

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9389/11 Document Question</p>
--

Key messages

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

General comments

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

The focus of the **(a)** questions is to identify valid similarities and differences of the content of the sources. In each of the **(a)** questions candidates were required to make comparisons of the views expressed in the sources about a particular topic – the relationship between Bismarck and the King in **Question 1(a)**, reasons for opposing the Missouri Compromise in **Question 2(a)** and the League's reaction to the invasion of Manchuria in **Question 3(a)**. Where responses were less successful it was often because of ignoring these particular aspects. Candidates sometimes wrote detailed comparisons of the sources which were not focused on the question, comparing source content in general without focusing on views or reasons. It is important that like-for-like comparisons are made. Several responses asserted similarities or differences for points which were not comparable. If the comparisons cannot be properly supported, they cannot be credited. In some cases, the similarity or difference was asserted with no support offered from the source. The focus of this question should be on making a developed comparison, i.e. identifying similarities and differences – marks in the top level for evaluation and contextual awareness are awarded where candidates use these skills to demonstrate **why** the similarities and/or differences occur.

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

When analysing the sources many candidates confused themselves by picking out sections of text which ran counter to the overall message of the source. An example from this paper can be found in **Section B, Source B** where many candidates wrote about the Kansas-Nebraska Act as a triumph for slave-holding states, evidenced in the statement that they were 'flushed with success', without realising that the source is from a northern newspaper which regards any success for the south as short-term only and believes that 'right will ultimately triumph'.

To achieve marks in the higher levels of **part (b)**, it is necessary to evaluate the sources by considering their nature, origin or purpose and the context in which they were produced. However, to be creditworthy the evaluation of the sources must relate to the question asked. Having considered the content of the source and whether this suggests support or challenge for the hypothesis, the candidate needs to consider provenance and context and assess whether these affect the usefulness of this source in answering the question. It is not enough simply to state that the source is unreliable – the answer must explicitly state whether the source's reliability (or lack of it) makes the source useful in their assessment of whether the sources support or challenge the statement in the question.

Effective time management remains an important skill to develop. Less successful responses to **part (a)** were sometimes rushed and in a significant minority of cases this was a result of the **part (a)** question being completed last. Although there is no required order for the question to be answered it should be noted that the **part (a)** question is designed to prepare candidates for the longer essay style question. Some responses to **(b)** questions were incomplete or hurried with the final source receiving very little attention. Often this resulted from spending too long on **(a)**, or writing lengthy sections on reliability or context which were not rewardable.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: European Option: The War between Prussia and Austria, 1866

Question 1

(a) Compare and contrast the views of the relationship between Bismarck and the King in Sources A and B

Most candidates found clear a similarity between the sources based around Bismarck's manipulation of the King, evidenced in A through reference to 'Bismarck's talent to manipulate the King' and in B through the declaration 'I became convinced that he (Bismarck) has created the whole situation to encourage the King to become more warlike'. Another clear similarity, that Bismarck was more in favour of war than the King, was also recognised by most candidates. Many also identified the similarity that Bismarck made the King angry. A majority of candidates were also able to find a difference – for example that in Source A the author is sure Bismarck will succeed in getting his way ('Bismarck's talent to manipulate the King is great') whereas in B he moves more slowly, 'encouraging' rather than 'manipulating' and the outcome is by no means decided ('We know no more than we did before. The King will not, Bismarck will'). Less successful responses generally resulted from a failure to focus on the relationship between the two men, focusing instead on a general comparison of source content.

(b) 'Austria must take responsibility for causing the War in 1866' How far do sources A to D support this view?

There were some excellent responses to this question, where candidates were easily able to identify that Sources A and B challenge the statement in the question, instead apportioning the responsibility for causing the War to Bismarck – evidenced in A by Bismarck's 'warlike policies' and his manipulation of the King so that 'he will not be able to do anything but commit to a war', and in B through his encouragement of the King 'to become more warlike' and his hints that Prussia needs a war 'to achieve the rounding off of Prussian territory'. Less successful responses failed to recognise that these sources could be used to challenge the argument and instead simply discounted them as they contain no direct mention of Austria. Source C was recognised by most candidates as supporting the argument, particularly referencing Austria's refusal to come to a friendly relationship with Prussia – the strongest responses acknowledged that the author of the source is the King of Prussia and so recognised the obvious bias. Source D contains evidence to support both sides of the argument – candidates either used it to apportion blame to Bismarck,

referring to the 'tone' of his language towards Austria, or to assign responsibility to Austria through the refusal 'to suspend its preparations for attacking Italy'. Either was acceptable and some responses included both interpretations. Very few responses achieved evaluation – some referred to source provenance and made comments about reliability but did not go on to use contextual knowledge or provenance to assess the relative use of each source in answering the question.

Section B: American Option: Implementing the Kansas-Nebraska Act

Question 2

- (a) Compare and contrast Sources A and D on the reasons for opposing the repeal of the Missouri Compromise**

A significant minority of responses paraphrased the sources without attempting comparison or without successfully identifying similarities or differences and were therefore restricted to marks in Level 1. Many did not recognise the link between the Missouri Compromise and the Kansas-Nebraska Act – that the passing of the Act effectively repealed the Compromise. Some responses were able to identify a difference – that Source A focuses narrowly on the impact of the repeal on the issue of slavery, referring to the Act (and therefore the repeal of the Compromise) as 'a rallying cry of another anti-slavery agitation which will throw all that have preceded it into the shade', whereas Source B focuses more widely on the impact on the Union. Others were able to identify similarities – both sources agree that the repeal of the Compromise will revive the slavery question as the focus of differences between North and South, with A referring to 'another anti-slavery agitation' and D stating that 'the only way slavery agitation could have been revived was the project of repealing the Missouri Compromise'.

- (b) The passing of the Kansas-Nebraska Act was a triumph for the slave-holding states.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?**

The majority of responses were able to achieve Level 3 on this question, if only by identifying Source A as a challenge to the statement in the question ('It is not expected that slavery will be extended...' and 'This Bill will be the rallying cry for another anti-slavery agitation') and Source C as a support to the statement, with its reference to slave states 'flinging off their masks' and creating new slave states in Texas, Kansas and Nebraska. Source B proved more of a challenge – the most popular interpretation, which was accepted, was that it was a triumph for the South, quoting that 'the whole future destiny of the country will be in the hands of slave-holders'. The strongest responses recognised that the author of this source, writing for a newspaper from New York, did not regard it as a triumph for the South, stating that 'we know that right will ultimately triumph'. The rhetorical nature of Source D, a speech by Lincoln, caused problems in some less successful responses; however, many were able to recognise that Lincoln considers that the Act will involve an extension of slavery to which he will reluctantly consent for the sake of saving the Union and is therefore a triumph for the slave-holding states. It would have been possible for responses to use contextual knowledge regarding Lincoln's stance on this Act to evaluate this source – however this was rarely seen. Responses which did consider the authorship of the sources and comment on their reliability often did so either with the use of stock evaluation, or comments on reliability not being used to address the question.

Section C: International Option: The League and the Japanese Invasion of Manchuria

Question 3

- (a) Compare and contrast Sources C and D as evidence about the League's reaction to the Japanese invasion of Manchuria**

Most candidates recognised the key difference between these sources – that Sir John Simon, the author of Source C, is reluctant to condemn Japan, stating that Japan had a 'real grievance against China', whereas the Commissioner in Source D believes that Japan's actions were wrong, saying they 'cannot be regarded as legitimate self-defence'. Similarities, such as the mention in both sources that a Commission of Enquiry was sent by the League, and that both sources were reluctant to take action that would stir up trouble, were also identified by many candidates. Some recognised that, despite the overall message of Source C being supportive of Japan, the author does recognise that they broke the Covenant and refused to evacuate when told to do so by the League, and that this is in agreement with Source D's condemnation of their actions. It should be

remembered the focus of this paper is source analysis, and that contextual knowledge should be used to explain why similarities and differences between the sources occur. Many responses showed good contextual knowledge of this topic; however there was a tendency to try to make the sources fit with this perceived knowledge – for example stating that both sources say the League took no action whereas both sources clearly show that action was taken (calling upon Japan to evacuate occupied territory from Source C and sending a Commission of Enquiry from D), even if that action in the end proved ineffective.

