

HISTORY

Paper 9697/11

Paper 11

Key Messages

Candidates who focused on the actual wording of the question, rather than the broader topic, were more likely to achieve well. In **Section A**, careful consideration of the provenance of all the sources was an important factor in achieving higher marks. The better responses in **Section B** came when candidates were able to 'assess' when asked to or to reflect when asked to consider 'how far'.

General Comments

As always, the candidates who really heeded the requirement in **Section A** to 'pay particular attention to the interpretation and evaluation of the sources' did very well, while at the same time really focussing on providing the required sustained judgment in **Section B**. Simply taking the Sources at face value and doing little more than providing a précis did not lead to success, and neither did writing long lists of facts in **Section B**. Careful reading of the instructions, doing exactly as the question asked and demonstrating the required skills was the route to the top marks and it was pleasing to see a good many candidates doing just that.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

The sources proved to be comprehensible and accessible to all. There was a good grasp of the key points being made in the sources and there was ample awareness of the need to identify clearly whether a source did or did not support the hypothesis. It was good to see fewer responses which were simply précis of the sources, or the sources being taken simply at face value. As always what differentiated the good responses from the others was a willingness to reflect, as the rubric requires, on 'the interpretation and evaluation of the sources, both individually and as a group.' The good responses showed careful thought about what the Kaiser's motives might be when talking to a British journalist in 1908 and commented also on the particular context of the year. Some commented perceptively on Source C, which although written with hindsight in the 1920s (and not by House as some suggested) might be seen to be giving a detached and 'neutral' view on events on 1914. There were quite a few undeveloped comments at the end of a paragraph commenting on a source of the 'it was written by German/American/British writer and it was biased', or 'he might be lying', type, which showed limited thinking on the source's provenance. However there were some very strong and well informed debates which challenged and supported the hypothesis with great verve.

Section B

Question 2

A popular choice which produced some excellent responses. The best reflected on what 'absolute' rule consisted of, gave a good definition of it in the context of the early 19th century, and then followed with a clear picture of the 'extent'. Once there was a good definition then there was lots of scope for arguing a case each way. It is always best to avoid vague statements like 'to a certain extent he was an absolute ruler...' which tends to indicate a reluctance to think about it. Some good responses argued that Napoleon was very much the 'absolute' ruler – and then looked at the way he dominated France and imposed his will on it. Others commented on the plebiscite and the fact that what he did was actually strongly supported by the majority of the French people so not really earning the description of 'absolute'. Weaker responses tended to simply list all he did, sometimes covering his foreign exploits in great depth, and then ending with the

assertion... 'therefore he was/was not absolute,' giving little indication of either 'extent' or awareness of what an 'absolute' ruler actually was.

Question 3

This was quite popular, but unusual in the way that the vast majority of the responses simply decided to list the causes of the Industrial Revolution in a generalised way. Some candidates had clearly done a lot of work on the Agricultural Revolution and were determined to write about that instead, or as well. Some decided that this was about the working class and while such responses could contain some relevant material, it was often little more than limited generalisations about working conditions. The number of candidates who noticed that it was firstly about the 'poor' and secondly wanted it looked at 'by the end of the 19th century' was very small indeed. There were a few good responses which looked at the issue from the perspective of the 'poor' and looked at such gains as compulsory education and legislation to legalise unions and improve living and working conditions as well as the disadvantages of the factory and urbanisation.

Question 4

This produced two broad types of answer. The better responses looked at the implications of the appointment of Bismarck for initially Prussia and then Germany as a whole, and then identified the ways in which he was to play a key role in German history. Factors such as his management of the Liberals, his development of the Prussian economy and army as well as his opportunism and grasp of political realities were usually mentioned. The really good responses took care to identify what they felt were the most important factors and give their reasons why they were so important to unification. Keeping the focus on the central part of the question was vital as was reflecting on what was 'decisive' and why. The weaker responses tended to consist of little more than a list of things that Bismarck did, invariably ending with an undeveloped conclusion that 'he was very important.'

