

HISTORY

Paper 9389/11
Document Question

Key messages

- Candidates should ensure that their answers address the specific questions being asked.
- When reading sources candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source in order to understand the argument or point of view of the author. This means that the source should be viewed in its entirety rather than divided into individual sentences or part sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to those which the source read as a whole can provide.
- Candidates should ensure that they look closely at the provenance of each source as they read and consider how far this is useful when analysing the statement given. Candidates should consider the nature (what type of source it is), the origin (who wrote or produced the source), and purpose of sources before commenting on generic reliability or placing in a particular context. However, comments about source evaluation should always be related to answering the question posed.
- Time-keeping is vitally important. Candidates need to make sure they leave enough time to complete answers to both questions.

General comments

There were fewer weak responses where candidates were really struggling to make valid points. Evaluation remains a problem for many candidates and as such there are fewer responses in the higher mark bands. Level 2 for (a) and L3 for (b) was quite common for this series. To achieve higher evaluation marks, it is necessary to explain why the nature, origin or purpose of the source makes it more or less useful when answering the question.

Comments on specific questions

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

1(a) Compare and contrast Bismarck's views of foreign relations as contained in Sources A and D.

The majority of responses did not address the key focus of the question which was 'foreign relations'. Instead they focused on Bismarck's attitude towards going to war and his views of France, often combing the two. Despite this, responses were able to identify a difference between the two sources: no war with France in Source A compared with war with France in Source D, but they were not able to identify a valid similarity. A minority of responses developed a different judgement by pointing out that Source A was written before Bismarck gained power and Source B sometime after he had left government office. A small number of stronger responses identified similarities. The most common similarity was Bismarck's willingness to use war as part of his relations with other powers.

1(b) 'Bismarck always wanted to go to war with France.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?

Most responses identified opposing views in Source A because Bismarck says that he does not anticipate war with France. A few stronger responses commented on the qualifying phrase of the final sentence, 'at present' and suggested he did not want to go to war with France in 1857. Some weaker responses saw the final date of 1867 in Source D and assumed that it was written in that

year. This reading did not allow those responses to develop effective analysis because the source was actually written some thirty years later.

Section B, the American Option: Impact of the Mexican-American War

2(a) Compare and contrast the views on the Wilmot Proviso given in Sources B and D.

Many responses were able to identify a similarity between the two sources as both say the Wilmot Proviso had received a great deal of attention, in Congress and across the nation. A few also offered some consideration of difference having successfully analysed Source B. Stronger responses were able to accurately interpret each source to produce some analysis while weaker responses tended to misread the source material.

2(b) 'The main issue raised by the Mexican-American War was the power of the federal government'. How far do Sources A to D support this view?

Two responses to this question were valid. One was to argue that the main issue was not federal government power, it was something else, the most obvious being slavery. The second was to say that the main issue was the extent of the power of federal government, some claiming it should have more power, others claiming less. Most responses chose the first of the two options. These responses identified a valid difference between Sources A and B while many weaker responses misinterpreted the provenance of Source D, reading 'an election pamphlet' as being non-partisan. Source C proved to be quite challenging for several candidates and this was usually because of the reference to the [North West] Ordinance of 1787 and also to 'Oregon and Mexico' in the last line which were generally misunderstood. Despite this, however, most responses were able to interpret this set of sources in order to answer the question effectively.

Section C, International Option: Britain's Leadership of the League of Nations

3(a) Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources B and C regarding the League of Nations' response to Japanese aggression in Manchuria.

Many responses focused too closely on Britain rather than the stated factor of the League of Nations and this limited the extent of valid judgement. References to Britain, if it was clearly linked to the League of Nations in some way, was appropriate and several stronger responses used the phrase 'Britain as a leading member of the League'. The question asked about the League's response to Japanese aggression in Manchuria [in 1931] and several weaker responses discussed the League's response to Italian aggression in Abyssinia in 1936. Stronger responses which did focus on the League and Manchuria were able to identify similarities and differences. Many identified similarities about how the League took little or no effective action. The difference was that Source B said the League took no action because Japan and China were not technically at war while Source C said that the inaction was because the great powers had no selfish, material interest in Manchuria.

3(b) 'Britain's actions during the Abyssinian crisis demonstrated its commitment to the principles of the League of Nations.' How far do Sources A–D support this view?

The majority of responses identified Source A as supporting the quote and Source C as challenging it. Source D was generally not well considered by many responses and these seemed to misinterpret the source, suggesting that Churchill argued that Britain was supporting the League, which supported the hypothesis without considering it more closely. Source D challenged the hypothesis and stronger responses which did interpret Source D effectively were able to produce more valid analysis and judgement. In weaker responses, evaluation of the sources was often general comments that did not go beyond the surface features of the source material. Use of source provenance and some contextual knowledge is usually enough to provide some specific evaluation and that evaluation will be credited to Level 4 so long as it is used to modify, if appropriate, the usefulness of the source in answering the question. 'Source D challenges the assertion but is unreliable for reasons already given and thus cannot be properly used in helping to decide whether the sources support or challenge the hypothesis' is the kind of link which it is essential to make to reach Level 4.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9389/12 Document Question</p>
--

Key messages

- Candidates should ensure that their answers address the specific questions being asked.
- When reading sources candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source in order to understand the argument or point of view of the author. This means that the source should be viewed in its entirety rather than divided into individual sentences or part sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to those which the source read as a whole can provide.
- Candidates should ensure that they look closely at the provenance of each source as they read and consider how far this is useful when analysing the statement given. Candidates should consider the nature (what type of source it is), the origin (who wrote or produced the source), and purpose of sources before commenting on generic reliability or placing in a particular context. However, comments about source evaluation should always be related to answering the question posed.
- Time-keeping is vitally important. Candidates need to make sure they leave enough time to complete answers to both questions.

General comments

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

Responses often made invalid points of comparison. Many of these claimed similarities for points which were not actually similar and differences for points which were not different. If the comparisons cannot be properly validated, they cannot be credited. The focus of the **(a)** question is to identify valid similarities and differences of the content of the sources. Weaker responses often included large sections of contextual knowledge or stock paragraphs of 'evaluation' rather than tackling the focus of the question. Although there are marks in the top level for commenting on the usefulness of the sources, the focus of the question should be on making a developed comparison i.e. identifying similarities and differences.

To achieve higher evaluation marks, it is necessary to explain why the nature, origin or purpose of the source makes it more or less useful when answering the question. One example of where this could be achieved was in **Section C, Source D**. Responses that dealt with this source successfully used their knowledge of the context to comment on the position taken by the British Labour party in these discussions and how it could be used to give weight to the source in relation to the wider question. As such when using these ideas, it is important that candidates explain why this makes the source more or less useful for the question rather than just stating the date or type of source and saying it is unreliable.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: European Option: The Appointment of Bismarck as Minister President in 1862

1(a) To what extent do Sources A and B agree about the appointment of Bismarck?

Most responses to this question were able to identify similarities. The differences were more subtle and required candidates to be clear about the exact criticisms each source was making of Bismarck. Therefore, whilst Source A regards Bismarck as a 'reactionary conservative' who is likely to harm the cause of German unity; Source B portrays him as a dangerous revolutionary who may be in favour of increased unity. Some weaker responses misinterpreted the use of the word 'conservative' while

stronger responses were able to identify differences relating to this including who was in danger from the ideas of Bismarck. This question was well attempted, but candidates are encouraged to take account of the whole message of the source rather than only small sections of it.

1(b) 'Bismarck's appointment as Minister President advanced the cause of German unity.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?

Source A provided a strong challenge to the assertion and many responses were able to use this to discuss the nature of the source and the weight of evidence it could provide. Source D, from Bismarck himself offered support to the question and similarly stronger responses were able to discuss possible reasons why Bismarck was keen to show himself as a supporter of unity when writing his memoirs in the 1890s. Sources B and C needed closer reading and weaker responses did not show this. Source B suggested that Bismarck was a proponent of unity even though the author is against it. Stronger responses were able to discuss reasons that von Gerlach might have had a particular view on both unity and Bismarck. Source C discussed various themes relating to the issue of unity although it did not state outright Bismarck's opinion. Many responses picked up on the ideas of the relationship with Austria and Prussia's place within the German states and used this source effectively. The strongest responses were able to place the authors within the context of the time.

Section B, the American Option: The outcomes of the Mexican–American War

2(a) Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources A and B on the issue of slavery in new Territories.

Strong responses to this question showed good understanding of the debates concerning the role of Congress in decision making and used the sources to show differences of opinion between Source A and Source B. The strongest responses supported these ideas with direct reference to the sources. There were few responses to this question but most were also able to discuss the similarities shown in each source, i.e. that this was an issue which was causing, and would continue to cause, discord. Weaker responses did not use much contextual knowledge of issues such as the Wilmot Proviso to further their comparison of the sources rather than include extended sections of description.

2(b) How far do Sources A to D support the assertion that the powers of the federal government were the main issue in disagreements that originated in the Mexican–American War?

The majority of responses to this question were able to use the sources successfully and looked for examples of support and challenge for the assertion. The big issue here was how much weight the sources could give to whether it was federal powers or the issue of slavery that was most upsetting and dividing people. Many strong responses dealt well with the subtleties that the sources offered on these issues but some weaker ones did struggle with this. Although the ideas of the expansion of slavery run throughout the sources there were some which were clearly more concerned with the exercise of federal power than of the practicalities of expansion. The strongest responses were able to use contextual knowledge of the period to discuss the growing tensions and new decisions that needed to be taken whilst placing the Mexican-American war into this picture.

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

3(a) Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources C and D regarding the role played by Britain in the League of Nations' consideration of the Manchurian question.

