.

10 'More illusion than reality'. How far do you agree with this assessment of détente in the 1970s?

There was often a good level of knowledge of the process of détente. Those good answers which really reflected on the implications of illusion and reality - whether it was all just empty rhetoric or real substantive achievement - did exceptionally well. Some felt strongly that it was little more than hot air, with SALT 2 never ratified and Afghanistan invaded. Other argued that tension did ease, men like Nixon were prepared to conciliate and talk, and there was progress with both China and Germany. The best showed real balance and good analysis, while weaker responses simply listed in narrative form the whole process, often in great detail, but did not actually answer the question.

11 How serious were the threats facing the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) during the 1980s?

There were too few responses seen to make general comment appropriate.

12 'The aim of superpower involvement in the Middle East from 1956 to 1979 was to ensure political and economic stability in the region.' How far do you agree?

While there was often quite detailed knowledge demonstrated of the period, less successful responses went off track to explain why there was conflict there and what form it took. Very few really tried to analyse the motivation behind superpower involvement. Oil was occasionally mentioned, but often only in passing. While there was some awareness of the links between the USA and Israel, hardly any seemed aware of the links and military support between the USSR and countries in the region. There was some depth of knowledge shown on the Suez conflict, but the focus tended to be on Nasser and not on why the various superpowers got involved in the way they did. Few made any reference to the later part of the period and commented on, for example, the role of Carter in setting up the process at Camp David in 1979. There seemed to be some depth there, but not on the topic under discussion.

Depth Study 4: African History, 1945–1991

Questions 13-16

There were too few candidates to make comment appropriate.

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

Questions 17-20

There were too few candidates to make comment appropriate.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/43
Depth Study

Key Messages

Successful answers:

- Respond to the exact terms of the question set
- Support points with relevant evidence
- Show detailed knowledge of the topic, appropriate to a 'depth' study.

General Comments

Two features stood out with the majority of the responses. The first was the willingness of most candidates to really try and tackle the question set. When they were asked 'To what extent...?' they genuinely tried to deal with 'extent'. There were some good debates and strong arguments. The awareness that there needed to be some balance was usually there and candidates responded appropriately to the requirement to 'evaluate' and 'discuss'. The second feature was a lack of depth of knowledge seen in many responses. Topics which were directly linked to both Key Questions and specified content were only considered in vague outline. For this paper, topics cover a shorter time-span and are meant to be studied in depth and detail. To attain Level Five, the analysis has to be 'fully supported by appropriate factual detail' and there has also to be a 'very good understanding of the question'. Candidates who did less well showed limited textbook knowledge and no evidence of any wider, or independent, reading. All questions set will be clearly linked to the Key Questions and the specified content. While how many topics are studied is an issue for Centres, a minimum of two have to be done and they have to be done in real depth.

There were no serious rubric errors seen. However, there were some cases where candidates wrote the essay they knew best rather than answering the question, for example, when asked about how Hitler 'retained' power, candidates wrote instead about how he got into power, often in great detail. While in many cases the overall essay technique was good, there were still a fair number of responses where the cases 'for' and 'against' were listed, and there was no clear conclusion. Some also tended to come to a conclusion which seemed to be unrelated to the facts and points which preceded it. The best responses tended to avoid long 'introductions' which contained a lot of vague background, got on with a clear answer and then developed a case in depth.

There is no expectation that historians' views on a topic need to be given. Some candidates listed various historians' views rather than give their own. While a relevant quote or view from a Kershaw or a Gaddis can be appropriate, perhaps one from the author of a textbook written over sixty years ago is not.

Comments on Specific Questions

Depth Study 1: Europe of the Dictators, 1918–1941

1 'The incompetence of the Whites was the main reason for Bolshevik victory in the Russian Civil War.' How far do you agree?

This was a popular and usually competently done response. Candidates focused appropriately on the central issues. Most tended to suggest that White incompetence was a minor factor when compared with other factors such as the work of Trotsky in developing the Red army and leading it. The very best responses usually took one factor and explained in depth why it was more important than others, taking care to ensure that there was ample supporting detail to back up their points. The weaker responses tended to survey possible factors, neglecting to argue a case either way and not dealing with the 'how far' aspect at all. The other weakness seen was a lack of depth: few seemed to know a great deal about the Whites and their leaders and there could be a real lack of awareness of the geography of the conflict.

2 'Mussolini's Corporate State failed.' How far do you agree?