Question 5

Those that managed to resist the temptation to write a long survey of the reasons for the 'Scramble' and keep the focus on benefits/ harm did well. The best responses really reflected on the 'how far', in some cases stressing that it could vary from country to country and from colony to colony. Most candidates knew about the Belgian profits in the Congo on the 'plus' side, and costly factors such as the Boer War or Adowa on the other. It was good also to see more candidates focusing on Asia as well as Africa. Some could not resist writing about the benefits or otherwise for the peoples who were colonised, sometimes at great length, which sadly gained no credit. As always, those who kept a firm focus on the question set and deployed their factual information in support of a reasoned case, did well.

Question 6

The key to success in this question lay with keeping the focus very firmly on 1905 and its implications and resisting the temptation to go on past 1914. Many candidates got distracted on either the causes of the 1905 revolution or on events between 1915 and 1922. While the decision to enter the war in 1914 could warrant some consideration, the Tsar's decision to assume personal command of his armies was really not relevant. The best responses really focused on events between 1905 and 1914 and reflected carefully on a range of factors, such as the Duma and the work of Stolypin and debated whether there was any real change of direction in Russia, for better or for worse, or whether it was just business as before with the decision to go to war of much greater import. Thinking about what a 'turning point' might involve gained credit, with some very good responses going for a simple definition and then arguing out a case each way. Giving a firm response to the 'how far' aspect of the question was important to doing well, with vague comments like 'to some extent' or 'a bit' not usually leading to much success.

Question 7

The very best answers thought carefully about what 'modernising' an economy might involve and whether 'modernisation' might be more than just increasing production of iron and steel. Candidates tended to have quite an impressive display of statistics to reinforce their arguments. The definition/balanced argument approach worked best, together with a clear and firm answer to the 'how far' part of the question. There was a tendency to simply list what Stalin did, with digressions on the purges, and assume that the Examiner would come to a conclusion for themselves. It was surprising to see the almost invariable assumption that agriculture was a resounding success story and a fine example of 'modernisation'. The deliberately created famine and a consistent inability to feed the population despite possessing some of the finest wheat growing areas in the world did not get much mention.

Question 8

There were two types of response here. The better ones really reflected carefully on what 'more powerful' might imply and there were an interesting range of factors considered. Some argued whether acquiring non-productive territories made you more powerful, or whether it was better to have a highly industrialised economy, with high employment and things like railways. On the whole the consensus was empires could cost you and industry would help. The other type of response tended to be a survey of the causes of the Industrial Revolution and/or Imperialism, often recycling information that had already appeared in **Questions 2 and 5**.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/12

Paper 12

Key Messages

Candidates who focused on the actual wording of the question, rather than the broader topic, were more likely to achieve well. In **Section A**, careful consideration of the provenance of all the sources was an important factor in achieving higher marks. The better responses in **Section B** came when candidates were able to 'assess' when asked to or to reflect when asked to consider 'how far'.

General Comments

The candidates who really heeded the requirement in **Section A** to 'pay particular attention to the interpretation and evaluation of the sources' did very well, while at the same time really focussing on providing sustained judgment in **Section B**. Simply taking the Sources at face value and doing little more than providing a précis did not lead to success. In **Section B** writing long lists of facts was not a way of achieving high marks. Reading the instructions, doing exactly as the question asked and demonstrating the required skills was the route to the top marks and it was pleasing to see a good many candidates doing just that.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

As always with the source based question there was a great variety of responses and much depended on how comfortable candidates were with dealing with this type of question. There were outstanding answers which demonstrated a clear grasp of the sources, a well-focused contextual knowledge and a willingness to comment thoughtfully on the source's provenance and validity. Grouping the sources into those which supported or opposed the hypothesis, or could be seen as ambiguous helped, as did a careful reflection on the dates given for each source. Too often the date was neglected. For example, in Source A it tended to be assumed that because it was a British source and the British and the French were allies in the war- this was somehow 'pro – French'. Few commented that this was the year of Fashoda (as well as Germany's support for the Boers) and that this might impact on the writer's opinion. The need to really reflect on what factors might have influenced the writers' views was critical to success. The tendency to précis is still strong, and there were still many limited comments at the end of a paragraph describing the source of the 'it was biased' type with no indication of why it might have been biased or what aspects of the source might suggest a bias one way or the other.