Many responses were able to apply effective contextual knowledge in order to identify similarities and differences between the sources but there were a significant minority which struggled to apply this knowledge accurately. Both sources clearly agreed that Britain held an extremely important and influential position within the League of Nations and that they had (or should have had) some sense of their moral leadership. The strongest responses supported these ideas with precise contextual knowledge of Britain's place within the league during the 1930s. Many were able to identify the clear differences between the sources, with Simon believing that Britain had acted fairly as part of the discussions over Manchuria, and Attlee believed that a lack of leadership had 'encouraged the Japanese militarists'.

3(b) 'In the period from September 1931 to November 1932, the League of Nations responded appropriately to the problems in Manchuria.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?

Many responses were able to consider the phrase 'appropriate response' effectively and so could identify support and challenge from the sources, although weaker responses sometimes got distracted into determinism because they saw the league as ultimately failing at the task. Within this context, Source C suggested that Britain took appropriate action and was willing to defend it. Many responses were able to discuss the purpose of this source effectively and suggested that limited weight could be given to it because it was a government defence of the policy. Source A could also be used to support the statement as it showed that the league had every intention of responding with thought and appropriate action. However, many responses also used Source A to suggest that the league, despite intentions, had been unable to respond appropriately because of the actions of Japan and the way that its own structures hampered it. Sources B and D clearly argued that the league had not taken appropriate action and many responses could clearly identify this. The best responses were those which were able to take these ideas and place the sources within a contextual framework which allowed them to be tested. These responses often produced interesting, and thoughtful, answers to the question rather than deciding purely based on perceptions of failure.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/13
Document Question

Key messages

- Candidates should ensure that their answers address the specific questions being asked.
- When reading sources candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source in order to understand the argument or point of view of the author. This means that the source should be viewed in its entirety rather than divided into individual sentences or part sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to those which the source read as a whole can provide.
- Candidates should ensure that they look closely at the provenance of each source as they read and consider how far this is useful when analysing the statement given. Candidates should consider the nature (what type of source it is), the origin (who wrote or produced the source), and purpose of sources before commenting on generic reliability or placing in a particular context. However, comments about source evaluation should always be related to answering the question posed.
- Time-keeping is vitally important. Candidates need to make sure they leave enough time to complete answers to both questions.

General comments

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

Responses often made invalid points of comparison. Many of these claimed similarities for points which were not actually similar and differences for points which were not different. If the comparisons cannot be properly validated, they cannot be credited. The focus of the **(a)** question is to identify valid similarities and differences of the content of the sources. Weaker responses often included large sections of contextual knowledge or stock paragraphs of 'evaluation' rather than tackling the focus of the question. Although there are marks in the top level for commenting on the usefulness of the sources, the focus of the question should be on making a developed comparison i.e. identifying similarities and differences.

To achieve higher evaluation marks it is necessary to explain why the nature, origin or purpose of the source makes it more or less useful when answering the question. One example of where this could be achieved was in **Section B, Source C**. Responses that dealt with this source successfully used their knowledge of the context to comment on the position taken by the Abolitionist convention in comparison to that taken by the Republican party, i.e. that they held different views on abolition versus stopping the spread of slavery. As such, when using these ideas it is important that candidates explain why this makes the source more or less useful for the question rather than just stating the date or type of source and saying it is unreliable.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: European Option: Foreign Intervention in Italy

1(a) Compare and contrast the views of Cavour given in Sources B and D.

This question was generally well answered with many responses picking out clear ideas and supporting them with direct reference to the sources. Both sources clearly spoke of the actions of the French and how Cavour felt abandoned by them. On the other hand, there were differences in the way that Cavour was reported to have reacted to the news. Source B refers to Cavour being distraught at the news of a general peace congress with all of the other Italian states maintaining that

the only thing left that he could do was to kill himself – ‘blow out my brains’. However, in Source D he is considering encouraging a revolution in Italy to bring about unity and he also states that he was prepared to carry on the war alone, but his generals dismissed this idea. The strongest responses were able to support their ideas by placing the sources within their contextual knowledge to show more about the similarities and differences.

1(b) ‘Foreign support helped the cause of Italian unification.’ How far do Sources A to D support this view?

Many responses showed an ability to use the sources to support and challenge the assertion given in the question. The question required some discrimination about which ‘foreign power’ was being discussed (i.e. France or Austria or others) and most responses dealt with this well. Sources A, C and D could be used to support the assertion showing that support from different powers did help unity be it through political or territorial measures. Sources A and D could also be used to question the assertion and the strongest responses did this by drawing out the subtleties within the sources. Source B suggested that any action by the French had not been helpful to the cause of unity. Stronger responses were able to place the authors within the context of the time while weaker ones relied more of general comments on provenance.

Section B, the American Option: The Formation of the Republican Party, 1854–56

2(a) Compare and contrast Sources A and C as evidence of Northern attitudes towards slavery.

Strong responses to this question showed that candidates understood the debates regarding slavery that took place between people in the North. The strongest responses identified clear similarities and differences between the sources. Some responses were weaker because they assumed that the Republican Party (even in 1854) supported abolition and so did not pick up on the subtleties of the sources. Whilst both sources clearly demonstrated opposition to slavery there were differences between the priorities of the two sources. The strongest responses used contextual knowledge of issues such as the Fugitive Slave Act to further their comparison of the sources rather than include extended sections of description.

2(b) ‘In its first three years, the Republican Party was only concerned with protecting the interests of the Northern section.’ How far do Sources A to D support this assertion?

Most responses were able to use the sources successfully and looked for examples of support and challenge for the assertion. The big issue here was how much weight the sources could give to whether the early Republican Party was mostly interested protecting the North or in influencing the whole country. The strongest responses dealt well with the source material and considered several of the more subtle features of them. Weaker responses struggled with these more subtle aspects and produced some general ideas. The strongest responses were able to use contextual knowledge of the period to discuss the growing tensions and new decisions that needed to be taken whilst placing the early years of the Republican Party war into this picture.

Section C, International Option: The United Nations Charter as Agreed at the San Francisco Conference

3(a) Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources B and D regarding the League of Nations.

The most important part of this question was that valid comments related to views of the League of Nations rather than the United Nations. The **part (b)** question in this section is focussed on the United Nations and as such this question was using different knowledge. Most responses dealt with this and their answers were focussed on comparing the sources for their views on the league. However, there were a significant majority of responses which wrote a lot about the views of the United Nations and this could not be credited. Beyond this most responses were able to identify similarities and differences between the sources, including the aims of the league and some of the problems it faced. The main difference could be identified as the level and directness of criticism which was levelled at the league. The strongest responses used contextual knowledge of the San Francisco conference to discuss the problems and issues which faced the great powers at the time.

3(b) 'At the time of its formation, it was believed that the United Nations would be a success.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?

This question required consideration of what 'success' might look like at the time of its formation and the relevant discussion surrounding this. Within this context, Sources B and C clearly supported the assertion by showing ways in which the UN was likely to succeed and how it was inherently different to the League of Nations. Sources A and D were more subtle but could generally be used to suggest that the UN was likely to face many of the same issues which had beset the League although many responses also noted a sense of positivity (albeit cautious) in both sources. There were many strong responses which were able to use all the sources to test the assertion with some useful contextual knowledge. The strongest of these responses were those which were able to take these ideas and place the sources within a contextual framework, allowing them to be tested against their nature, origin and purpose. These responses often produced interesting, and thoughtful, answers to the question rather than deciding purely based on their own perceptions of the UN.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/21
Outline Study

Key messages

- In **Part (a)** questions, candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a range of factors to show how they interacted and reaching a judgement regarding their relative significance.
- In **Part (b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.
- Some candidates write almost as much for **Part (a)** as for **Part (b)** despite **Part (b)** being worth twice as many marks. Being aware of the mark allocation is encouraged to help apportion time effectively and ensure every selected question can be finished.

General comments

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

Part (a) questions are about causation. Answers which were effective showed detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. Causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of a number of factors, both long and short-term. Responses were most effective when they 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. The identification and explanation of some relevant causal factors was made by most candidates, but less successful answers tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. The weaker responses were characterised by 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.

In **Part (b)** the awareness that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways was a characteristic of good answers. To be valid, an interpretation 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. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Less successful responses fell into one of two categories – relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth; narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question. 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 time frames given in the question).



Comments on specific questions

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

Question 1: France, 1789–1814

(a) Why were so many reforms passed by the Legislative Assembly in 1791 and 1792?

Successful responses focused on the Legislative Assembly showing understanding of causes, such as the need to deal with unresolved issues (e.g. non-juring clergy), the king's attitude and the impact of war. Less successful responses did not distinguish between the work of the Legislative Assembly and that of the National (Constituent) Assembly. Thus, there were references to the need to abolish feudalism, rein in absolutism and promote new freedoms.

(b) 'He was a successful and popular general.' To what extent does this explain why Napoleon was able to retain power?

A common feature of responses was to set up an obvious contrast; ways that Napoleon's success and popularity as a general helped him retain power set against other factors which helped him retain power. There were some good responses seen from many candidates who took this approach, showing a sound depth of knowledge and understanding of key developments such as Napoleon's Italian campaign, victories at Austerlitz and Jena, the Concordat with the Papacy, the Napoleonic Code and his use of propaganda and censorship. Answers that were less successful provided a narrative of events or lost the question's focus and cited examples of Napoleon's lack of popularity.

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

(a) Why was there a move towards freer trade in the nineteenth century?

Good responses grasped the concept of 'free trade' and placed it within the context, for example, of the laissez-faire approach adopted by British governments, the abandonment of tariffs in order to promote more trade and, thereby, increase profits. Weaker responses highlighted ways trade became quicker through developments in transport.

(b) How significant were agricultural changes as a cause of the Industrial Revolution? Refer to any two countries from Britain, France or Germany in your answer.