(b) 'Japan's actions in Manchuria were justified.' How far do Source A to D support this view?

Most candidates recognised that Source A challenges the statement, describing Japan's attack as being 'without provocation of any kind', as does Source D which states that 'the military operations of the Japanese troops cannot be regarded as legitimate self-defence'. Source B was used to support the statement, arguing that 'Chinese troops destroyed the tracks of the South Manchurian Railway' and that the 'Japanese Government has no territorial designs in Manchuria'. Source C could be used for either side of the argument (or both) – those who used it to support based their argument around Japan's 'real grievance against China' and that 'Japan owns the Railway and is entitled to have troops guarding the land'. Others used this source to challenge, arguing that Japan acted 'contrary to the Covenant' and refused to evacuate occupied territory as required to do so by the League. As with previous questions, there were few attempts to evaluate the sources and those who did restricted their analysis to stock comments on reliability only, even though many candidates clearly had good contextual knowledge which could have been used to evaluate the sources in context.

HISTORY

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

Key messages

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

General comments

Most candidates know that the **(a)** question requires an identification of similarities **and** differences, and that answers to **(b)** questions require an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the prompt in the question.

Stronger responses supported the points they made with precise quotations or direct paraphrases from the relevant sources. In some weaker responses candidates attempted to include long sections of quotation by starting a sentence and then using ellipses to join with a later section. This was rarely a successful way of showing support from the source and often led to confusion or lack of clarity. Support should take the form of brief, precise quotation, or paraphrase.

Weaker responses to **part (a)** seemed rushed and in a significant minority of cases this was a result of the **part (a)** question being completed last. Although there is no required order for the question to be answered it should be noted that the **part (a)** question is designed to prepare candidates for the longer essay style question by concentrating on two sources and a particular issue. Candidates who completed **part (b)** first often found it difficult to refocus on **part (a)**.

Several responses made inappropriate points of comparison, claiming 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. Comparisons should also focus on the question, e.g. in **Section A** comparisons should focus on 'Bismarck's policies' rather than other similarities and differences between the sources.

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.

When analysing the sources many candidates confused themselves by picking out sections of text which ran counter to the overall message of the source. Some candidates were prone to just looking for similar words without thinking about their context. Therefore, candidates should look at the whole source and not dissected sections of it when making both links to the questions and further judgements.

To achieve higher evaluation marks, it is necessary to explain why the nature, origin or purpose of the source makes it more or less useful when answering the question. One example of where this could be achieved was in **Section C**, Source C. Responses that dealt with this source successfully used their knowledge of the context to comment on the purpose of the Abyssinian government when appealing to the League. 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: Liberalism and Nationalism in Germany 1815–1871

Question 1

(a) Compare and contrast the views of Bismarck's policies in Sources C and D.

This question was well attempted with candidates able to identify the difference in how each source viewed Bismarck's policies by showing the strongly critical nature of Source C. Most candidates were able to compare the sources with relevance to the question, but a significant minority were distracted by making other comparisons. It is important to remember that comparisons that are not relevant to the focus of the question cannot be credited. In stronger responses comparisons were accompanied by clear contextual knowledge that was used to clarify or further explain the areas of comparison and contrast. The strongest responses began to use the nature and purpose of both sources to explain why the sources differed.

(b) 'Denmark caused the Schleswig-Holstein crisis.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?

This question required some knowledge of the debates surrounding the Schleswig-Holstein crisis and hostility with Denmark. Many candidates were able to show both support and challenge from the sources with some useful contextual knowledge. Overall, the question was well attempted although some responses displayed a lack of contextual knowledge. There were a few responses which began to evaluate the sources to show how useful they were when answering the question but some attempts at this did not move beyond stock descriptions of provenance.

Section B: the American Option: The origins of the Civil War, 1820–61

There were too few responses to this question to make a general comment appropriate

Section C: International Option: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1930s

Question 3

(a) To what extent do Sources A and D agree about Italy?

This question required candidates to focus on extracts from Laval and Hoare – the instigators of the appeasing pact with Italy. In some cases, when looking at these two extracts, responses got drawn into wider issues about the weaknesses and failures of the League but this was not really the focus of the question. It is important for candidates to read what is in the sources rather than write about what they expect to be there. However, most candidates were able to recognise both similarities and differences in the sources as detailed in the mark scheme. Stronger responses

were able to use knowledge of the period, for example to expand on the position of the French in relation to Italy, to contextualise these sources and clarify or explain the positions taken in them.

(b) 'The League was undermined by Britain and France.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?

Most responses engaged with the sources thoughtfully to offer support and challenge for the assertion stated in the question. There was plenty of scope to discuss what 'undermined' may have looked like for the League and the best responses began to use their contextual knowledge to do this. Many candidates were able to use all four sources to support and challenge the assertion in the question and there was some careful reading of the extracts. Most of these responses used evidence from the sources to clearly support their argument. The strongest responses used knowledge of the period to evaluate the sources and explain how this evaluation made them useful when answering the question. This was particularly relevant in some strong responses when using the differences in Source C and Source D to explain the context of the period.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9389/13 Document Question</p>
--

There were too few candidates for a meaningful report to be produced.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9389/21 Outline Study</p>
--

Key messages

- In **Part (a)** questions the key element is explaining why something happened. Identifying several reasons is an important first step but to reach higher levels of the mark scheme it is necessary to give some indication of the significance of that factor to the event. At the very highest Level of the mark scheme, it is necessary to make a comparative judgement about the relative importance of different factors.
- In **Part (b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported. A well written but one-sided analysis will not allow the candidate to reach the top Level of the mark scheme.
- Candidates could have improved their responses by ensuring that they focused more on the question set rather than providing a narrative of their body of knowledge on a given topic.

General comments

In line with the requirements of the examination, most candidates attempted two complete questions from one section of the paper, **Section A** questions being the most popular. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in at least some of their answers. It was not uncommon for candidates to produce satisfactory or better responses to one part of a question, yet weaker (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part.

Part (a) questions are about causation. The most effective responses were clearly focused on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they interacted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance. Most candidates were able to identify some relevant causal factors, and many were able to add at least some basic explanation to this list of factors. The weakest responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy; some were too vague, were limited to generalised assertions and demonstrated little engagement with the issue being explained.

The most successful **Part (b)** 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. There is some evidence that candidates, faced with a very familiar topic, were not able to adapt their knowledge to the specific question asked in the paper. Less successful responses fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the specific nature of the question set, or relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance (often by not considering timeframes given in the question).

Comments on specific questions

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

Question: 1 France, 1789 – 1814

(a) Why did demands for reform become more radical between 1789 and 1792?

Strong responses were able to cover the full period and explain various factors (e. g role of the king/economic issues/external threats/rise of the Jacobins). Weaker responses described the events of 1789.

(b) How far were Napoleon's domestic policies aimed at increasing his personal power?

Responses which were successful provided a balanced argument by addressing ways Napoleon extended his personal power set against aspects showing a wider concern. Less focused answers examined one aspect, whilst weaker responses described his military career.

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

(a) Why was industrialisation encouraged by developments in transport by 1800?

Answers which grasped the timeframe end date produced focused responses by examining the ways roads and canals encouraged industrialisation. Less successful responses wrote at length about railways, thereby losing the timeframe focus.

(b) To what extent were governments responsible for economic growth in the nineteenth century?