Question 2

The better responses considered carefully what ought to be seen as the achievements of the French Revolution and then debated whether this should be seen as central to Napoleon's ambitions. There were some strong arguments in favour of personal autocracy and dynasty as his principal aim, while others looked more to the expansion of France and the creation of an Empire. There was usually a good level of knowledge about much of the domestic legislation and policy in France in the period. The Code and 'careers open to talent' got ample coverage, as did censorship of the press and the work of Fouché and the prefects.

Question 3

Quite a popular question but it tended to be used as a vehicle for a 'causes of the Industrial Revolution in Britain' list. Better responses tended to identify the key differences such as pace, link to Agricultural Revolution, role of government, social and political impact and dependence on colonial trade, and then look at the differences between, usually, Britain and one of the other two countries. Many tended to describe what happened in Britain first and then added a brief description of events in Germany with some implicit hint of what could be seen as differences. Those that really thought about 'differences' and did not start with a prepared answer on some aspect of the Industrial Revolution were the more successful.

Question 4

The key to success here was in responding in depth to the word 'from' in the title. There were some responses which were excellent in the way they looked at the problems 'in' 1849 such as the inherent disunity, the Austrians, the attitude of the Pope and so on but never really looked at issues which arose after 1849. Some tried to look in depth at the roles of Mazzini and Garibaldi, which had limited relevance. As is always the case, the best responses identified the range of problems which arose in the period and reflected on which might be seen as the most challenging and why.

Question 5

While the imperialism question is invariably popular, this one produced a number of high quality responses. There was some impressive reflection on the broad causes of colonial acquisition in the period, in both Africa and Asia, and some good comments on whether in some cases acquisition was more about giving politicians something to gain support from or whether it was imposed on them by demand from below. There were many good examples brought in from Germany and France and some really interesting debates on the motivation for the 'scramble'. It was really refreshing to see so few lists of reasons and more sophisticated sustained judgment.

Question 6

Those who managed to avoid writing just about what Lenin did and reflected on how he became a successful revolutionary leader did well. Sorting out the period to be covered was also important and those who looked not only at the period before October 1917 but also the period after when the revolution became established did best. 'Causes of the Revolution' essays were not very successful, nor were 'why did he win the civil war?' essays either. There was usually a high level of knowledge but making appropriate use of it was critical. There was a very interesting range of reasons put forward, such as Lenin's ability to choose the right men, the right words for his slogans and his decision-taking and it was good to see some serious analysis of those reasons and not just a list of them.

Question 7

Getting a sensible definition of the terms was important here, and those that at least made a serious effort produced the better responses. Some argued that Mussolini changed over time while others suggested it either varied according to issues, such as religion, or that he aimed at one and only succeeded in the other. There was usually a good level of knowledge and grasp of what he did, but too many essays produced rather long descriptions of what he did with a conclusion that 'he was both authoritarian and totalitarian' as the total amount of analysis for the essay. There were also a lot of essays dealing with his foreign policy and his relationship with Hitler which were of limited relevance.

Question 8

There were a few impressive responses which really showed not only a grasp of the economies of the two countries, but also showed real awareness of the differences. Russia was seen as very much like Britain had been before the Agricultural Revolution with Britain starting on a period of comparative decline when faced with the emerging economies of Germany and America. However there were also some responses which contained a large number of vague generalisations, usually about the Industrial Revolution in Britain and limited evidence of grasping what the question really was looking for.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/13

Paper 13

Key Messages

Candidates who focused on the actual wording of the question, rather than the broader topic, were more likely to achieve well. In **Section A**, careful consideration of the provenance of all the sources was an important factor in achieving higher marks. The better responses in **Section B** came when candidates were able to 'assess' when asked to or to reflect when asked to consider 'how far'.