Successful responses assessed how agricultural changes contributed to the creation of the Industrial Revolution against the roles played by, for example, changes in transport, availability of funds for investment and technological developments. Such responses focused on the effects these agricultural changes produced in terms of availability of food, the creation of a growing population and the resultant increase in demand for goods and an available industrial workforce, released from agricultural responsibilities. Responses which were less successful highlighted various agricultural changes without really addressing the issue of how these helped to 'cause the Industrial Revolution.'

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

(a) Why was the German 'Blank Cheque' to Austria an important cause of the First World War?

Some excellent responses were seen, providing explanations of how the 'Blank Cheque' emboldened Austria-Hungary to be aggressive in its approach to Serbia and send the ultimatum, which led to its rejection by Serbia, leading to Russia's mobilisation and Germany, then, enacting the Schlieffen Plan. Other responses could have been improved by avoiding lengthy narratives of the origins of the events of 28 June 1914 in Sarajevo or seeing what followed the assassination as an inevitable unfolding of the alliance system. Less focused responses looked at other causes of the First World War.

(b) To what extent did the Great Powers have different reasons for joining alliances and ententes before the First World War?

A number of candidates were able to provide a fully focused and balanced response, leading to well-reasoned judgements supported by appropriate factual evidence. Some less focused responses ignored the fact that the question was about the reasons Great Powers joined alliances and ententes before the First World War and, instead, focused on why the Great Powers went to war in 1914. Often, this was further compounded by seeing Serbia as a Great Power.

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

(a) Why did the decision to continue fighting in the First World War in 1917 damage the Provisional Government?

Good responses provided a very thorough explanation of the reasons why the decision to continue fighting in the First World War damaged the Provisional Government. The making of a comparative judgement which is required to reach the highest level of the mark scheme would have further improved such answers. Weaker responses sometimes got confused about the chronology of events in 1917 and a few wrote why the war brought about the fall of the Tsarist regime and, thus, missed the focus of the question.

(b) How successfully did the Tsarist regime deal with opposition between 1900 and 1914?

The most successful responses demonstrated good knowledge and understanding of the opposition which faced the Tsarist regime throughout the given timeframe, together with detailed analysis of the extent to which this opposition was dealt with 'successfully'. This involved focused consideration, for example, of issues such as army loyalty, Stolypin's reforms and methods, divisions within the various political groups etc. This was set against ways the regime was not successful, such as the outbreak of violence and political chaos after 'Bloody Sunday' and the lack of improvement to social and economic conditions creating disorder and strikes in the years immediately prior to 1914. Less successful responses were commonly restricted to narrative accounts of the events of 1905 and the period after Russia's entry into the First World War. Some responses drifted into irrelevance by describing the impact of the Tsar's decision to take personal control of the army during the First World War, in particular the problems created by the Tsarina and Rasputin.

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 support the independence of Cuba in the later 1890s?

Successful responses grasped that the focus of the question was support for the independence of Cuba and not why the USA went to war with Spain. There was good knowledge and understanding shown in the references, for example, to such support being part of McKinley's election platform in 1896, the expectation that such support would provide a fillip to US business interests on the island and the sense of a shared colonial background in struggling against a European master. Less successful responses provided a narrative account of why the USA went to war in 1898.

(b) 'US participation in the First World War was a turning point in its relations with Europe.' How far do you agree?

Effective responses appreciated that the USA's participation in the First World War was a turning point in its relations with Europe whilst assessing, also, the extent to which this view could be challenged. Thus, the fact that this was the first time the USA participated, alongside allies, in a foreign war was set against the USA's commitment to retaining a separate military command from France and Britain. In addition, the USA's role in the Versailles Treaty was analysed alongside its isolationist stance after Wilson's presidency. Weaker responses focused on why the USA entered the War in 1917 and ignored US actions after the War.

Question 6: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–1877

(a) Why did Reconstruction plans change so frequently in the period 1863–77?

Good responses displayed clear knowledge and understanding of why the differing aims and ambitions of the various Presidential and Congressional plans led to Reconstruction changing frequently in the timeframe period. Responses which were less successful focused on the South's reaction to Reconstruction without linking it to why this led to changes in Reconstruction plans.

(b) 'The US navy made a vital contribution to the military victory of the North.' How far do you agree?

There were some very thoughtful responses to this question. For example, how the US naval blockade weakened the Confederacy's economy and, thereby, its war effort, but acknowledging the success of blockade runners. In addition, it was noted that the US navy played an important role in the capture of cities such as New Orleans. A balanced assessment was made through an analysis of other factors contributing to the USA's victory (e.g. superiority in men and material/Emancipation Proclamation/Gettysburg and Vicksburg/Grant's military ability). Weaker responses described the blockade but did not link it to any assessment of the extent it contributed to the USA's victory.

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

(a) Why did the US economy grow so rapidly in the 1870s and 1880s?

Most candidates demonstrated good knowledge and understanding of the roles played by technological innovation, immigration and the opening up of the country through the creation of trans-continental railways in the growth of the US economy in this period. Responses that were less successful described the Gilded Age.

(b) How significant a feature of the Progressive Movement was the demand for Prohibition?

Effective responses were able to place the demand for Prohibition in the context of the aims of the Progressive Movement and assess its significance against, for example, the demands for an improvement in social conditions and political accountability. Weaker responses described Prohibition and its impact without relating it to Progressivism.

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

(a) Why did the National Industry Recovery Act (NIRA) cause so much opposition?

Most candidates were able to identify and explain at least one relevant factor, for example, the NIRA's oversight of business was regarded as an assault on the principles of American capitalism. Stronger responses identified and explained several other factors, such as a fear that the NIRA was undermining the US political system through adopting corporatist ideas from Europe and giving too much oversight to the Executive branch of government. Less successful responses described the role of the NIRA.

(b) 'Franklin Roosevelt achieved his goal of putting the American people back to work.' How far do you agree?

Successful responses were analytical throughout, and supported by appropriately selected factual evidence. These responses developed fully focused arguments, often looking at regional, racial and gender aspects, and reached well-reasoned conclusions. Less successful responses were more narrative in approach; Roosevelt's New Deal policies were described, often in considerable detail, with only limited reference to their effectiveness in 'putting American people back to work', usually confined to rather assertive statements in conclusions.

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

Question 9: International Relations, 1871–1918

(a) Why did German foreign policy change after 1890?

Responses which were effective showed good knowledge and understanding of events post-1890 and could identify and explain, in detail, several reasons why German foreign policy changed in this period. For example, the more confrontational approach adopted by the Kaiser, who directed policy after Bismarck stood down; the change in emphasis from European security to *Weltpolitik*; the consequences of allowing the Reinsurance Treaty to lapse and the desire to achieve naval parity with Britain. Less successful responses described, often at length, Bismarck's actions prior to 1890.

(b) 'Imperial rivalry in Africa posed a significant threat to peace in Europe.' How far do you agree?

Good responses were characterised by the development of fully-focused and balanced arguments, leading to well-reasoned judgements supported by appropriate factual evidence. Thus, there was well informed comment on key issues such as the Treaty of Berlin, Fashoda, the Boer War and the Moroccan Crises. Some of these responses also sought to broaden their counter arguments to assess the extent to which, for example, German offensive measures such as the naval race and /or the Balkan issues posed threats to peace in Europe. Weaker responses described the process of European control of Africa.

Question 10: International Relations, 1919–1933

(a) Why did the signing of the Locarno Treaties bring reassurance to the French people?

Effective responses identified and explained reasons why the treaties provided reassurance to the French people (e.g. the acceptance of borders by Germany, France and Belgium as set out in the Treaty of Versailles/the commitment to these borders by Britain and Italy). Less successful responses focused on why the French people felt insecure. Weaker responses confused the Locarno Treaties with the Dawes and Young Plans.

(b) 'A peace with no trace of justice.' How far do you agree with this assessment of the Treaty of Versailles?

Most candidates were able to identify appropriate evidence in support of the statement. This was then assessed against ways in which the statement could be challenged (e.g. Germany's harsh terms for Russia in the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk/reparations were vital for France to help restore its infrastructure, destroyed by fighting and German occupation). Responses which were less successful provided lengthy descriptions of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles or set out the aims of Wilson, Lloyd-George and Clemenceau without relating it to 'no trace of justice'.

Question 11: International Relations, 1933–1939

(a) Why, in 1939, did Hitler go against the advice of his generals by ordering the invasion of Poland?

Some excellent responses were seen, with many candidates identifying and explaining reasons why Hitler ignored his generals over Poland in 1939. Answers were well informed in explaining how the British and French policy of appeasement, the fixation with *Lebensraum* and the Nazi-Soviet Pact led Hitler to 'go against the advice of his generals'. The making of a comparative judgement, which is required to reach the highest level of the mark scheme, would have further improved such responses. Less successful responses described incidents from appeasement (e.g. the re-militarisation of the Rhineland/the Sudetenland).

- (b) **How far do you agree with the view that the causes of the Spanish Civil War were economic rather than political?**

Good responses gave equal consideration to economic and political issues and demonstrated that the economic issues simply fed the existing political divisions, which to some extent were also dependent on underlying social conflict. Weaker responses lost the question's focus and wrote narrative accounts of why Hitler, Mussolini and Stalin became involved in the fighting in the Spanish Civil War.

Question 12: China and Japan, 1919–1945

- (a) **Why, in 1926, did the Kuomintang embark upon the Northern Expedition?**

There were too few responses to make comment appropriate.

- (b) **Assess the reasons for Japan's involvement in the Second World War.**

There were too few responses to make comment appropriate.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/22
Outline Study

Key messages

- In **Part (a)** questions, candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a range of factors to show how they interacted and reaching a judgement regarding their relative significance.
- In **Part (b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.
- Some candidates write almost as much for **Part (a)** as for **Part (b)** despite **Part (b)** being worth twice as many marks. Being aware of the mark allocation is encouraged to help apportion time effectively and ensure every selected question can be finished.