Strong responses examined the role of government in helping to produce economic growth set against other influences (e. g private enterprise/technological innovations). Weaker responses concentrated on one European country and/or focused on one aspect rather than a range of influences.

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

(a) Why did the Schlieffen Plan play an important part in the July Crisis of 1914?

Responses which were successful displayed good understanding of the nature of the Schlieffen Plan and why this meant it played a key part in the July Crisis of 1914. Responses which were weaker described the events at Sarajevo in June 1914.

(b) To what extent was Serbia responsible for the instability in the Balkans in the years before World War One?

Some very good responses were seen which showed sound knowledge and understanding of Serbia's role in creating instability in the region and assessed this against the influence of other factors (e. g Austria-Hungary/Russia/other Balkan states). Less successful responses examined Serbia's role in isolation, whilst weaker answers described why World War One happened.

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

(a) Why did the Kornilov revolt fail?

Successful responses displayed a clear understanding of the revolt and the various reasons for its failure, for example Kerensky's actions and the Bolshevik's role in persuading Kornilov's troops to abandon the revolt. Less focused responses provided general points about the revolt lacking planning, whilst weaker responses were, often, confused and saw the revolt taking place during the time of the Tsar's rule.

(b) How secure was the Tsar's hold on power between 1906 and 1914?



The characteristics of strong responses were a focus on the question's timeframe and an assessment, by looking at a range of factors, of the extent to which Nicholas II's hold on power was secure (the role of the secret police/Fundamental laws/opposition divisions/Stolypin's role/increase in strikes/dislike of the Russification policy/growing frustration at the Tsar's real commitment to political and social reform). Responses which were less successful wrote about events outside the timeframe (e.g. Nicholas II assuming personal command of Russia's troops in 1915).

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 United States follow a policy of 'dollar diplomacy' during the early twentieth century?**

Good responses showed a clear understanding of the policy, e. g. protecting and extending American business interests, and its geographical focus, the Caribbean and Central America. Weaker responses lacked an understanding of the policy and described the foreign policy of the United States.

- (b) **'The relationships between the US and the great powers of Europe were fundamentally changed by the Civil War.' How far do you agree?**

Responses which were successful displayed a focused, balanced and well supported assessment of the extent to which the relationships between the US and the great powers of Europe were fundamentally changed by the Civil War. For example, France's challenge to the Monroe Doctrine through its Mexican adventure and the crises in British-American relations caused by the *Trent* and *Alabama* incidents. Answers which were less successful wrote about European reliance on Southern cotton but did not link this to the question's focus of relations with the US.

Question: 6 Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861 – 1877

- (a) **Why did Lincoln face challenges to his political leadership during the Civil War?**

Good responses provided several reasons for the challenges Lincoln faced to his political leadership during the Civil War. They could have been improved by showing how they were connected and/or providing an assessment of their relative significance. Responses which were less successful focused on why the South opposed Lincoln.

- (b) **To what extent were the policies of Radical Reconstruction successful in reuniting the country?**

Successful responses showed a clear understanding of what constituted Radical Reconstruction. They were able to provide, also, a balanced and focused assessment of the extent its policies reunited the country. Other responses described the policies (e.g. the Freedmen's Bureau) without addressing the issue of reuniting the country. Less focused responses wrote about the policies of Lincoln and Johnson.

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

- (a) **Why did Theodore Roosevelt introduce the idea of a 'square deal' in his first term as President?**

Too few responses were seen to make meaningful comment.

- (b) **'Trade policies such as high tariffs were the main cause of rapid industrialisation in the United States during the late nineteenth century.' How far do you agree?**

Too few responses were seen to make meaningful comment.

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

- (a) **Why do some historians suggest that the New Deal had little impact?**

Strong responses provided several reasons to explain why the New Deal had little impact, such as increasing government interference in the economy made investors wary, seeming as it did to undermine traditional American economic policy, and the role of the so-called 'Roosevelt's Recession' of 1937 – 38. Less successful responses described the policies of the New Deal.

- (b) **To what extent was opposition to the New Deal from the conservative right more effective than opposition from other groups?**

Responses which were successful provided a balanced assessment of a range of appropriately selected evidence. They were able to identify what constituted the conservative right and evaluate the extent of its effectiveness and that of other opposition to the New Deal. Responses which were less successful did not distinguish between the various points of opposition and/or described what their objections were to the New Deal.

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

Question: 9 International Relations, 1871 – 1918

- (a) **Why did the United States enter the First World War in 1917?**

Stronger responses showed a clear understanding of the roles the German recommencement of unrestricted submarine warfare and the revelation of the Zimmerman Telegram played in America entering the war in 1917, as well as the impact of the Russian February Revolution of 1917 in presenting the Allies, now, as democracies ranged against monarchical tyrannies. Weaker responses wrote at length about the sinking of the *Lusitania* in 1915, but without addressing the issue of the United States not entering the war until two years later in 1917.

- (b) **How far did the Berlin Conference of 1884 – 85 solve the problems of the 'Scramble for Africa'?**

Responses which were successful provided a balanced assessment of the extent to which the Berlin Conference of 1884 – 85 did solve the problems created by the 'Scramble for Africa.' The main terms of the agreement (e.g. the Principle of Effectivity) were understood, and they were set against examples of remaining problems, the Fashoda crisis/the Boer war/Germany's *Weltpolitik*. Less successful responses described why the 'Scramble for Africa' took place and/or showed confusion over chronology in seeing the Fashoda crisis as taking place before the conference.

Question: 10 International Relations, 1919 – 1933

- (a) **Why did relations between France and Germany improve between 1924 and 1929?**

Stronger responses were able to provide several explained reasons as to why relations improved between the two countries in this period (the seeming resolution of the issue of reparations via the Dawes and Young Plans/the Locarno treaties/Germany joining the League of Nations. Less focused answers described the problems that existed between the two countries prior to 1924.

- (b) **'The application of Wilson's principle of national self-determination was the main cause of problems in the 'successor states' in the 1920s.' How far do you agree?**

Responses which were successful had a good grasp of what constituted both national self-determination and a 'successor state'. This allowed these candidates to assess the other causes of problems for the 'successor states' against the role of national self-determination. Responses which were less successful wrote at length about Wilson's beliefs (e.g. the 14 Points) and/or described national self-determination.

Question: 11 International Relations, c.1933 – 1939

- (a) **Why did the issue of Czechoslovakia remain a problem after the Munich Conference?**

Stronger responses displayed understanding of the Munich Crisis, the weakness of Britain and France further revealed by Munich, Hitler's antipathy towards the Czechs and German occupation of the rest of Czechoslovakia in March 1939. Responses which were less successful wrote about the Munich Crisis.

- (b) **‘Mussolini did not plan his foreign policy, he simply reacted to opportunities.’ How far do you agree?**

Responses which were successful grasped the need to assess the extent of planning employed by Mussolini in his foreign policy (e.g., the need for good relations with Britain and France in the immediate period after Hitler became Chancellor) against instances of exploiting opportunities as they presented themselves (e.g., the Spanish Civil War). As a result, a balanced response was achieved. Less focused responses provided a descriptive account of Mussolini’s foreign policy with no link to planning/opportunism.

Question: 12 China and Japan, 1919 – 1941

- (a) **Why did Japanese policies in the Far East between 1937 and 1941 lead to its involvement in the Second World War?**

Stronger responses provided several explained reasons why Japan’s policies in the region, 1937 – 1941, led to its involvement in the Second World War. Responses which were less successful described what Japan did in the Far East in this period.