General Comments

The candidates who really heeded the requirement in **Section A** to 'pay particular attention to the interpretation and evaluation of the sources' did very well while at the same time really focusing on providing sustained judgment in **Section B**. Simply taking the Sources at face value and doing little more than providing a précis did not lead to success, and neither did writing long lists of facts. Reading the instructions, doing exactly as the question asked and demonstrating the required skills was the route to the top marks and it was pleasing to see a good many candidates doing just that.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

The majority of candidates had no difficulty in understanding both the provenance and the content of the five sources. Sources A and B were rightly seen as taking a negative approach to the hypothesis, and Sources C, D and E seen as taking a more positive approach to it. Source E was often seen as being slightly ambiguous. The better responses rightly suspected the partisan approach of both Sources C and D, with two of the key players in the Naval Race on the German side possibly justifying their role in it all. Source A tended to be taken more at face value and the details in Source B tended to be listed and not commented on. Most saw Source E as possibly being 'neutral' and having the advantage of hindsight. The best responses really reflected on the 'fully' justified aspect of the hypothesis and considered the 'provocation' versus the 'self-defence' elements of the sources. Some ignored altogether the requirement to 'interpret and evaluate' the sources. Use of contextual knowledge was often very helpful, particularly when reflecting on events before the War broke out, in the case of Sources A and B.

Section B

Question 2

This was not a popular choice. There seemed to be uncertainty as to where the focus of the response should lie. The better responses tended to avoid a simple survey of what the causes were and kept the focus on the 'sudden and unexpected' aspect of the question. There were some good responses which argued that, given the situation which had built up in the previous decade or so, with financial, social and political problems and an incompetent monarch as well, it was hardly surprising that the creaking system collapsed.

Question 3

Few attempted this question, but there were some excellent answers. There were some good ideas put forward as to what might, or might not have been, significant results of the Revolution. Some argued that it was a mix of urbanisation and industrialisation while others reflected carefully on broader social, economic and political results. As always there was a tendency to generalise and not deal with factors specific to the named countries. Some argued successfully that what was a major result in France was not the same for Britain. There were quite a few simple lists of the causes which naturally did not do well.

Question 4

Those who avoided the temptation to simply focus on Bismarck's work and reflected on the essential differences between expansionism and nationalism did well. It was good to note some very well structured debates which pointed firmly to one side or the other. There were some responses which simply described the two aspects and seemed to leave the conclusion to the reader to imply. A reflection on the overall work of Bismarck was looked for, and just a narrative of the events of the 1860s really did not provide this. Candidates often knew enough to do well, but did not know how to utilise their extensive knowledge effectively.

Question 5

There were some exceptional responses to this question which initially reflected on the exact implications of what 'unplanned expansionism' might imply. Those who just embarked on a survey of the motives behind the expansion found that a narrative did not work well and could lead to conclusions which bore little connection to the question posed. A mix of the broad reflection followed by good use of appropriate examples worked well in many cases and it was good to note a mix of both African and Asian examples being used in many responses.

Question 6

There was a large response to this question and those who got the right focus on the 'so' damaging part of the question did well. There were quite a lot of simple lists of the problems that the war posed for the regime, but the key to the very high marks was reflection on which elements really were most critical in ending the autocracy and above all *why* they were more damaging. A range of factors were offered, such as the impact on the army's loyalty and morale, high inflation and real hunger. Imposing a debate on a question like this was the key to success.

Question 7

As with the question above, a list of reasons produced satisfactory, but not outstanding answers. The best responses tended to identify a particular reason and argue its case, and then suggest reasons why other factors were less important. Some suggested that the majority of the German people tended to support a legitimate and authoritarian regime, and that was, at least initially, what Hitler provided. Some argued that it was his ideas and others placed more stress on his use of terror and propaganda, the carrot and the stick. There was ample scope for debate there.

Question 8

Too few responses to this question were seen to be able to produce a report.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/21

Paper 21

Key Messages

This is the final examination paper for the 9697 syllabus. If your school or college wishes to take Cambridge International Examinations AS and/or A Level History, it needs to transfer its attention to the 9389 specification, a syllabus first examined in June 2014.

General Comments

On the source-based question, it is vital to use all the sources and then to divide them into support and challenge sources. The sources must be evaluated for strengths and weaknesses and finally the conclusion should look at which sources are preferred or offer a supported alternative hypothesis.