General comments

The majority of candidates answered questions from **Section A** with **Questions 1, 3 and 4** being equally popular. Many candidates were able to demonstrate a good grasp of basic detail and were able to write appropriately about the events they had studied. There was a significant difference between those who were simply able to relate information about the topics they had studied and those who were able to relate specific details to the questions that they were attempting to answer.

The majority of candidates try to write longer answers to **Part (b)** questions but there are still a significant number who seem to get the balance of detail between the two types of question confused. On **Part (a)** questions, strong candidates are able to offer several relevant factors in writing about the topic. In these responses more judgement about which is the most important factor and how the other factors link to it is to be encouraged.

On **Part (b)** questions many candidates are able to offer alternative explanations, but few seem willing to commit themselves to a reasoned choice about which argument they think is stronger. Weaker responses tended to try and write down anything that might be relevant and in doing this lost sight of the question being asked.

Comments on specific questions

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

Question 1 France, 1789–1814

(a) Why was there no successful counter-revolution in France between 1789 and 1799?

Good responses covered the whole period including the failure of the king in the early years, the strength of Republicanism and the effects of the reign of Terror and the success of the Directory in suppressing the counter-revolutionaries. Weaker responses did not make use of the opportunity to assess the failure of counter-revolutionaries across the whole period and often stopped with the execution of the king. A minority of responses discussed the Estates General and the causes of the Revolution with limited understanding of what the question was asking for.

(b) How far had the ideals of 'liberty equality and fraternity' been established in France by the end of 1792?



Stronger responses often began with a clear introduction which set out suggestions about changes that had contributed to improvements in equality and a counter argument about how far inequalities remained. For example *'...the power of the king had been reduced and an elected assembly now had power. Unfair taxes and the feudal system had been ended but it was mainly the middle class who had gained and the peasants and workers still lived in poverty'*. Weaker responses struggled with how changes in liberty, equality and fraternity might be measured and were often a narrative account about the Revolution, concentrating on the early events like the meeting of the Estate General and the Fall of the Bastille.

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

- (a) **Why did railways develop so rapidly?**
- (b) **Assess the reasons why industrialisation brought about so much political change. Refer to any two countries from Britain, France or Germany in your answer.**

There were too few responses to make comment appropriate.

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

- (a) **Why did Germany see it as essential to invade Belgium in 1914?**

There were many good responses that offered several reasons for Germany's actions. The Schlieffen Plan was well understood and the need to avoid a war on two fronts was central to many successful responses. Stronger candidates were fully aware of the strategic significance of Belgium and the advantages for Germany in avoiding the strong defences further south on the Franco-German border, plus the element of surprise, and some even mentioned the possibility of cutting the French off from possible support from Britain. Some weaker responses struggled with the geographical features of the question, particularly the location of Belgium and the importance this might have had for Germany's decision. A minority of weaker responses got confused about the role of Britain, explaining the invasion of Belgium as a way of getting Britain involved in the war.

- (b) **Assess the view that events in the Balkans did not cause the First World War.**

Strong responses were able to demonstrate how the underlying problems in the Balkans culminated in the assassination of Franz Ferdinand which triggered the war, before assessing the importance of these against other causal factors like the ambitions of Germany and the imperialist conflicts that preceded the First World War, e.g. *'...in conclusion the Balkans did play a role because of the effects of Balkan nationalism on Great Power rivalry, which was a short term cause of war, but in the long run factors such as Great Power nationalism and the alliance system were vital in influencing the decisions that led to World War One.'* Weaker responses provided substantial detail of the conflicts in the Balkans in the early 20th century but struggled to establish a link to the question.

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

- (a) **Why did the Provisional Government face so much opposition?**

Strong responses were able to provide a detailed analysis of the problems that faced the Provisional Government and draw reasonable conclusions, e.g. *'...the main reason was the continuation of the war which went against public opinion ... this was aggravated by the land question and the rise of opposition from the Bolsheviks with Lenin's slogan 'peace bread and land' being increasingly popular.'* A minority of weaker responses failed to separate the failure of the PG from the fall of the Tsar and some wrote about the overthrow of the Provisional Government rather than its lack of popularity.

- (b) **'The social and economic policies of the Tsarist Government between 1905 and 1914 brought few benefits to the Russian people.' How far do you agree?**

There were several good responses to this question but many were not restricted to the 'economic and social policies' and included political developments following the 1905 Revolution such as the October Manifesto and role of the Dumas. These features were not relevant to the question focus

and stronger responses looked at the work of Stolypin and at the failings of the regime to satisfy the demands for improved conditions for workers and peasants. The strongest responses focused only on these elements. A minority of weaker responses focused generally on the 1905 Revolution and some went beyond the timeframe to 1917.

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

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

- (a) **Why did President Wilson order US troops to intervene in Mexico in 1914–16?**
- (b) **How isolationist was US policy towards Europe in the 1920s?**

There were too few responses to make comment appropriate.

Question 6: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–1877

- (a) **Why, in 1869–70, was the 15th Amendment to the constitution passed?**
- (b) **‘Cautious in both its political aims and its military strategy.’ How accurately does this describe the leadership of the North in 1861–2?**

There were too few responses to make comment appropriate.

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

- (a) **Why in the period did the US economy fluctuate between periods of crisis and times of rapid growth?**
- (b) **'In practice little could be done to limit the power of party bosses.' How far do you agree?**

There were too few responses to make comment appropriate.

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

- (a) **Why were the 1920s such hard times for US farmers?**
- (b) **How far did the New Deal change the relationship between the citizen and the state?**

There were too few responses to make comment appropriate.

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

Question 9: International Relations, 1871–1918

- (a) **Why did Kaiser Wilhelm II's telegram to Paul Kruger in January 1896 cause resentment in Britain?**

The strongest responses focused on the telegram and its impact on Britain explaining that it raised fears of German intervention in supporting the Boers. They were able to set the telegram in a wider context of growing mistrust of German imperialist ambitions and also of the rising significance of public opinion and the expression of nationalistic sentiments. Weaker responses produced accounts of the Boer Wars, the discovery of extensive mineral reserves, including diamonds, in the Transvaal, and the failure of the Jameson Raid but did not address the response to the Kruger Telegram.

- (b) **'While it was intended to preserve peace the Alliance System greatly increased the prospect of war.' How far do you agree?**

Stronger responses explained the defensive aspects of the alliances and were aware of the motives of each of the countries in forming the alliances that they did. These responses also linked the alliance system to the more confrontational policies of militarisation and imperialism and a few very good responses were able to draw reasoned conclusions about the balance between preserving peace and promoting war. Weaker responses often just wrote about alliances as one aspect of the causes of the First World War and then wrote about other factors.

Question 10: International Relations, 1919–1933

- (a) **Why were many of the 'successor states' politically unstable during the 1920's?**

Responses that understood the term 'successor states' were generally clear and contained appropriate examples about the problems of these states, for example demonstrating how the number of nationalities in Poland generated so many political parties that in the end dictatorship was established by General Pilsudski in 1926. The strongest responses were able to relate all the problems to the artificiality of the border created under the guidance of Wilson's 14 points. Weaker responses did not demonstrate knowledge of what 'successor states' meant and focussed instead on problems in any European country following the end of the war including Britain, France and Germany.

- (b) **How isolationist was the USA foreign policy during the 1920's?**

This produced some good responses with clear explanation of the motives that prompted active intervention in foreign affairs (largely economic) and the actions and intentions that kept the US isolated from events overseas (largely political). There was understanding that in the aftermath of World War One many Americans felt that they should not be involved any further in European affairs which led to conflict and this was reflected in the congressional rejection of the Versailles settlement. Strong responses identified these choices with the Republican policies of the

presidents of the 1920s. At the same time there was recognition that the US was involved because of the debt owed to it by European countries and hence had to intervene in the reparations issues, and that international trade was still a factor in overseas involvement. Most responses produced relevant detail but weaker ones were restricted to narrative with little analysis of motive.

Question 11: International Relations, c.1933–1939

- (a) **Why did Mussolini adopt a diplomatic approach to foreign policy in the period from 1923 to 1934?**

Most responses demonstrated some knowledge of Mussolini's foreign policy in the period and focussed on key events like the Corfu crisis, though some failed to note the time limit and went on to the invasion of Abyssinia. There was also a general understanding of his basic aim being to 'make Italy great' and his ambition to achieve a '*Mare Nostrum*' in the Mediterranean. Reference to all these elements was common to most responses but weaker ones went no further than simple description with limited reference to the question. Stronger responses were aware of, and made reference to, the relatively weak position of Italy and its isolation as the only Fascist state in Europe and used these to explain Italy's involvement in the major diplomatic moves of the 1920s in a bid to establish a good reputation both at home and abroad.

- (b) **'Hitler and Mussolini supported Franco in the Spanish Civil War primarily because they wanted to establish a third Fascist state in Europe.' How far do you agree?**

Most responses were heavily weighted on the 'disagree' side of the argument as it is much easier to provide relevant detail to support the argument that the two leaders were only involved out of self-interest and most responses pointed out Hitler's role in initiating the conflict by providing transport for Franco and the role of the Condor legion as well as supplying arms (but at a price that reflected his basic self-interest). There was less confident explanation of the role of Mussolini. On the opposite side there was some general argument about the benefits of having a Fascist state on the southern borders of France and also a few responses were aware of the support for another anti-communist regime but the support side of the argument was generally brief and lacked development even in the stronger responses.