The most successful responses really tried to explain what the Corporate State was, before embarking on a discussion of whether it failed or not. There were some outstanding responses which reflected carefully on what might be the criteria for failure and success in the context of Italy in the 1920s and 1930s. Some argued that while the Corporate State was an attractive concept it never came near to working in practice and that Mussolini did little good and a lot of harm to the Italian economy and people. They pointed out that major issues such as southern poverty were neglected, but at the same time Italy did not suffer the appalling unemployment of Germany in the early 1930s. Some suggested that the Corporate State was just an elaborate propaganda myth with limited substance, only successful in that it helped Mussolini to retain power. The weaker answers tended to lapse into descriptions of the various 'Battles' while there were some prepared answers on how Mussolini got into power.

3 To what extent did Stalin create a totalitarian state in Russia?

This was a popular and usually competently done question. The majority of good responses really worked on getting over a good definition of a totalitarian state as a base to work from, and then argued a case each way. Less successful answers showed a lack of depth. Here the nature and extent of the purges was often superficially covered, and while there were many comments about the control over education and the media, for example, there was very little supporting detail. Collectivisation was often mentioned as an example of Stalin's ability to impose his 'economic' will but very few went into much detail about what it meant in practice and why it was such a good example of 'totalitarian' rule. Better answers showed a grasp of how the regime tried to dominate how people thought, with some interesting examples dealing with the 'state approved' nursery rhymes.

4 'Hitler was able to establish himself in power by 1934 mainly because of a weak opposition.' How far do you agree?

This question was usually competently done. While some responses had too much of a focus on how he got into power, the best ones looked at the period after early 1933 and got their focus on the word 'establish' in the 1933-4 period. The best had detailed knowledge of who his opponents actually were, and looked at the reasons why they were unable to work together and deal with the threat of Hitler. Some thought that the only opponents were the Communists, while better responses looked not only at other parties, but also social and sectional groups, as well as looking at the SA who became, potentially, opponents. Less successful answers were characterised by a lack of depth, and also there were a number of prepared answers on the rise of Hitler. Some put too much emphasis on the 'hyper-inflation of the 1929-33' period.

Depth Study 2: The History of the USA, 1945–1990

Questions 5-8

There were too few answers to make general comment appropriate.

Depth Study 3: International History, 1945–1991

9 To what extent did the nuclear arms race make the world safer in the period from 1950 to 1975?

This question produced some very interesting and thoughtful responses. It was evident that the idea of an arms race, especially a nuclear one, making the world safer was not something that had been much thought about. As a result, it tended to make candidates think and reflect carefully and the resulting, often very perceptive responses, made good reading. There were a variety of different views, with the best responses having a detailed knowledge of both the race, with its potential consequences, as well as the attempts to minimise the risk of MAD. A really good attempt to tackle the question of 'extent' was needed for the higher marks and some responses which had a great command of the topic did less well because they left the conclusion to the reader. Weaker answers gave long descriptions of the Cuban Missile crisis or lists of the various types of missiles and systems which both sides developed. Some got rather immersed in the various 'proxy' wars without ever explaining what their relevance was to the question asked.

10 'The growth of nationalism in Eastern Europe was the main reason for the collapse of the Soviet Union.' How far do you agree?

This was a very popular question. Competent answers argued a case each way, but often found it hard to actually reach some conclusion. The best responses tended to start with a clear case, usually arguing that the principal reasons lay within the USSR, with failed policies and economic system plus the work of Gorbachev, being the most important factors. Some responses which had a fairly sound level of detail, would have reached a higher mark if they had dealt with the issue of 'How far?' What prevented some responses from attaining high marks was the lack of detail on both the rise of nationalism within Eastern Europe and on exactly what Gorbachev got up to in Russia.

11 How successful was Deng Xiaoping's policy of 'market socialism'?

While most candidates who took on this question were aware of the broad implications of what 'market socialism' was, there was an absence of much detail on it. The best responses really reflected carefully on what might be the criteria for 'successes' in this context. Some argued that as long as it was different from what Mao had done it was bound to be an improvement. There were some good comments on the way in which, economically at least, Deng's policies were a real improvement which offered a genuine way forward for China. There were also some perceptive comments on the political implications, most suggesting that they were less successful than the economic ones. There were some good responses which argued that given the situation he inherited, as well as the political 'traditions' of China, it was a remarkable attainment.

12 To what extent did the Iran-Iraq War (1980 – 88) destabilise international relations?

There were too few answers to make general comment appropriate.

Depth Study 4: African History, 1945–1991

Questions 13-16

There were too few candidates to make comment appropriate.

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

Questions 17-20

There were too few candidates to make comment appropriate.