For the essay questions, it is very important that essays are analytical and have sufficient factual material to support this analysis. There must be a clear focus on the question. Timing is important. A weak final essay may severely harm a candidate's final grade.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

This is the source-based question, and it requires candidates to use all the sources provided, and then to divide them into support and challenge sources. Some sources may both support and challenge. Having used the sources to support or challenge the hypothesis, it is also very important to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the sources. This may be achieved by looking at the provenance of the source, the type of source, the origin of the source and its purpose. This evaluation can also be achieved by using contextual knowledge to put the source in its proper historical context. To access the very highest marks, it is necessary to decide which sources are to be preferred and why, or to offer an alternative or modified hypothesis. When stating which sources are preferred, it is important to explain why and, similarly, with the alternative or modified hypothesis, it is necessary to explain the reasoning behind this. It is not sufficient to offer an alternative hypothesis without supporting material.

Question 2

This question asked candidates to assess the reasons why Siam was successful in resisting foreign colonisation while other parts of Southeast Asia were not. Answers might have focused on the geographical location, the diplomatic skills of its rulers, and the policies of modernisation. Some explanations centre on the desire of Britain and France to keep Siam as a buffer state and to avoid a common frontier by colonisation. The monarchs Rama IV (Mongkut) and Rama V (Chulalongkorn) in the period 1851–90 were able to play Britain and France off against one another. Although some concessions had to be made, the essence of the Kingdom was preserved. Siam could have been usefully compared with other areas that succumbed to colonisation. The focus of this question was on Siam, and then comparisons could have been made with other areas. The key point was to write an analytical essay, supported by relevant historical knowledge and a breadth of examples from several areas.

Question 3

This question asked candidates to assess the results of bureaucratic centralisation in colonial rule in Southeast Asia. It was a less popular question and several candidates tended towards a narrative description, rather than an analytical approach. An examination of the impact of colonial rule was needed

and, in particular, examination over a range of countries. Burma and the imposition of new political and legal systems and an Indian-style new administrative system would have been a good example; Malaya, where local power structures were less changed, albeit with greater British control, could have been another. In Dutch colonies, there was greater economic impact and less political impact. In the Philippines, there was more of a 'civilising' mission and the USA was more willing to accept a measure of devolution. Candidates might have considered administrative reforms, educational changes, transport, communications, economic control, policing and increasing political control. The varying impact of a western-model bureaucracy in each colony might have been examined, as well as the intention to institute a neutral bureaucracy. Contrasts between the British-American models and those of the French might usefully have been examined.

Question 4

This was a popular question, which asked candidates to look at the extent to which the coming of capitalism benefitted Southeast Asia under colonial rule. There were many differing factors that could have been included. The links between the primary producers and the capitalist world economy and the inevitable giving way of local markets to the world market, with the consequent exposure to new kinds of economic instability was a key issue. The wide ranging impact of the Wall Street Crash and the Great Depression from 1929 was an essential ingredient to this essay. The change from subsistence agriculture to cash crops and the volatility of the market produced much local hardship. However, the ability to be involved in cash crops such as rubber, timber, minerals, teas, opium, palm oil and oil brought new opportunities, too. Economic diversification was a key development, for example the introduction of rubber into Malaya, Siam, Vietnam, Cambodia and Sumatra, and the consequent benefit from the transport revolution in the West, which required mass tyre production. The key to a very good essay was to look at both the benefits and disadvantages that capitalism brought; this analysis needed to be supported by a broad range of examples.