Question 12: China and Japan, 1919–1945

- (a) **Why did Japanese forces take full control of Manchuria in 1931–32?**
- (b) **Compare and contrast Sun Yat-sen and Chiang Kai-shek as leaders of the Koumintang.**

There were too few responses to make comment appropriate.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/23
Outline Study

Key messages

- In **Part (a)** questions, candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a range of factors to show how they interacted and reaching a judgement regarding their relative significance.
- In **Part (b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.
- Some candidates write almost as much for **Part (a)** as for **Part (b)** despite **Part (b)** being worth twice as many marks. Being aware of the mark allocation is encouraged to help apportion time effectively and ensure every selected question can be finished.

General comments

The majority of candidates answered questions from **section A** with **Questions 1, 3 and 4** being equally popular. Many candidates were able to demonstrate a good grasp of basic detail and were able to write relevantly about the events they had studied. There was a significant difference between those who were simply able to relate information about the topics they had studied and those who were able to relate specific details to the questions that they were attempting to answer.

The majority of candidates try to write longer answers to **Part (b)** questions but there are still a significant number who seem to get the balance of detail between the two types of question confused. On **Part (a)** questions strong candidates are able to offer several relevant factors in writing about the topic. In these responses more judgement about which is the most important factor and how the other factors link to it is to be encouraged.

On **Part (b)** questions many candidates are able to offer alternative explanations, but few seem willing to commit themselves to a reasoned choice about which argument they think is stronger. Weaker responses tended to try and write down anything that might be relevant and in doing this lost sight of the question being asked.

Comments of specific questions

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

Question 1: France, 1789–1814

(a) Why was the Brumaire coup d'état successful?

The context was well understood by the majority of candidates who produced well supported reasons linked to the failure and unpopularity of the Directory and the popularity of Napoleon. General statements were supported by specific details of a government weakened by opposition from Jacobins and Royalists, the financial instability and the overseas victories of Napoleon, coupled with the subversive intentions of Sieyès, to produce a convincing explanation of the success of Napoleon in 1799. Some of the weaker responses discussed 'success' in terms of what Napoleon achieved after he took control.

(b) To what extent was French government and society reformed by the end of 1791?

Weaker responses often contained substantial detail of the meetings of the Estates General, the problems of voting, the Tennis court Oath and the Storming of the Bastille but then did not develop these points with explanation of what had changed by 1791 and what had stayed the same. Strong responses showed a good understanding of the measures introduced by the National Assembly and were able to demonstrate how the government had been transformed into a constitutional monarchy by the end of 1791. These responses were also able to discuss how that change was limited, especially for those lower down the social scale, along with growing opposition from supporters of the king, resistance from the King himself and growing support for the King from abroad which threatened the reforms already achieved.

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

(a) Why were there major developments in the iron and steel industries?

(b) ‘Changes in transport and communications were the result of industrialisation rather than a cause.’ How far do you agree? Refer to any two countries from Britain, France or Germany in your answer.

There were very few responses so meaningful comment is not possible.

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

(a) Why did the Sarajevo assassinations lead to war between Austria and Serbia?

There was some good understanding of the issues in all responses but weaker ones did tend to provide lengthy narrative about the Balkan Wars rather than a brief background summary. These also gave lots of detail of the assassination but were not so effective at making the links between the assassination and the outbreak of war which were central to the question. Stronger responses went through the steps from assassination to war with careful explanation. At the higher end there were attempts to identify the key factor, the influence of Germany often being cited as having particular importance in Austrian decision making.

(b) ‘The Great Powers has very different war aims in 1914.’ How far do you agree?

The majority of candidates wrote individually about each of the major powers and some also included Serbia, Italy, which was not involved initially. The general argument in these responses was that all the Powers had slightly different reasons for getting involved in the War. A few stronger responses did try to identify similarities, usually along the lines of offensive vs. defensive or on the grounds of imperialistic or nationalistic pressures, but there were few really strong answers to this question despite it being the most popular one.

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

(a) Why was Rasputin murdered?

Most responses were able to provide some sound reasoning as to why Rasputin was unpopular mainly focusing around the discredit he brought to the royal family. Strong responses were more specific in their focus on the role of the group of nobles who carried out the act the murder and the worries of the nobility for the position of the Tsar (and themselves) – weaker responses tended to just write about ‘the people’ not liking Rasputin, but most of ‘the people’ would not have known anything about him. There were some very good responses to this question offering balanced views of several factors like his general behaviour, his relationship with Alexandra, the growing general unpopularity of the regime whilst the Tsar was away at the front line.

(b) Assess the view that the Tsar was able to strengthen his regime between 1905 and 1914.

Most responses established a balance sheet of success and failure. In weaker responses this was often a narrative of the way in which each factor strengthened the Tsar with a quite weak consideration of weaknesses- or vice versa. Stronger responses were able to point to the reforms, following the 1905 Revolution, in political institutions, in agriculture and in the army, as ways in which the regime tried to improve its appeal while also noting the oppressive measures like Stolypin's necktie that were used. The strongest responses managed a balanced account and included some attempt at a reasoned conclusion.

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 US government order its naval force known as 'the Great White Fleet' to circumnavigate the globe in 1907–09?

This was not a popular question. Most responses identified the decision to move the fleet as a mainly promotional move to show that the US was now a force to be reckoned with in the world, though few candidates linked it to the acquisition of a Pacific empire from the Spanish-American wars of the previous century. Lack of detail was the main difference between the weak and the stronger responses.

(b) Assess the impact of the Indian Wars on the expansion of the USA in North America during the nineteenth century.

There were few responses to this question and of these the majority were narrative and quite limited in detail and range of factors. Often responses were simply descriptive of the Indian wars sometimes with a limited reference to Manifest Destiny, and on the whole the conclusion was that the Indian Wars had played a significant part in the expansion of the USA. There was little indication of different ways in which the Indian Wars might have influenced the expansion westwards and as a result many responses lacked direction.

Question 6: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–1877

(a) Why, in the Civil War, despite inferior resources, was the South able to resist the North for so long?

This was a question that was generally well done by most candidates who were able to identify several advantages that the South possessed at the beginning of the Civil War. These usually centred around a listing and explanation of the factors that included better Generals, and a President who was experienced in warfare. Added to this were a more committed population and divisions in the North. A few stronger responses incorporated the idea that actually the South resisted so long because that was all it had to do – it did not need to win the war, it just had to try not to lose it.

(b) The three constitutional amendments of 1865–70 were a revolution in the American system of government.' How far do you agree?

Weaker responses were limited by a lack of awareness of who was responsible for each of the changes, what the amendments actually did and how they affected the slave and former slave populations of the United States. There were some strong responses which approached the question from the perspective of legal versus practical changes and highlighted the mismatch between what the amendments said and what this actually meant for most African-Americans in the short run. These included details of the initial changes and the factors that limited their application and provided very effective analysis.

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

- (a) **Why were party bosses in the cities so powerful?**
- (b) **How far, by the early twentieth century, had the Progressives limited the excesses of the Gilded Age?**

Very few responses so meaningful comment is not possible.

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

- (a) **Why was there widespread opposition to the National Labour Relations Act of 1935?**

Success on this question depended on understanding of the Labour Relations Act and responses which demonstrated such knowledge were quite successful. Weaker responses discussed general opposition to Roosevelt from the Left and Right wings and tried to focus it on 'workers'. Stronger responses recognised that the opposition was largely from the employers who saw their strong bargaining position being undermined by this Act.

- (b) **How far did President Hoover depart from traditional economic policies in order to revive the US economy?**

Stronger responses discussed the arguments that Hoover did nothing or that he did try, within the limits of his own perception of the situation, to do quite a lot to alleviate the effects of the depression but was hamstrung by his basic belief that the economy would 'sort itself out in the end'. Weaker responses had limited knowledge of anything that Hoover did and tended to make a comparison of Hoover with Roosevelt that emphasised the limitations of Hoover's efforts in comparison to Roosevelt.

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

Question 9: International Relations, 1871–1918

- (a) **Why were the European powers able to avoid war over the 'scramble for Africa'?**
- (b) **How far had the USA departed from its policy of isolationism by 1914?**

Very few responses so meaningful comment is not possible.

Question 10: International Relations, 1919–1933

- (a) **Why, in 1921–22, did the Washington Naval Conference take place?**

Responses to this question were well considered and provided a range of good reasons for the calling of this international conference. A few weaker responses said little about reasons and spent time describing the different treaties that emerged from the conferences rather than explaining the reasons for them. Stronger responses were able to highlight issues, including difficulties between the US and Japan in particular, that were central to the discussions at this conference including size of their respective fleets and the nature of their trading relationship with China.

- (b) **'A foolish action, from which France gained nothing.' How far do you agree with this assessment of the French occupation of the Ruhr?**

Some response struggled with the concept of 'foolish action' on the part of a country but most provided some insights into what happened in the Ruhr in January 1923. Strong responses began from the weaknesses of the Versailles settlement with regard to the issue of reparations and explored the French attitude towards, and basic mistrust of, Germany. In this context they then considered whether the action was foolish because it stopped reparations completely and won universal criticism from otherwise friendly countries or whether, on the other hand, it had positive consequences in that it led to the Dawes Plan, the Locarno Pact and a thawing of Franco-German relations under the leadership of Aristide Briand and Gustav Stresemann. A few strong responses explored these possibilities in detail and reached reasoned conclusions.

Question 11: International Relations, c.1933–1939

- (a) **Why did the British government’s opinions about Hitler’s intentions change between September 1938 and March 1939?**

The strongest responses discussed the Munich agreement understanding that it was hailed by Chamberlain as, 'Peace for our time!' and looked at events from then to the end of March that eroded this confidence. This approach tended to focus on the events of March with the invasion of what remained of Czechoslovakia and the signing of the Anglo-French Treaty with Poland. Some responses did comment on the increased preparations for war in Britain during the winter of 1938/9 and the growing voices of concern about Germany, notably that of Churchill. Weaker responses focussed on the Nazi Soviet Pact and the invasion of Poland.