- (b) **How far do you agree with the claim that it was the leadership of Mao Zedong that ensured the survival of the Chinese Communist Party?**

Successful responses focused on Mao’s leadership from the inception of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP), the Long March, control over the Shaanxi Soviet and policies towards the peasants. This was assessed against the policies of Chiang Kai-shek, economic, social, and military. As a result, a balanced argument was achieved. Other responses, whilst showing clear understanding, focused on the Long March. Weaker responses showed confusion over chronology and offered generalisations rather than specific examples to support points.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9389/22 Outline Study</p>
--

Key messages

- In **Part (a)** questions the key element is explaining why something happened. Identifying several reasons is an important first step but to reach higher levels of the mark scheme it is necessary to give some indication of the significance of that factor to the event. At the very highest level of the mark scheme it is necessary to make a comparative judgement about the relative importance of different factors.
- In **Part (b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported. A well written but one-sided analysis will not allow the candidate to reach the top Level of the mark scheme.
- Candidates could improve their responses by ensuring that they focus more on the question set and rather than providing a narrative of their body of knowledge on a given topic.

General comments

In line with the requirements of the examination, most candidates attempted two complete questions from one section of the paper, **Section A** questions being the most popular. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in at least some of their responses, but less successful candidates could improve on sustaining consistent quality across all four of their responses. It was not uncommon for candidates to produce satisfactory or better responses to one part of a question, yet weaker (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part.

Part (a) questions are about causation. The most effective responses were clearly focused on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they interacted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance. Most candidates were able to identify some relevant causal factors and many were able to add at least some basic explanation to this list of factors. The weakest responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy; some were too vague, were limited to generalised assertions and demonstrated little engagement with the issue being explained.

The most successful **Part (b)** 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. There is some evidence that candidates, faced with a very familiar topic, were not able to adapt their knowledge to the specific question asked in the paper. Less successful responses fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the specific nature of the question set, or relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance (often by not considering timeframes given in the question).

Comments on specific questions

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

Question 1: France, 1789 – 1814

- (a) **Why was Napoleon able to become increasingly powerful in France after the Brumaire coup?**

Strong responses kept the questions focus of ‘after the Brumaire coup’ and presented several explained reasons for Napoleon’s increasing power (e. g., propaganda/censorship/policies, such as the Concordat). Less focused responses described his rise to power prior to the Brumaire coup.

- (b) **‘Divided and leaderless.’ How far does this explain the failure of the Counter-Revolutionaries?**

Responses which were successful provided a balanced argument by addressing the ways divisions and lack of leadership caused failure, assessed against other causes of failure (e. g., extent of revolutionary fervour/the Terror/foreign support). Other responses focused on one side of the argument, and less successful ones provided a narrative/descriptive account of the topic.

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

- (a) **Why did industrialisation lead to political change?**

Successful responses were able to show a number of reasons why industrialisation led to political change. For example, the growing acceptance that the State did need to take a more interventionist role. Weaker responses described political changes such as the Reform Act of 1832 in Britain.

- (b) **‘Railways were the most important factor in producing economic growth in this period.’ How far do you agree?**

Several good responses were seen for this question. There was sound knowledge and understanding shown of the role railways played in producing economic growth and its significance was assessed against several other influences – population growth/entrepreneurs/State actions such as the Zollverein. Responses which were less successful focused on one country, mainly Britain, whilst weaker ones described the growth of railways.

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

- (a) **Why did the Sarajevo assassination lead so quickly to a world war?**

Good understanding was shown not only of the events at Sarajevo, and its consequences, but also its context. This meant several explained reasons were given as to why the assassination led so quickly to a world war. They could have been improved by showing how they were connected and/or providing an assessment of their relative significance. Less successful responses provided a narrative account of the assassination.

- (b) **‘The Alliances and Ententes were the main cause of international tension in the years before 1914.’ How far do you agree?**

Responses which were successful provided a balanced argument based on an assessment of the interpretations, supported by appropriately selected evidence. Responses which were not as successful focused on one side of the argument whilst weaker ones wrote a descriptive account of the terms of the Alliances and Ententes, with confusions over chronology and factual inaccuracies.

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

(a) Why did opposition to the Tsar grow after 1914?

Responses which were successful displayed clear understanding and knowledge, and as a result presented several explained reasons for the growing opposition to the Tsar after 1914 (military defeats/personal command of the Army after 1915/growing scandal over the Tsarina's seeming inappropriate relationship with Rasputin/worsening of the social and economic conditions in Russia caused by war). Less focused responses described the issues without linking it to why this led to opposition to the Tsar.

(b) How effectively did the Tsar deal with the problems facing Russia in the period from 1906 to 1914?

Strong responses were well-focussed on the question's timeframe and provided an assessment, by looking at a range of factors, of the effectiveness of Nicholas II's actions dealing with Russia's problems in this period (the introduction of the October Manifesto/role of Stolypin/increase in strikes/dislike of the Russification policy/the Tsar's lack of a real commitment to political and social reform). Responses which were less successful wrote about events outside the timeframe (e. g the February Revolution of 1917).

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

Questions 5, 6, 7 and 8.

Too few responses were seen to make meaningful comment.

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

Question: 9 International Relations, 1871 – 1918

(a) Why did Japan go to war with China in 1894?

Stronger responses displayed sound knowledge of the roles Korea and Japan's wish to increase its international standing played in causing the war with China in 1894. Less successful responses described in general terms Japan's wish for raw materials. Weaker responses often confused the war of 1894 with later events such as the Russo-Japanese War of 1904 – 05.

(b) How far was the division of Europe into two rival alliances the result of the dismissal from power of Bismarck in 1890?

Successful responses grasped the question's evaluative thrust and provided a balanced response, supported by accurate and appropriate evidence. Such responses showed a good understanding of both Kaiser Wilhelm II's *Weltpolitik* and Bismarck's *Realpolitik*, as well as the growing Anglo-French understanding developed after 1898 following the Fashoda crisis and increasing tension in the Balkans between Austria-Hungary and Russia. Less successful responses presented descriptive accounts of the various stages of Bismarck's Alliance System and/or a narrative of the Anglo-German Naval Race.

Question 10: International Relations, 1919 – 1933

(a) Why did the United States not fully isolate itself from European affairs in the 1920s?

Strong responses were able to provide several explained reasons for the United States not fully isolating herself from Europe in the 1920s (reparations, the Dawes and Young Plans/Kellogg-Briand Pact). Responses which were less successful described the terms of the Dawes and Young Plans, whilst weaker responses lost the question's focus and wrote about either the impact of the Depression in the 1930s or Wilson's aims for the League of Nations.

(b) How far was British and French mistrust of communism responsible for their poor relations with the Soviet Union in the 1920s?

Good responses were characterised by a balanced argument which assessed the various factors which led to the poor relations in the 1920s. This was based on accurate selected evidence. Some responses were aware that there were occasions when relations were less poor but kept the question's focus by acknowledging this was not the norm because of several factors (e. g., the Comintern/Soviet provocations in India/the 'discovery' of the Zinoviev letter/the *rapprochement* between the Soviets and Germany after the Rapallo Treaty). Weaker responses provided general comments about capitalist countries fearing communism.

Question 11: International Relations, c.1933 – 1939

(a) Why did Mussolini seize control of Fiume in 1924?

Successful responses were able to present several explained reasons for Mussolini's seizure of Fiume (a desire to assert his power after coming to power in 1922/it had been an Italian aim since the secret Treaty of London in 1915). Less successful responses described what Mussolini did in 1924 regarding Fiume.

(b) How far was Hitler's foreign policy from 1933 to 1939 based on his determination to destroy the Treaty of Versailles?

Strong responses were able to distinguish, clearly, between those aspects of Hitler's foreign policy which sought to destroy the Treaty of Versailles and those which had a wider goal (e. g., living space in the East/unification of all German speaking people/ideological motivation behind support of fascism in Spain). This resulted in a balanced assessment based on carefully selected evidence. Less successful responses focused on one aspect, mainly the Treaty of Versailles, while weaker responses showed confusion over chronology and presented inaccurate factual content.