Question 5

This was a very popular question, which asked candidates to assess the importance of political ideas for the growth of support for nationalism in Southeast Asia before 1941. One crucial point that some candidates missed was the date of the question. It was looking up to 1941, and not for the growth of nationalism in the Second World War or post-war nationalism. Mass nationalism was driven by the hope for improved economic conditions, social justice and participation on government. Economic policies during the colonial period had, in many cases, lowered living standards; yet educational provision had increased the access to new ideas. Increasing access to Higher Education in Western Europe had allowed knowledge of the French and American revolutions to be disseminated. The educated classes were able to discuss the past and this led to a growth in nationalism. The improvement in communications led to the wider propagation of nationalist ideas and knowledge of key events such as The Boxer Rebellion and the Russian Revolution, as well as resistance movements in India. The First World War led to greater breadth of ideas: self-determination and Marxism and consequent demands for change. Communism, anti-clericalism, socio-economic grievances, resentment against colonial rule and greater historical awareness all led to a growth in nationalism. The focus of the essay had, primarily, to be on ideas such as liberalism, socialism, self-determination and European nationalism and their impact.

Question 6

This was another very popular question, as it asked candidates to assess the impact of the Second World War on the growth of nationalism in Southeast Asia. The war revealed European weaknesses and the defeats by the Japanese encouraged nationalism. Japanese policies also played a key role, encouraging local regionalism and the recruitment of political leaders by the Japanese. Nationalists in Indonesia and Burma had access to the radio to propagate their ideas and create mass movements. The Japanese recruited young people who were resistant to the return of the colonial powers. Other groups resisted the Japanese, for example the communists in Vietnam. Co-operation by some groups with the West led to concessions in the Philippines, which gained independence in 1946. Britain accepted the independence of India and Burma, but not that of Malaya. The essay could have highlighted that there were greater changes in some areas than others. As well as nationalism, candidates could usefully look at pre-war nationalism, the changing attitude to colonialism in the West and the different socio-economic context after 1945. The war could have been seen as important for what happened under Japanese rule or the weakening of the European colonial powers. The key was to look at not only the impact of the war, but also at other factors, and to examine nationalism alongside socio-economic and geo-political factors.

Question 7

This question was not widely attempted. It asked candidates to assess the significance of import substitution policies in promoting economic development in Southeast Asia after 1945. Candidates needed to look at the motivation of Southeast Asia and the broad range of factors that affected economic growth. There was a desire for economic growth, restructuring of economies and the promotion of industry. The key elements were economic nationalism, a belief in central planning and a commitment to state intervention in the immediate post-independence period. Policies varied, but included: discrimination against non-native producers and restrictions on Indian and Chinese immigration; efforts to foster heavy industry and to establish a fairer distribution of wealth. Initially, there was much central control and investment. Primary production and then export-based industries were promoted. At the same time, the growth in the world economy helped stimulate demand for tropical products. A broad trend towards industry and services and away from agricultural production could have been examined and explained. As well as Import Substitution, the role of urbanisation and greater economic diversification, together with the growth of globalism, could have been compared and contrasted. Answers needed to offer an analysis of the key factor, but might also have contrasted this with other elements in economic growth after 1945.

Question 8

This was a popular question. It needed the candidates to look at the variety of causes of tension and disputes between the newly-independent states. Candidates could have looked at Indonesia's invasion of East Timor, conflicts between The Philippines and Malaysia, and also between Malaysia and Singapore. Disputes in the South China Sea over energy between Brunei, Indonesia, Malaya, The Philippines and Vietnam could have been analysed. Naval clashes, refugee problems and internal conflict, spilling into international conflict (for example the Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia), all provided further material that candidates could usefully have used and analysed. Better answers considered the different types of conflict and their causes, rather than just describing a series of conflicts. As always, analysis is to be preferred over simple narrative. There needed to be a clear focus on economic factors, but then an examination of other factors that have brought about tension and conflict, and all needed to be supported by a wide range of examples.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/22

Paper 22

Key Messages

This is the final examination paper for the 9697 syllabus. If your school or college wishes to take Cambridge International Examinations AS and/or A Level History, it needs to transfer its attention to the 9389 specification, a syllabus first examined in June 2014.

General Comments

On the source-based question, it is vital to use all the sources and then to divide them into support and challenge sources. The sources must be evaluated for strengths and weaknesses and finally the conclusion should look at which sources are preferred or offer a supported alternative hypothesis.