- (b) **In 1934 Mussolini described Hitler as ‘that mad little clown’. Analyse the reasons why Mussolini subsequently became Hitler’s closest ally.**

The most successful responses were built around the events of 1934/5 and very much relied on the 'before and after' model. Before 1934 Mussolini had spent over a decade building up relations with the Western Allies from the Locarno Pact to the Stresa front, including acting to block Hitler's attempted Anschluss with Austria in 1934 after the assassination of Dolfuss. In return for this he expected support in his plans for Abyssinia and was angered by the Anglo-French response. He was also increasingly impressed by Hitler's confrontational actions in re-armament and leaving the League. By analysing these events and actions the best responses were able to reach reasoned conclusions about the reasons for Mussolini's change of strategy in trying to build up Italian 'greatness'.

Question 12: China and Japan, 1919–1945

- (a) **Why did Japan feel it essential to attack Pearl Harbor?**
- (b) **'In the period from 1925 to 1937, the Kuomintang lost more than it gained under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek.' How far do you agree?**

Very few responses so meaningful comment is not possible.

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- Candidates are reminded that the task is to make inferences about the historian, and then, using the extract, to explain how these inferences have been made. Therefore, candidates should avoid writing out or paraphrasing the extract.
- Before starting their answer, candidates should spend time reading and thinking about the extract, making notes on what they think are the central points of the interpretation, and how the extract can be used to illustrate these.
- Candidates are advised to work on the extract as a whole, rather than on little parts of it. The historian's interpretation will be valid for the whole extract; different paragraphs will not have different interpretations.
- It is important that candidates keep their answer focused on answering the question. They should not spend time writing lengthy paragraphs about the context, or paraphrasing parts of the extract as this is not needed in their explanation of the interpretation.

General comments

The most successful answers identified and explained the historian's interpretation in the extract. Successful comprehension of the extract is in part determined by the candidate's knowledge of the historiography and the historical context, as well as their awareness of examination technique. Candidates also need an understanding of how historians work, and the nature and status of claims they make. It is important to be aware of the fact that academic historians write on the basis of a consideration of the whole of the available evidence. The incompleteness of the evidence is the fundamental cause of the variety of interpretations of the same events, but these interpretations would not be historical if there was no reasoned consideration of the evidence on which to base them. Many otherwise good answers were undermined by attempts to evaluate the historian's conclusions, generally on the grounds that they did not consider something or omitted to use certain evidence.

Successful responses showed understanding of the interpretation by identifying and illustrating from the extract all the important elements of the interpretation. Less successful answers used the extract to illustrate what they saw as the interpretation, but there were some errors or inconsistencies in the argument. Some of these responses detected elements of the main interpretation, but undermined this valid material with other, contradictory arguments. This mainly occurred by not treating the extract as a whole and the consequent assertion that the extract contains multiple, usually contradictory, interpretations. Therefore, candidates should avoid working through the extract paragraph by paragraph and ascribing to each paragraph different interpretations.

Many candidates included references to specific historians in their answers, which, when appropriate, can be a useful way of throwing additional light on the historian's interpretation. For this to be successful, candidates must first have properly understood the extract itself, and second must understand the views of the historian to whom they are referring. Many candidates seemed to have had difficulties with this approach.

Comments on specific questions

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that the main factor underpinning British imperialism was economic power, but that before the 1890s this produced an 'unofficial empire' rather than a formal one. There were very few candidates taking this topic, and answers in general took aspects of the extract and used them as prompts on which to write in generalised terms about empire. Most answers tended only to detect sub-messages from the extract, rather than engaging with the historian's overall interpretation.

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that Hitler ordered the extermination of the Jews, and thus bears prime responsibility. The striking feature of this interpretation is the historian's belief in the existence of a 'Führer Order'. The most successful answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. The way the extract relates the passing of the Führer Order in stages to many different recipients led some candidates to infer that the interpretation was about the recipients (rather than the Order), thus producing incorrect inferences about the historian's approach being structuralist. Though the extract mentioned aspects of the structure of the Nazi state, this did not mean that its explanation of Holocaust causation was structuralist. Likewise, mentions of the war in the extract produced arguments that the approach was functionalist, but the historian did not argue that the Holocaust was caused by the circumstances of war. Central to the extract was the argument that all that happened was consequent upon Hitler ordering it and therefore if a historiographical 'label' was to be used, only intentionalism fitted the extract as a whole. Weaker answers paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that the Cold War was caused primarily by real strategic issues rather than ideology, while accepting that ideology was nonetheless important. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Few candidates fully explained the argument the historian was putting forward about the relative importance of ideology. The extract stated that ideology was not what determined the policies of the USA and the USSR, but most answers argued that ideology was indeed the cause of the Cold War and that real strategic questions were too. This basic misunderstanding did not, though, affect the broader conclusion that the historian was ascribing blame to both sides, and was therefore adopting a post-revisionist approach. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/32
Interpretations Question

Key messages

- Candidates are reminded that the task is to make inferences about the historian, and then, using the extract, to explain how these inferences have been made. Therefore, candidates should avoid writing out or paraphrasing the extract.
- Before starting their answer, candidates should spend time reading and thinking about the extract, making notes on what they think are the central points of the interpretation, and how the extract can be used to illustrate these.
- Candidates are advised to work on the extract as a whole, rather than on little parts of it. The historian's interpretation will be valid for the whole extract; different paragraphs will not have different interpretations.
- It is important that candidates keep their answer focused on answering the question. They should not spend time writing lengthy paragraphs about the context, or paraphrasing parts of the extract as this is not needed in their explanation of the interpretation.

General comments

The most successful answers identified and explained the historian's interpretation in the extract. Successful comprehension of the extract is in part determined by the candidate's knowledge of the historiography and the historical context, as well as their awareness of examination technique. Candidates also need an understanding of how historians work, and the nature and status of claims they make. It is important to be aware of the fact that academic historians write on the basis of a consideration of the whole of the available evidence. The incompleteness of the evidence is the fundamental cause of the variety of interpretations of the same events, but these interpretations would not be historical if there was no reasoned consideration of the evidence on which to base them. Many otherwise good answers were undermined by attempts to evaluate the historian's conclusions, generally on the grounds that they did not consider something or omitted to use certain evidence.

Successful responses showed understanding of the interpretation by identifying and illustrating from the extract all the important elements of the interpretation. Less successful answers used the extract to illustrate what they saw as the interpretation, but there were some errors or inconsistencies in the argument. Some of these responses detected elements of the main interpretation, but undermined this valid material with other, contradictory arguments. This mainly occurred by not treating the extract as a whole and the consequent assertion that the extract contains multiple, usually contradictory, interpretations. Therefore, candidates should avoid working through the extract paragraph by paragraph and ascribing to each paragraph different interpretations.

Many candidates included references to specific historians in their answers, which, when appropriate, can be a useful way of throwing additional light on the historian's interpretation. For this to be successful, candidates must first have properly understood the extract itself, and second must understand the views of the historian to whom they are referring. Many candidates seemed to have had difficulties with this approach.

Comments on specific questions

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

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

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that Hitler's anti-Semitic ideas were potentially genocidal from the start of his career, and that once in power his policies were genocidal in intent. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. At the highest level candidates were able to make the point about the continuity of Hitler's genocidal ideas up to 1939. Some candidates treated the extract as if it were simply about Hitler's anti-Semitism, which was insufficient. Whilst the extract was undoubtedly about anti-Semitism, it was making a specific point about the nature of the threat to the Jews posed by Hitler and the Nazis. Where candidates used a historiographical 'label', this was almost always intentionalism. Indeed, nothing else would make any sense. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that the unstable international situation in 1945 made conflict almost certain, but the particular nature of the Cold War was determined by the competing interests and ideologies of the USA and the USSR. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. In practice, candidates were much more comfortable explaining the competitive conflict between the superpowers than the more theoretical argument about the inherent instability of international political systems. They were able to give sound explanations of the historian's post-revisionist approach, but few could tease out the specific significance given in the interpretation to the international system as an enabling factor, and the USA-USSR relationship as the trigger, for the Cold War. Any attempts to argue that the historian's approach was anything other than post-revisionist were bound to be flawed. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- Candidates are reminded that the task is to make inferences about the historian, and then, using the extract, to explain how these inferences have been made. Therefore, candidates should avoid writing out or paraphrasing the extract.
- Before starting their answer, candidates should spend time reading and thinking about the extract, making notes on what they think are the central points of the interpretation, and how the extract can be used to illustrate these.
- Candidates are advised to work on the extract as a whole, rather than on little parts of it. The historian's interpretation will be valid for the whole extract; different paragraphs will not have different interpretations.
- It is important that candidates keep their answer focused on answering the question. They should not spend time writing lengthy paragraphs about the context, or paraphrasing parts of the extract as this is not needed in their explanation of the interpretation.

General comments

The most successful answers identified and explained the historian's interpretation in the extract. Successful comprehension of the extract is in part determined by the candidate's knowledge of the historiography and the historical context, as well as their awareness of examination technique. Candidates also need an understanding of how historians work, and the nature and status of claims they make. It is important to be aware of the fact that academic historians write on the basis of a consideration of the whole of the available evidence. The incompleteness of the evidence is the fundamental cause of the variety of interpretations of the same events, but these interpretations would not be historical if there was no reasoned consideration of the evidence on which to base them. Many otherwise good answers were undermined by attempts to evaluate the historian's conclusions, generally on the grounds that they did not consider something or omitted to use certain evidence.