Question 12: China and Japan, 1919 – 1941

(a) Why were warlords able to take control of much of China by 1916?

Strong responses showed good knowledge of the role Yuan Shih-Kai's actions played in assisting warlord control of much of China by 1916, as well as the rise of militarism and regionalism. Responses which were less successful provided a narrative of events from the Revolution of 1911 until 1916.

(b) 'By failing to deliver the Three Principles of Sun Yat-sen, Chiang Kai-shek lost the opportunity to establish Kuomintang control over China.' How far do you agree?

Strong responses showed a clear understanding of what constituted the Three Principles. This allowed the response to assess Chiang Kai-shek's actions regarding them against other factors which undermined Kuomintang (KMT) control over China (e.g., ending of cooperation with the communists/seeming KMT indifference to Japanese aggression). This resulted in a balanced response being produced. Less successful responses focused only on the Three Principles, and weaker responses described either the encirclement campaigns and/or the Long March.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/23
Outline Study

There were too few candidates for a meaningful report to be produced.

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- The interpretation applies to the whole extract and not just part of it. Going through the extract and claiming that the historian's interpretation can be detected in just one sentence or a single paragraph, and then that another interpretation can be detected in the next sentence or paragraph, will not provide the basis for a successful response.
- In every extract there will be important passages that contain the essential aspects of the historian's argument and allow inference of the interpretation. Build the response around these central aspects, rather than simply writing about each paragraph of the extract in turn.
- In some extracts it is possible to detect an approach taken by the historian which can be given an historiographical 'label', such as revisionism, intentionalism, structuralism. If making use of such 'labels' they need to be used correctly. If a 'label' is wrongly attributed to an extract, it will be a clear indication of a lack of understanding, either of the 'label' itself, or of its relevance to the particular extract.
- The question asks what can be learnt about the historian's interpretation and approach from the extract. The response should therefore focus on the historian's ideas and arguments, and not on the events covered by the extract. Many responses spend a lot of time on explaining events, and therefore writing about the context, rather than focusing on the interpretation.

General comments

The strongest responses show understanding of the historian's interpretation, can explain how this can be inferred from the extract, and can use relevant sections of the content of the extract to illustrate explanations. Many responses do not demonstrate this level of understanding, and instead are based upon a summary of what the extract says, interspersed, to a greater or lesser extent, with comments about aspects of the historian's arguments. These responses found it hard to prioritise one aspect of the argument over another, mainly because they lacked an overview of the whole extract. Conclusions in these responses were often only valid for part of the extract rather than the whole of it. Time spent reading the extracts carefully would help with this as many responses contained claims about the extract that were not sustainable based on a proper reading. A common example of this was where candidates mistook the views expressed in the extract by historical figures for the views of the historian. This produced conclusions about the interpretation that were totally opposite to the reality of what the historian was arguing. Although it is understandable that candidates wish to start writing their answers as soon as possible, they should understand that time spent at the start of the examination on reading and thinking about the extract is not wasted time; far from it, it is an essential part of the process of producing a successful response.

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 the Holocaust could have occurred nowhere but Germany because a party with virulently anti-Semitic ideology took power in a country where its views were broadly shared by a population willing to cooperate in implementing genocide. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. They were able to explain how achieving power enabled the Nazis to turn extreme ideas into state policy. This alone, however, would have been insufficient without the willingness of ordinary Germans to tolerate

and participate in the killing of Jewish people. Both factors were necessary, neither on its own would have been sufficient. Many responses were not able to explain this inter-relationship of factors and were limited by a narrow focus on anti-Semitism as the cause of the Holocaust, which missed the specific points made in the historian's argument. Others focused too much on the final paragraph and claimed that it was the war that made the Holocaust possible, whereas this was really a sub-aspect of the main interpretation, explaining the geographical extent of the Holocaust, rather than its causation. If a 'label' was used to identify the historian's approach, then only intentionalism could be properly argued. Generally, the quote 'without the Nazis, and without Hitler, the Holocaust would not have occurred' was enough to push candidates towards this conclusion. The weakest responses 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 Soviets were responsible for increasing tensions by viewing the West as hostile and thereby moving away from wartime cooperation and towards a policy of coexistence based on Cold War confrontation. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. The key to successful interpretation of this extract was understanding that it presented the Soviet perspective. Therefore, when it referred, for example, to 'reactionary forces' in the West undermining the cooperation of Yalta and Potsdam, this was what the Soviets, and not necessarily the historian, believed. Many responses missed this, and therefore concluded that the historian was placing blame on the West. Coupled with other parts of the extract that talked about Stalin's wish for peaceful coexistence, this was enough to persuade many candidates that the historian had adopted a revisionist approach. In truth, there were plenty of indications that the historian was arguing that the Soviets, and more particularly Stalin, were culpable. Crises were seen as being caused by Stalin's wish to 'maximise the fruits of victory', and although Stalin certainly did not want war, the kind of coexistence he had in mind was to be achieved 'by methods of Cold War: diplomatic confrontation, ideological struggle and competition'. Overall, this was certainly a nuanced view, a long way away from traditional interpretations, but nonetheless focusing on the Soviet Union and Stalin, and portraying them as confrontational. The weakest responses paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- The interpretation applies to the whole extract and not just part of it. Going through the extract and claiming that the historian's interpretation can be detected in just one sentence or a single paragraph, and then that another interpretation can be detected in the next sentence or paragraph, will not provide the basis for a successful response.
- In every extract there will be important passages that contain the essential aspects of the historian's argument and allow inference of the interpretation. Build the response around these central aspects, rather than simply writing about each paragraph of the extract in turn.
- In some extracts it is possible to detect an approach taken by the historian which can be given an historiographical 'label', such as revisionism, intentionalism, structuralism. If making use of such 'labels' they need to be used correctly. If a 'label' is wrongly attributed to an extract, it will be a clear indication of a lack of understanding, either of the 'label' itself, or of its relevance to the particular extract.
- The question asks what can be learnt about the historian's interpretation and approach from the extract. The response should therefore focus on the historian's ideas and arguments, and not on the events covered by the extract. Many responses spend a lot of time on explaining events, and therefore writing about the context, rather than focusing on the interpretation.

General comments

The strongest responses show understanding of the historian's interpretation, can explain how this can be inferred from the extract, and can use relevant sections of the content of the extract to illustrate explanations. Many responses do not demonstrate this level of understanding, and instead are based upon a summary of what the extract says, interspersed, to a greater or lesser extent, with comments about aspects of the historian's arguments. These responses found it hard to prioritise one aspect of the argument over another, mainly because they lacked an overview of the whole extract. Conclusions in these responses were often only valid for part of the extract rather than the whole of it. Time spent reading the extracts carefully would help with this as many responses contained claims about the extract that were not sustainable based on a proper reading. A common example of this was where candidates mistook the views expressed in the extract by historical figures for the views of the historian. This produced conclusions about the interpretation that were totally opposite to the reality of what the historian was arguing. Although it is understandable that candidates wish to start writing their answers as soon as possible, they should understand that time spent at the start of the examination on reading and thinking about the extract is not wasted time; far from it, it is an essential part of the process of producing a successful response.