For the essay questions, it is very important that essays are analytical and have sufficient factual material to support this analysis. There must be a clear focus on the question. Timing is important. A weak final essay may severely harm a candidate's final grade.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

This is the source-based question, and it requires candidates to use all the sources provided, and then to divide them into support and challenge sources. Some sources may both support and challenge. Having used the sources to support or challenge the hypothesis, it is also very important to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the sources. This may be achieved by looking at the provenance of the source, the type of source, the origin of the source and its purpose. This evaluation can also be achieved by using contextual knowledge to put the source in its proper historical context. To access the very highest marks, it is necessary to decide which sources are to be preferred and why, or to offer an alternative or modified hypothesis. When stating which sources are preferred, it is important to explain why and, similarly, with the alternative or modified hypothesis, it is necessary to explain the reasoning behind this. It is not sufficient to offer an alternative hypothesis without supporting material.

Question 2

This question asked candidates to assess the reasons why Siam was successful in resisting foreign colonisation while other parts of Southeast Asia were not. Answers might have focused on the geographical location, the diplomatic skills of its rulers, and the policies of modernisation. Some explanations centre on the desire of Britain and France to keep Siam as a buffer state and to avoid a common frontier by colonisation. The monarchs Rama IV (Mongkut) and Rama V (Chulalongkorn) in the period 1851–90 were able to play Britain and France off against one another. Although some concessions had to be made, the essence of the Kingdom was preserved. Siam could have been usefully compared with other areas that succumbed to colonisation. The focus of this question was on Siam, and then comparisons could have been made with other areas. The key point was to write an analytical essay, supported by relevant historical knowledge and a breadth of examples from several areas.

Question 3

This question asked candidates to assess the results of bureaucratic centralisation in colonial rule in Southeast Asia. It was a less popular question and several candidates tended towards a narrative description, rather than an analytical approach. An examination of the impact of colonial rule was needed

and, in particular, examination over a range of countries. Burma and the imposition of new political and legal systems and an Indian-style new administrative system would have been a good example; Malaya, where local power structures were less changed, albeit with greater British control, could have been another. In Dutch colonies, there was greater economic impact and less political impact. In the Philippines, there was more of a 'civilising' mission and the USA was more willing to accept a measure of devolution. Candidates might have considered administrative reforms, educational changes, transport, communications, economic control, policing and increasing political control. The varying impact of a western-model bureaucracy in each colony might have been examined, as well as the intention to institute a neutral bureaucracy. Contrasts between the British-American models and those of the French might usefully have been examined.

Question 4

This was a popular question, which asked candidates to look at the extent to which the coming of capitalism benefitted Southeast Asia under colonial rule. There were many differing factors that could have been included. The links between the primary producers and the capitalist world economy and the inevitable giving way of local markets to the world market, with the consequent exposure to new kinds of economic instability was a key issue. The wide ranging impact of the Wall Street Crash and the Great Depression from 1929 was an essential ingredient to this essay. The change from subsistence agriculture to cash crops and the volatility of the market produced much local hardship. However, the ability to be involved in cash crops such as rubber, timber, minerals, teas, opium, palm oil and oil brought new opportunities, too. Economic diversification was a key development, for example the introduction of rubber into Malaya, Siam, Vietnam, Cambodia and Sumatra, and the consequent benefit from the transport revolution in the West, which required mass tyre production. The key to a very good essay was to look at both the benefits and disadvantages that capitalism brought; this analysis needed to be supported by a broad range of examples.

Question 5

This was a very popular question, which asked candidates to assess the importance of political ideas for the growth of support for nationalism in Southeast Asia before 1941. One crucial point that some candidates missed was the date of the question. It was looking up to 1941, and not for the growth of nationalism in the Second World War or post-war nationalism. Mass nationalism was driven by the hope for improved economic conditions, social justice and participation on government. Economic policies during the colonial period had, in many cases, lowered living standards; yet educational provision had increased the access to new ideas. Increasing access to Higher Education in Western Europe had allowed knowledge of the French and American revolutions to be disseminated. The educated classes were able to discuss the past and this led to a growth in nationalism. The improvement in communications led to the wider propagation of nationalist ideas and knowledge of key events such as The Boxer Rebellion and the Russian Revolution, as well as resistance movements in India. The First World War led to greater breadth of ideas: self-determination and Marxism and consequent demands for change. Communism, anti-clericalism, socio-economic grievances, resentment against colonial rule and greater historical awareness all led to a growth in nationalism. The focus of the essay had, primarily, to be on ideas such as liberalism, socialism, self-determination and European nationalism and their impact.