Successful responses showed understanding of the interpretation by identifying and illustrating from the extract all the important elements of the interpretation. Less successful answers used the extract to illustrate what they saw as the interpretation, but there were some errors or inconsistencies in the argument. Some of these responses detected elements of the main interpretation, but undermined this valid material with other, contradictory arguments. This mainly occurred by not treating the extract as a whole and the consequent assertion that the extract contains multiple, usually contradictory, interpretations. Therefore, candidates should avoid working through the extract paragraph by paragraph and ascribing to each paragraph different interpretations.

Many candidates included references to specific historians in their answers, which, when appropriate, can be a useful way of throwing additional light on the historian's interpretation. For this to be successful, candidates must first have properly understood the extract itself, and second must understand the views of the historian to whom they are referring. Many candidates seemed to have had difficulties with this approach.

Comments on specific questions

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that the decline of the British Empire in the inter-war period had broad cultural causes, and that the response to this was a stagnation of imperial policy. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the

extract. Most responses recognised the cultural impact of the First World War and the way this undermined the Empire. It was rarer to see responses that explained how this brought about the stagnation of policy. Weaker candidates tended to use the extract as a stimulus for generalised writing about empire.

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that Hitler's contribution to causing the Holocaust was to set the genocidal tone, and that thereafter his subordinates would compete to carry out his wishes. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Most candidates could see the argument that without Hitler there would have been no Holocaust, and that this historian also believed the particular nature of the Holocaust that ensued was determined by subordinates. The suggestion that these subordinates 'competed' to put Hitler's wishes into effect was a clear signal that the interpretation had a structuralist element to it, which put together with Hitler's intentions suggested that the interpretation overall was 'synthesis' in nature. Some candidates were distracted by the way in which the end of the extract seemed to point to further developments in the Holocaust as a result of mass shootings proving insufficient, but this was not part of the historian's argument about causation. Thinking that this showed the historian was a functionalist was therefore missing the more significant points elsewhere in the extract. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that Stalin was responsible for Cold War tensions, but that he was not irrational since he never pushed hostility too far or had an overriding motive. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. The focus on the interpretation was squarely on Stalin, and most answers had little difficulty in detecting the blame placed on him by the historian. It was much rarer to see answers that showed awareness of how this blame was somewhat modified, either by the point that Stalin was always careful to stop short of war, or by the historian's belief that Stalin was waging a Cold War as much against opposition within the USSR as against his capitalist adversaries. The Stalin-centric nature of the extract, as well as hints of Soviet sources being used, suggested that the historian's approach might have been post-post-revisionist, but candidates who argued that it was traditional or orthodox were credited equally. No other historiographical 'label' could work. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/41
Depth Study

Key messages

- A sustained and clear focus on the actual question asked is the key to accessing the higher levels of the mark scheme.
- Answers must be analytical throughout and attempt to address all aspects of the question.
- Analysis must be supported by relevant and accurate factual information and this knowledge should be in depth.
- Candidates must take note of the chronological timeframe of the question.
- Questions will require a balanced response that argues a case.
- Factual narrative answers will not access the higher level of the mark scheme.

General comments

Higher quality answers were clearly analytical in approach and had a clearly argued case that was supported with good levels of relevant subject knowledge and then reached a logical final judgement. A good example of this was **Question 3**, where better candidates examined the aims and successes and failures of collectivisation. Weaker answers tended to just narrate the policies of collectivisation.

Lack of subject knowledge sometimes hampered candidates, and this was illustrated in **Question 4**, where candidates did not always have knowledge of both social and economic change.

Having a balanced answer is very important. **Question 9** assessing how far the threat of nuclear war diminished during the 1960s needed a balanced response looking at increased and reduced risk and then coming to a reasoned judgement.

Comments on specific questions

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

1 Evaluate the factors which led to the survival of the communist regime in the USSR by 1924.

Candidates had generally good levels of subject knowledge. There was a tendency to just describe the various factors or offer a chronological survey of the period. The question asked candidates to evaluate and so a value judgement had to be made on the relative importance of the factors examined. Candidates had good subject knowledge of the Cheka, War Communism, the Civil War and the New Economic Policy. The roles of Lenin and Trotsky and the weaknesses of the opposition were often examined. Some candidates focused very heavily on the Civil War, while Democratic Centralism and the ban on factions were rarely mentioned. The very best answers analysed the survival factors and prioritised them convincingly.

2 ‘The main reason Mussolini was able to consolidate his regime was his effective use of propaganda.’ How far do you agree?

This question was looking at the consolidation of power and not at the gaining of power in 1922. Many answers wanted to write about Mussolini’s rise to power. There was a tendency toward descriptive narrative and at times a lack of knowledge about propaganda and its use. Some candidates confused Italy and Germany in this question. Other factors had to be considered and terror, economics, relations with the church were all cited and sometimes evaluated. Not all candidates appeared to understand consolidation, and many did not examine the murder of Matteotti, the Aventine Secession or the Acerbo Law. Better quality answers assessed the methods used by Mussolini to consolidate his regime and prioritised the factors making this possible.

3 To what extent had collectivisation achieved its aims by 1941?

This was a popular question. Higher quality answers outlined the aims of collectivisation and then went on to assess Stalin's achievements considering his aims. There were plenty of answers with balanced judgements. Economic aims tended to be more heavily examined than political and the achievement of socialism was not often examined. It was important to note that the question extended to 1941 and some answers only looked at the early 1930s. There was plenty of data deployed, although few questioned the reliability of Soviet data. Better candidates also looked at the human cost of collectivisation and famines. The key to success here was to be analytical and really focus on extent.

4 'A period of limited social and economic change.' Discuss this view of Nazi Germany between 1933 and 1939.

This question required candidates to examine both social and economic change and not all did this. Weaker answers tended to pay little attention to one of the stated factors. Economic change tended to be more difficult for many candidates and there was greater detail on social change. Social change focused on women, racial policy and education. There was a better focus on change than continuity. Not all candidates were able to address the idea of limitation and tended to write essays in terms of success and failure of policies. Higher quality answers had a balanced approach between social and economic change, looked at the extent of change and tried to make a judgement as to whether it was limited or not.

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

Too few responses were seen for **Questions 5–8** to be able to make a meaningful comment.

Depth Study 3: International History, 1945–91

9 How far did the threat of nuclear war reduce during the 1960s?

This was a popular question in this section of the examination paper. Candidates were able to write balanced answers, although not always with sufficient factual support. The Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 featured extensively, as did the Test Ban Treaty of 1963. Some candidates mentioned the Hotline and the Non-Proliferation Treaty. SALT 1 was also mentioned. The growth of nuclear weapons and the enlargement of the nuclear club of nations was also mentioned. Some candidates went beyond the timeframe and talked about Détente in the 1970s. The better answers assessed the real results of the Cuban Crisis of 1962 and gave a balanced and evaluative judgement across the 1960s.

10 'The Soviet Union collapsed because Gorbachev introduced too much reform too quickly.' How far do you agree?

This was again a popular question in this section of the examination. There was a clear focus on Glasnost and Perestroika and at times significant descriptive passages. Higher quality answers looked at the longer-term problems that Gorbachev inherited, such as the Second Cold War, the economic stagnation and the inability of the command economy to cope with the demands of modernising the Soviet Union. The ending of the Brezhnev Doctrine was sometimes usefully assessed and with it the growth of nationalism in Eastern Europe and then the Soviet Union itself. The role of the USA was also well handled. The very best answers focused on 'too much too quickly' and provided a reasoned judgement on this stated factor.

11 'Mao Zedong brought order to China.' How far do you agree?

This question was less popular. Some candidates tended to write a chronological survey of Mao's period in power from the Great Leap Forward to the Cultural Revolution. There was clear evidence of both economic and political control in answers and higher quality responses examined what 'order' might mean and look like, analysing both the initial consolidation of power after 1949 and the later Cultural Revolution. There were some very good evaluative judgements and how order changed over time.

12 How far was the USA responsible for problems facing Palestine in 1948–49?

This question was rarely attempted and produced a broad range of answers. At times, the issue of problems facing Palestine were ignored. There were some answers that were largely descriptive, and some that misread the time period and talked about the Suez Crisis. Most answers argued that the USA had not caused the problems but had certainly exacerbated them. Some candidates wished to apportion blame to Great Britain and less to the USA.

13–16 and **17–20** were too infrequently seen to be able to make meaningful comments.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/42
Depth Study

Key messages

- A sustained and clear focus on the actual question asked is the key to accessing the higher levels of the mark scheme.
- Answers must be analytical throughout and attempt to address all aspects of the question.
- Analysis must be supported by relevant and accurate factual information and this knowledge should be in depth.
- Candidates must take note of the chronological timeframe of the question.
- Questions will require a balanced response that argues a case.
- Factual narrative answers will not access the higher level of the mark scheme.

General comments

Higher quality answers were clearly analytical in approach and had a well-argued case that was supported with good levels of relevant subject knowledge and then reached a logical final judgement. A good example of this was **Question 4**, where candidates had to assess the importance of economic recovery in keeping the Nazis in power after 1933 and then evaluate economic recovery alongside other factors such as propaganda, terror, lack of opposition and foreign policy successes.

Lack of subject knowledge sometimes hampered candidates and this was illustrated in **Question 5** where candidates knew about the Brown v. The Board of Education, 1954 case but little else in some cases.

Having a balanced answer is very important. **Question 10** highlighted this, where candidates had to examine the successes and failures of the SALT Treaties and then come to a reasoned overall judgement. This latter judgement is crucial to accessing top level marks. It was also important in this question to know what the treaties actually said and attempted to do.

Comments on specific questions.

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

1 ‘War Communism did nothing but lose the Bolsheviks support.’ How far do you agree?