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 the most important factor explaining the willingness of perpetrators to kill was group conformity, within the context of the intensifying effects of war. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract to explain the ways in which group conformity and the impact of war enabled perpetrators to kill. They understood that the historian was not, in the usual sense, concerned with explaining the causation of the Holocaust, and therefore avoided the use of 'labels' such as intentionalist or functionalist. The

historian's focus was on perpetrators, and on exploring what it was that enabled men, without any specific preparation, to kill Jewish people. Many responses referred to the historian's conclusion that, under similar circumstances, others would probably behave in much the same way as the men of Reserve Police Battalion 101. Responses that did not grasp the main interpretation focused instead on aspects such as anti-Semitism, or the effects of propaganda and indoctrination, assuming that the historian's argument was that these were the factors that enabled the men to kill. The weakest responses 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 bears the prime responsibility for causing the Cold War, and though others bear some responsibility, no other reason would have been sufficient. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Candidates generally had little difficulty illustrating how the historian indicated Stalin's culpability, but there was considerable variation in how the element of blame placed on others was dealt with. The crucial point was that whatever the level of responsibility of Roosevelt, Truman or Churchill, this would not have been sufficient to ensure that the Cold War happened. This meant that the blame placed on Stalin was of a different order – he was indispensable, the others were not. Some responses missed this distinction, and thereby reached the conclusion that the historian was sharing the blame between the Soviets and the West, seeing this as a post-revisionist approach. The first few sentences of the extract should have been warning against this, with the reference to the 'new history' and the view that Stalin made Cold War unavoidable. A few candidates, adopting the method of working through the extract paragraph by paragraph, placed too much emphasis on what it said about long-term developments and chance events, and thereby lost sight of the main arguments. The weakest responses simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- The interpretation applies to the whole extract and not just part of it. Going through the extract and claiming that the historian's interpretation can be detected in just one sentence or a single paragraph, and then that another interpretation can be detected in the next sentence or paragraph, will not provide the basis for a successful response.
- In every extract there will be important passages that contain the essential aspects of the historian's argument and allow inference of the interpretation. Build the response around these central aspects, rather than simply writing about each paragraph of the extract in turn.
- In some extracts it is possible to detect an approach taken by the historian which can be given an historiographical 'label', such as revisionism, intentionalism, structuralism. If making use of such 'labels' they need to be used correctly. If a 'label' is wrongly attributed to an extract, it will be a clear indication of a lack of understanding, either of the 'label' itself, or of its relevance to the particular extract.
- The question asks what can be learnt about the historian's interpretation and approach from the extract. The response should therefore focus on the historian's ideas and arguments, and not on the events covered by the extract. Many responses spend a lot of time on explaining events, and therefore writing about the context, rather than focusing on the interpretation.

General comments

The strongest responses show understanding of the historian's interpretation, can explain how this can be inferred from the extract, and can use relevant sections of the content of the extract to illustrate explanations. Many responses do not demonstrate this level of understanding, and instead are based upon a summary of what the extract says, interspersed, to a greater or lesser extent, with comments about aspects of the historian's arguments. These responses found it hard to prioritise one aspect of the argument over another, mainly because they lacked an overview of the whole extract. Conclusions in these responses were often only valid for part of the extract rather than the whole of it. Time spent reading the extracts carefully would help with this as many responses contained claims about the extract that were not sustainable based on a proper reading. A common example of this was where candidates mistook the views expressed in the extract by historical figures for the views of the historian. This produced conclusions about the interpretation that were totally opposite to the reality of what the historian was arguing. Although it is understandable that candidates wish to start writing their answers as soon as possible, they should understand that time spent at the start of the examination on reading and thinking about the extract is not wasted time; far from it, it is an essential part of the process of producing a successful response.

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 driving force behind empire was the opportunities it gave to those who might have been constrained if they stayed at home, be they individuals looking for wealth and employment, or officials who became 'men on the spot'. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. The tone of the historian's writing suggested disapproval of many of the developments it described, referring to the 'callousness' and 'indifference' of the British, behaving 'arrogantly ...and unfeelingly', and the stronger responses included this in their analysis of the extract. The historian's argument made much of the appeal of empire to those who sought a lack of constraint on their behaviour, and to those who might simply have been too mediocre to have succeeded at home. Candidates who missed the historian's main points saw instead straightforward arguments about economic motives, or for the importance of the periphery, in driving imperial

expansion. The weakest responses simply paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about Imperialism with no reference to the extract.

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that Hitler's fanatical will to destroy the Jews was an indispensable factor in producing the Holocaust, but this could not have been turned into practical policy without the structure of the Nazi state and the circumstances of war. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. The extract put forward a synthesis interpretation. Many candidates had no problem dealing with the first aspect regarding Hitler's intent, but only the strongest responses successfully explained the other aspects. For most candidates the functionalist dimension of the interpretation equated with the coming of war. Only rarely were the references to 'organisational chaos' and 'lack of clear central direction' related to the idea of the Holocaust as a response to circumstances. Similarly, the structuralist dimension of the interpretation was seen as Hitler needing others to carry out the organisation of mass murder. Again, it was rare to see the structure of the Nazi state being related to references such as 'the momentum of escalating radicalism', and the 'nature of Hitler's charismatic rule'. This lack of clarity over what it is that characterises functionalist and structuralist interpretations was a notable feature of many responses. Some responses missed entirely the importance of Hitler and looked only at the other aspects of the extract, which proved a serious limitation. The weakest responses 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 during 1946 hardliners on both sides began to dominate policymaking, and that the deterioration of relations was the result of mutual misunderstandings and suspicion. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Most candidates appreciated that the historian's approach was post-revisionist in nature, but this still left aspects that needed more explanation. This was the kind of post-revisionist argument that rests on the notion of mutual misunderstanding being to blame, rather than seeing both sides as pursuing aggressive or confrontational policies, and the extract had to be used to illustrate this. Understanding the importance that the historian placed on hardliners coming to prominence on both sides, and the way in which this heightened misunderstanding, was a feature of the strongest responses, whilst answers that missed this and relied only on the idea of mutual suspicion were less effective. The weakest responses paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9389/41 Depth Study</p>
--

Key messages

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

General comments

The strongest responses were analytical in approach and had a well-argued case that was supported with good levels of relevant, in depth, subject knowledge and which reached a logical conclusion. Lack of subject knowledge sometimes hampered candidates, and this was illustrated in Question 6, where candidates did not always have enough subject material to answer the question on the impact of affirmative action policies in America in the 1960s and 1970s. Having a balanced answer is also very important and this was a common characteristic in the strongest responses. At the highest levels, engagement with the specific wording of the question, for example, making a fully supported judgement on how far the candidate agreed with the statement in question 2, or the extent to which economic factors explain the fall of the Weimar Republic in Question 4, is crucial.

Comments on specific questions

1 ‘Offering popular policies was the main reason for the Bolshevik retention of power between 1918 and 1924.’ How far do you agree?

The question required an analysis of the relative significance of ‘popular policies’ and other factors. Strong responses were able to offer a range of policies which were considered popular, with ‘peace, land and bread’ and New Economic Policy widely employed as examples. These also tended to employ a wider range of examples and employed more detailed supporting material. The strongest responses also provided a consistent analysis of what the ‘main reason’ was. Most responses contained balance through an examination of alternative explanations for Bolshevik survival and generally terror was used. Candidates were also often able to explain the reasons for victory in the Civil War.

2 The main reason why Mussolini was able to consolidate his power after 1922 was that his opponents were weak and divided. How far do you agree?

This was a popular question and demanded an analysis of the factors which allowed Mussolini to maintain control in Italy after 1922. The stated factor caused almost all candidates difficulty and very few wrote convincingly about the nature of the opposition to Mussolini. Better responses included some comments about division between socialists and communists, the failure of liberalism and in many cases Matteotti was identified as a symbol of the opposition. Often candidates wrote at some length on all the other ways in which Mussolini was able to consolidate his power. These essays showed considerable knowledge but very often the material came over as disconnected bodies of information. A few candidates were able to establish a framework built around 1922, showing a clear understanding of the sequence of events in the years immediately afterwards. Some of the strongest

answers were able to identify the linkages between the key factors. Some candidates found difficulty in distinguishing between the achievement and the consolidation of power. Explicit explanation of how the two were linked was necessary.