This question required an in-depth analysis of War Communism and its benefits and drawbacks for the Bolsheviks. Some candidates attempted to talk about other factors in keeping the Bolsheviks in power, but this was not the focus of this particular question title. It was also important to have a balanced argument and then a reasoned final judgement. Answers tended to be rather one-sided and usually saying that War Communism was a disaster for the Bolsheviks. Higher quality answers looked across the whole-time span from 1918 to 1921 and gave a nuanced and balanced assessment, avoiding going on to the New Economic Policy.

2 'The Corporate State was the most successful of Mussolini's economic policies.' How far do you agree?

This was a popular question for some centres and candidates could generally explain the idea of the Corporate State, although some were slightly uncritical of it. Some candidates provided a very positive interpretation of the successes of Mussolini's economic policies. There was a tendency to list the various battles and then to be rather uncritical in evaluating them. Narrative passages predominated in some answers. The key feature of weaker responses was a lack of evaluation.

3 Analyse the reasons why there were so few limitations to Stalin's power.

There was sometimes a misunderstanding in responses that wanted to write about Stalin's rise to power, rather than his hold on power once in office. Several candidates found this question difficult and did not get beyond the 1920s. There was some description of the Collectivisation and Five-Year Plans and some talked at length about the Great Terror. Better quality responses focused on limitations and why these were not always successful in controlling the power of Stalin. This question needed a balanced evaluation of powers, limitations and why and how far Stalin's power was in fact unlimited.

4 'Economic recovery was the principal reason for the Nazis remaining in power after 1933.' How far do you agree?

This was a popular question and often answered well. Candidates looked at economic recovery and then assessed other factors such as propaganda, foreign policy successes, terror, the One-Party State and the lack of a credible opposition. Some answers were a little cursory on the economy and wanted to look at other factors. These tended to include indoctrination of the youth, popularity of Hitler and anti-Semitism. The very good quality answers evaluated the economic recovery and then prioritised it against other factors and gave a reasoned and substantiated judgement.

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

Too few of these responses were seen to be able to give meaningful feedback.

Depth Study 3: International History, 1945–91

9 Assess the reasons why the USA became directly involved in the Korean War when the USSR did not.

This question was a popular one and candidates had a good understanding of why the USA became directly involved in the Korean War. Candidates were less good in assessing the reasons. This meant analysing and prioritising them. The higher quality answers looked at both the USA and the USSR and were able to explain the motivations and actions of both. Candidates who did well on this question clearly had very good subject knowledge and understanding.

10 'The SALT Treaties achieved nothing significant.' How far do you agree?

The biggest failing here was where candidates had a lack of knowledge about the SALT Treaties and were therefore unable to engage with the question asked. Some judgements were really just assertions as there was no factual support. Better quality answers looked at 'nothing significant' and were prepared to debate this with evidence. There was still a tendency to present a case on each side of the argument but not to come to an overall conclusion that reached a clear verdict.

11 'China under Deng Xiaoping was fundamentally different from China under Mao Zedong.' How far do you agree?

This question was not very popular. Where it was attempted, candidates sometimes lacked subject knowledge to be able to compare China under each leader. The best answers distinguished between political and economic policy to identify similarities and differences. These answers were well crafted and had excellent factual knowledge and analysis. The vast majority of candidates chose to identify economic points of difference and political points of similarity.

12 Compare and contrast the policies pursued by Presidents Nasser and Sadat regarding Egypt's relations with Israel.

Candidates were generally better on Nasser than Sadat. This meant that the essays were somewhat unbalanced in their approach. Those who dealt with Sadat tended to view him as more successful than Nasser in his relations with Israel. This answer was not attempted very often, and several candidates lacked the depth of subject knowledge and also the requisite analysis to be able to reach a reasoned and well supported overall judgement.

Depth Study 4: African History, 1945–91

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

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

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

HISTORY

Paper 9389/43
Depth Study

Key messages

- A sustained and clear focus on the actual question asked is the key to accessing the higher levels of the mark scheme.
- Answers must be analytical throughout and attempt to address all aspects of the question.
- Analysis must be supported by relevant and accurate factual information and this knowledge should be in depth.
- Candidates must take note of the chronological timeframe of the question.
- Questions will require a balanced response that argues a case.
- Factual narrative answers will not access the higher level of the mark scheme.

General comments

Higher quality answers were clearly analytical in approach and had a well-argued case that was supported with good levels of relevant subject knowledge and then reached a logical final judgement. A good example of this was **Question 4**, where candidates had to debate whether the Führer Principle was the most important principle in Nazism. They examined the Führer Principle but also looked in depth at other facets of Nazism and provided a balanced and reasoned judgement.

Lack of subject knowledge sometimes hampered several candidates, and this was illustrated in **Question 1**, where candidates sometimes did not explain the effectiveness of Lenin's leadership and tended to give a narrative overview of the events of 1917 to 1924.

Having a balanced answer is very important. **Question 10** highlighted this, with high quality answers looking at both national uprisings in Eastern Europe and within the Soviet Union. These also offered a good analysis of the other factors that combined to bring about the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. This question was both popular and well answered in general.

Comments on specific questions

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

1 Evaluate the effectiveness of Lenin's leadership of the USSR.

This was a popular question and many candidates were able to deal with the demands of the question, examining a wide range of factors including Lenin's personality and the key policies of war Communism, the New Economic Policy, winning the Civil War and also how he managed the Bolshevik Party. Better quality answers looked at both the strengths and failings of his leadership and did so with plenty of supporting factual material.

2 'Mussolini's relations with the Church were his only domestic success.' How far do you agree?

This question was less popular, but the majority of candidates had a good understanding of Mussolini's relations with the Church and were able to analyse whether it was a success or failure. They looked at the changing relationship over time. They then examined other domestic policies in depth and again evaluated their success and failure. The various 'battles' were explained and analysed. The very best answers had a balanced and reasoned overall judgement.

3 Analyse the reasons why Trotsky was unable to win the struggle for power with Stalin.

This was a very popular question and candidates had very good subject knowledge on the power struggle following Lenin's death. Candidates examined the strengths and weaknesses of Trotsky and also those of Stalin and other rivals. There was a slight tendency in some responses to write an answer as to why Stalin gained power. Stronger candidates wrote a balanced response that examined both Trotsky and Stalin and their strengths and weaknesses and analysed why Trotsky was ultimately unable to gain power. These answers were tightly focused on the question throughout and did not lose question focus.

4 'The Führer Principle was the most important principle in Nazism. How far do you agree?'

This was a very popular question and candidates had a very good understanding of both the Führer Principle and also the other principles that were constituent parts of Nazism. A good range of factual examples were provided to illustrate the Führer Principle and then other facets of Nazism such as anti-Semitism, the authoritarian state, Autarky, nationalism and anti-communism were all examined. Some candidates examined misogyny in Nazi Germany as a principle and also the concept of the Übermensch and Untermensch. The very best answers examined the various principles in depth and analysed their relative importance to Nazism and then provided a reasoned and balanced overall verdict.

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

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

Depth Study 3: International History, 1945–91

9 To what extent was the globalisation of the Cold War caused by the Soviet Union's determination to increase its international influence?

This was a popular question and candidates were often able to provide a balanced response that looked at the motivation and actions of both the USSR and the USA. Answers focused on Asia, Latin America and Europe. A minority of candidates allowed their essays to focus solely on Europe and therefore did not really answer the question on globalisation. Popular areas of conflict that were examined were; Korea, Vietnam, Cuba and of course the development of the Cold War in German then the Eastern Bloc. Stronger candidates exhibited balance, analysis and a reasoned overall judgement that looked at both the USSR and the USA. These also attempted to decide who was to blame and to what extent.

10 'The inability to cope with national uprisings, both in Eastern Europe and within the Soviet Union, was the main reason why the USSR collapsed by 1991.' How far do you agree?

The answers to this question exhibited a good understanding of the key reasons for the collapse of the Soviet Union. National uprisings were analysed in Eastern Europe and then how nationalism spread to within the Soviet Union itself. Gorbachev's rejection of the Brezhnev Doctrine and its consequences were examined in detail, as was the desire for some of the Socialist Republics themselves to break free of the Soviet Union, culminating with Russia itself under Yeltsin. Other factors such as Gorbachev's reforms and the economic challenges facing the Soviet Union were examined, as were the actions of the USA. Czechoslovakia and Poland featured prominently in answers as did the Baltic States. The best answers offered a synthesis of the varying causes of the collapse of the Soviet Union and prioritised them in light of the question asked. These answers had a clear focus on the question.

11 How far can Mao Zedong be seen as the 'saviour of China' during his rule?

Candidates who attempted this question were not numerous, but they had very good subject knowledge. They defined 'saviour of China' and attempted to evaluate the policies of Mao and how they did and did not benefit China and the Chinese people. They dealt with the whole period 1949-76 and looked at economic, political and social policies. The best responses attempted to balance the positive and negative aspects of Mao's period of office and then presented a reasoned, factually supported judgement. Many responses saw the early period as one in which Mao saved China and made good progress with his aims and contrasted this with the failures of the Great Leap Forward and the Cultural Revolution. Weaker answers tended to write a descriptive narrative and did not really analyse or offer a clear viewpoint on the question.

12 How far was the USA responsible for causing the Suez crisis in 1956?

This question was not popular and those candidates who did attempt it successfully had very good subject knowledge of the role of the USA and also the roles of Israel, France, Great Britain, as well as Egypt and their supporters and the Soviet Union. The strongest responses were able to explain cogently how these nations all impacted on the Suez crisis. The answers were analytical in style and highlighted the role of the USA and other participating nations to reach a well thought out overall verdict. Weaker responses lacked depth of subject knowledge and analytical judgement. These responses usually produced little reasoned argument and sometimes just described the events of the Suez crisis.

Depth Study 4: African History, 1945–91 and Depth Study 5: Southeast Asian History, 1945–90s

Too few responses were seen to be able to offer any meaningful feedback.