3 'Russia gained little and lost much.' Assess this view on the results of Stalin's economic policies.

This question required a balanced analysis of the success of Stalin's economic policies. The best responses were often characterised by reference to what criteria would be used to define success, by discussing Stalin's aims, and by the use of a range of policies in a consistently analytical fashion. In most cases, the twin themes of collectivisation and industrialisation dominated the discussion, and candidates overwhelmingly grasped the need for a balanced argument. Among the strongest responses, there was a consideration of the difference between Russia and the Russian people. Perceptively, some candidates could explain the benefits to the country as a whole through the industrialisation programme ultimately allowing the Soviet Union to withstand attack from Nazi Germany, but that the people suffered poor working, living and housing conditions. Those answers which carefully built up to a final considered judgement were the most persuasive. Less successful approaches tended to be characterised by description of policies, without developed analysis of their impact and a desire to discuss the purges at length, without closely linking this material to the question. There was some difficulty in deciding how to conduct the analysis of Stalin's policies, with some candidates opting for an approach which discussed the advantages and disadvantages of policies in the search for balance, without really forming an over-arching judgement to answer the question directly.

4 To what extent do economic factors explain the fall of the Weimar Republic?

This was a popular question, which called for an analysis of the reasons for the Nazi overthrow of Germany's democratic system in 1933–34, with a clear focus on economic difficulties as the stated factor. The best responses understood this and were therefore able to concentrate largely on events from 1929 onwards, with a solid grasp of the impact of the Great Depression on Germany and of the role of mass unemployment in causing the collapse of the Weimar Republic. There was also recognition and argument of the failures of political leadership and of the effectiveness and the appeal of the Nazi message in this context. Weaker answers tended to focus less closely on the problems afflicting Germany after 1929, and some ignored this period altogether, focussing almost entirely on the 1920s. A common misapprehension was that Germany was suffering from inflation, rather than deflation, after 1929 and there was confusion between the events of 1923 and 1929–33 in some weaker responses.

5 Evaluate the reasons why Truman won the 1948 election

Relatively few candidates attempted this question, but those that did tended to grasp the issues well and to understand that the discussion of a range of factors, with a consistent analysis on their relative significance was required. Responses generally focused on Truman rather than on the weaknesses of the Republican campaign. Candidates were able to explain the appeal of Truman and of his domestic and foreign policies competently and how he was seen as the heir to Roosevelt by many. The strength of the economy and Truman's popularity with minority groups were other factors well employed by some.

6 Assess the impact of affirmative action policies during the 1960s and 1970s

This question drew few responses, with the majority able to identify some key examples from the early 1960s, such as Kennedy's Executive Order and the 1964 Civil Rights Act, while focusing on the Bakke case as a counter argument. In one example the candidate was able to name individuals such as Condoleezza Rice and Colin Powell who benefitted from these policies. However, there was a tendency to discuss factors outside of the demands of the question, such as the relative success of the non-violent civil rights movement and Black Power, which indicated that some candidates lacked sufficient knowledge of this topic to write in sufficient depth on it.

7 The 'war on drugs' of the 1980s had little impact.' How far do you agree?

There were too few responses to this question to make a general comment appropriate

- 8 'The foreign policy of the United States during the 1970s and 1980s was dictated by its military failure in Vietnam.' How far do you agree?**

There were too few responses to this question to make a general comment appropriate

- 9 Assess the importance of the Vietnam War in bringing about improved relations between the United States and the Soviet Union in 1970s.**

This was a popular question and candidates generally grasped the requirement to weigh the impact of the Vietnam conflict against other factors behind détente, including from the Soviet perspective in addition to that of the US. The strongest responses explicitly explained the impact of the Vietnam War on the USA, with the financial and military costs combined with public opinion to discuss how the conflict changed American attitudes towards international relations. Some candidates got somewhat bogged down in detail about the conflict itself, sometimes going back as far as 1945, and this approach was less successful. A consideration of the Soviet Union's financial situation, joint fears of nuclear Armageddon, the role of the Soviet-Sino split and Brandt's Ostpolitik initiative were all used to good effect to provide a balanced discussion. The strongest responses were characterised by a clear assessment of the different factors and of how they might be inter-connected, with a genuine effort to explain their relative significance.

- 10 How significant was the invasion of Afghanistan in bringing about the Second Cold War?**

This was a popular question, which was generally answered very well, with candidates understanding what was required of them, in terms of providing a balanced explanation, with clear analysis of the relative significance of the stated factor in the question against others. Candidates were generally able to explain the importance the invasion, measured against the ongoing involvement of the Superpowers in Third World conflicts, the rise of neo-conservatism in the US and the failure of leadership in the Soviet Union. The ability to measure the significance of individual factors was often the distinguishing factor between the strongest responses and the rest.

- 11 Assess the reasons why China overcame the 'crisis of communism' when the Soviet Union failed.**

Many candidates were able to make competent assessments of Deng's approach to managing post-Mao China and were comfortable in discussing the different approaches taken to economic and political policy to maintain Communist control. The ability to 'assess' these factors distinguished the strongest responses from the rest. Some candidates took the opportunity to include an analysis of the failures of communism in the Soviet Union and did so effectively, although candidates who focused exclusively on China were equally successful.

- 12 'The Camp David Agreements only benefitted Israel. Evaluate this view.**

There were too few responses to this question to make a general comment appropriate

- 13 'The weakness of the colonial authorities rather than the influence of mass parties explains the achievement of independence in sub-Saharan Africa.' How far do you agree?**

The few answers to this question were effective. Responses tended to be stronger on the weakness of the colonists after the Second World War than on the influence of mass parties. The range of examples given varied, although detailed explanation of at least two examples was required.

- 14 Assess the factors which determined how inclusive government was in post-independence Africa.**

There were a small number of responses to the question, with the common difficulty of determining of what inclusive actually meant in this context, limiting the scope of many candidates to answer effectively. There was a recognition that, over time, one-party states became the predominant form of government.

- 15–20**

No further responses were seen

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9389/42 Depth Study</p>
--

Key messages

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

General comments

The strongest responses were analytical in approach and had a well-argued case that was supported with good levels of relevant, in depth, subject knowledge and which reached a logical conclusion. Lack of subject knowledge sometimes hampered candidates, and this was illustrated in Question 5, where candidates did not always have enough subject material to answer the question on the importance of CORE for the Civil Rights movement in the 1950s. Having a balanced answer is also very important and this was a common characteristic in the strongest responses. At the highest levels, engagement with the specific wording of the question, for example, making a fully supported judgement on how far the candidate agreed with the statement in question 9, or the extent to which the collapse of the Soviet Union was the result of the ending of the Brezhnev Doctrine in Question 10, is crucial.

Comments on specific questions

1 To what extent was there a social revolution in Russia between 1918 and 1924?

The strongest responses focused on social changes, such as women and the family, religion, education, and healthcare and were able to explain the extent to which Lenin's government made significant changes in these areas. Other candidates were more concerned with the issue of revolution than social but were able to make relevant comments about changes in the class system. However, there were a few candidates who interpreted the question as relating to socialist revolution and they tended to rely on material which lacked full relevance.

2 How fascist was Mussolini's Italy?

The focus here was clearly on the extent to which Mussolini's policies and actions fitted the description fascist and a definition of what the candidate considered to be fascism was a good starting point, although not all responses did so. Even those that did so often had difficulty in providing examples, citing Mussolini's use of violence as evidence of fascism, for example. Stronger responses used economic and social policies to test Mussolini's ideology against, while less effective approaches included those who tried to explain the extent to which Mussolini was a successful dictator.

3 How far had Stalin achieved his aim of 'socialism in one country' by 1941?

The strongest responses were those which made it clear from the outset that they understood the implications of the term 'socialism in one country' and then went on to assess how far Stalin's achievements matched this definition. Knowledge of the impact of his policies was often rewarded,

albeit with analysis being implicit where there was no clear grasp of the phrase. There were some responses which were side-tracked by discussion of how the issue of 'socialism in one country' versus 'permanent revolution' helped Stalin come to power, which were not highly rewarded and others which went into depth about the purges, again lacking clear relevance to the question as set.

4 How important were Nazi ideas in Hitler's rise to power by January 1933?

There was usually a clear understanding of what the question demanded. Strong responses made it clear what they considered Hitler's ideas to be and then went on to explain how they helped him to take control in Germany. A balanced response was achieved by identifying and explaining other factors and it was possible to combine two, for example by explaining how Hitler offered scapegoats for, and solutions to, the economic problems afflicting the country. Few candidates were able to go to these lengths, however. The strongest responses paid attention to the 'how important' aspect of the question and analysed the relative significance of this and other factors.

5 Evaluate the importance of CORE within the Civil Rights movement of the 1950s.

There were a small number of responses to this question and they were typified by a lack of knowledge of CORE in this period, instead depending upon discussion of the Brown Case and Rosa Parks and the Montgomery Bus Boycott, which lacked relevance.

6 Analyse the reasons why the Watergate scandal led to the resignation of Nixon in 1974.

No responses seen.

7 To what extent did economic recovery take place under Reagan?

A small number of responses to this question were seen. They tended to be characterised by good knowledge of Reaganomics and a willingness to analyse their impact – arguing that the benefits of the recovery were not widely shared, and that trickle-down economics did not work in practice, and that the resulting deficit caused difficulties.

8 Evaluate the effectiveness of US foreign policy in the Middle East during the 1950s and 1960s.

No responses seen.

9 'The United States was responsible for the Cuban Missile Crisis.' How far do you agree?

There was generally detailed knowledge about the event. Strong responses were analytical and balanced, with some explaining the responsibility of both Eisenhower and Kennedy on the US side, and both Khrushchev and Castro from the other perspective. More perceptive responses considered the domestic pressures placed on the various leaders. Some candidates lapsed into a long narrative description of events, with commentary on responsibility left to the concluding comments and this approach was not as highly rewarded as those which were consistently analytical. Typically, the most successful answers were characterised by a willingness to engage with the 'how far' element of the question, making their judgement both explicit and clearly supported by the arguments put forth throughout the essay.

10 To what extent was the collapse of the Soviet Union caused by the ending of the Brezhnev Doctrine?

Those candidates who knew exactly what the Brezhnev Doctrine was tended to fare best when it came to analysing the key factor. Some candidates who were uncertain and chose to focus entirely on Gorbachev's other policies. Responses were generally based on Eastern Europe, although the best examples were able to identify and explain Reagan's role. Candidates were often knowledgeable about Glasnost and Perestroika, although not always able to clearly demonstrate how they contributed to the ending of the Soviet Union.

11 Assess the success of economic reform in China after 1979

No responses seen.

12 Assess the effectiveness of Soviet policies in the Middle East during the Cold War

There were too few responses to this question to make a general comment appropriate

13–20

No responses seen.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9389/43 Depth Study</p>
--

Key messages

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

General comments

The strongest responses were analytical in approach and had a well-argued case that was supported with good levels of relevant, in depth, subject knowledge and which reached a logical conclusion. Lack of subject knowledge sometimes hampered candidates, as did a lack of balance in responses. For example, in Question 3, many less successful responses did not clearly engage with the stated factor in the question and instead focused on other factors which often meant judgements were not persuasive. Having a balanced answer is very important and this was a common characteristic in the strongest responses. At the highest levels, engagement with the specific wording of the question, for example, making a fully supported judgement on how far the candidate agreed with the statement in question 1, or the extent to which the Sino-Soviet split was caused by relations with the west in question 11, is crucial.

Comments on specific questions

1 'The New Economic Policy was a betrayal of the revolution'. How far do you agree?

A popular question, and most candidates were able to approach it successfully. Most responses examined the policy in a balanced fashion, agreeing that ideologically speaking, it was a betrayal of the revolution, but that it brought benefits which could be argued to have saved it, using Tambov and Kronstadt in support. Another argument commonly made was that the NEP was a temporary measure only. Strong answers identified individual supporters or critics of the policy from within the higher echelons of the Bolshevik Party itself. Sustained analysis, sometimes based upon the notion that the degree of betrayal might depend upon an individual's circumstances, characterised the best answers, but very few failed to get to grips with the argument.

2 'He achieved little, beyond staying in power.' Discuss this view of Mussolini.

A popular question, although the degree to which candidates came to terms with its demands varied. There was a general realisation that a balanced approach was necessary, although in some cases focus was placed upon how Mussolini stayed in power, rather than his achievements. Often a list of policies, with limited comment about their individual success, was produced, rather than a more joined-up approach, in which candidates thought carefully about what an achievement might consist of. The strongest responses gave examples of success such as the Lateran Treaty and, in a small number of cases, foreign policy. Responses were generally stronger on failures, with the best examples discussing Mussolini's inability to imprint Fascism on Italian society and on various economic policies.

3 Assess the importance of the cult of personality to Stalin's control of Russia.

Candidates who answered this well were clear about what the cult of personality was and how it contributed to Stalin's grip on the Soviet Union. This was far from common, with many responses discussing propaganda more widely, without real focus on the key issue. Less successful approaches moved quickly beyond the stated factor to allow them to write in great depth about the purges, resulting in a lack of balance. Some responses got caught up in a discussion of Stalin's rise to power and, although credit could be given to commentary on his control of party machinery and processes, this material lacked direct focus on the question. Description of industrialisation and collectivisation were included in some responses but was only successful if clearly linked to popular support for these policies enhancing Stalin's authority.

4 'It was a popular dictatorship.' How valid is this view of Hitler's rule of Germany?

Stronger responses engaged fully with the concept of a 'popular' dictatorship and were able to discuss the impact of Hitler's domestic and foreign policy on gaining widespread support from the German people. The most perceptive argued that although Hitler's rule was tolerated for want of an alternative, this does not necessarily mean it was popular, and that it was then maintained by force and propaganda. There were some less successful responses which tended to discuss the extent to which Hitler was a dictator and they were not rewarded highly. Getting to grips with the idea of popularity was crucial to candidates' prospects of success.

5–8

No responses seen

9 Examine the view that the globalisation of the Cold War up to 1975 was caused by the stalemate between the USA and Soviet Union in Europe

The strongest answers to this question showed evidence of clear planning and engaged thoroughly with the question from the very outset. They were able to address the causes of the globalisation of the Cold War clearly, using various examples, including an examination of the impact of the stalemate in Europe. There were some references to decolonisation, but these were often lacking supporting examples and were under-developed as a result. Weaker responses tended to betray some confusion about which direction their essays should take, often spending valuable time on descriptions of the situation in Europe, without properly linking that to the question's focus.

10 Détente in the 1970s was largely a failure. How far do you agree?

The most successful approach here was to consider what could be described as 'failure' in this context, and also engaged directly with the element of analysis implied by the use of 'largely' in the question. Balanced responses were common, with thoughtful discussions of the extent to which détente lessened the prospects of direct conflict being rewarded appropriately. On the other side, the continuation of Superpower involvement in the developing world and the ultimate breakdown of détente were considered. Candidates who spent time and energy on describing the various agreements were less well rewarded, as their focus on the question was patchy. That said, most candidates tackled this question effectively.

11 To what extent was the Sino-Soviet Split caused by disagreement over relations with the west?

Not many candidates tackled this question, but generally did so competently, by examining the personality clashes between Stalin, Mao and Khrushchev, policy disputes, as well as racial and ideological divides. A reluctance to fully engage with the issue of 'extent' was the barrier to some of these responses reaching the top level.

12–20

No responses seen