Question 6

This was another very popular question, as it asked candidates to assess the impact of the Second World War on the growth of nationalism in Southeast Asia. The war revealed European weaknesses and the defeats by the Japanese encouraged nationalism. Japanese policies also played a key role, encouraging local regionalism and the recruitment of political leaders by the Japanese. Nationalists in Indonesia and Burma had access to the radio to propagate their ideas and create mass movements. The Japanese recruited young people who were resistant to the return of the colonial powers. Other groups resisted the Japanese, for example the communists in Vietnam. Co-operation by some groups with the West led to concessions in the Philippines, which gained independence in 1946. Britain accepted the independence of India and Burma, but not that of Malaya. The essay could have highlighted that there were greater changes in some areas than others. As well as nationalism, candidates could usefully look at pre-war nationalism, the changing attitude to colonialism in the West and the different socio-economic context after 1945. The war could have been seen as important for what happened under Japanese rule or the weakening of the European colonial powers. The key was to look at not only the impact of the war, but also at other factors, and to examine nationalism alongside socio-economic and geo-political factors.

Question 7

This question was not widely attempted. It asked candidates to assess the significance of import substitution policies in promoting economic development in Southeast Asia after 1945. Candidates needed to look at the motivation of Southeast Asia and the broad range of factors that affected economic growth. There was a desire for economic growth, restructuring of economies and the promotion of industry. The key elements were economic nationalism, a belief in central planning and a commitment to state intervention in the immediate post-independence period. Policies varied, but included: discrimination against non-native producers and restrictions on Indian and Chinese immigration; efforts to foster heavy industry and to establish a fairer distribution of wealth. Initially, there was much central control and investment. Primary production and then export-based industries were promoted. At the same time, the growth in the world economy helped stimulate demand for tropical products. A broad trend towards industry and services and away from agricultural production could have been examined and explained. As well as Import Substitution, the role of urbanisation and greater economic diversification, together with the growth of globalism, could have been compared and contrasted. Answers needed to offer an analysis of the key factor, but might also have contrasted this with other elements in economic growth after 1945.

Question 8

This was a popular question. It needed the candidates to look at the variety of causes of tension and disputes between the newly-independent states. Candidates could have looked at Indonesia's invasion of East Timor, conflicts between The Philippines and Malaysia, and also between Malaysia and Singapore. Disputes in the South China Sea over energy between Brunei, Indonesia, Malaya, The Philippines and Vietnam could have been analysed. Naval clashes, refugee problems and internal conflict, spilling into international conflict (for example the Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia), all provided further material that candidates could usefully have used and analysed. Better answers considered the different types of conflict and their causes, rather than just describing a series of conflicts. As always, analysis is to be preferred over simple narrative. There needed to be a clear focus on economic factors, but then an examination of other factors that have brought about tension and conflict, and all needed to be supported by a wide range of examples.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/23

Paper 23

Key Messages

This is the final examination paper for the 9697 syllabus. If your school or college wishes to take Cambridge International Examinations AS and/or A Level History, it needs to transfer its attention to the 9389 specification, a syllabus first examined in June 2014.

General Comments

On the source-based question, it is vital to use all the sources and then to divide them into support and challenge sources. The sources must be evaluated for strengths and weaknesses and finally the conclusion should look at which sources are preferred or offer a supported alternative hypothesis.

For the essay questions, it is very important that essays are analytical and have sufficient factual material to support this analysis. There must be a clear focus on the question. Timing is important. A weak final essay may severely harm a candidate's final grade.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A

Question 1

This is the source-based question, and it requires candidates to use all the sources provided, and then to divide them into support and challenge sources. Some sources may both support and challenge. Having used the sources to support or challenge the hypothesis, it is also very important to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of the sources. This may be achieved by looking at the provenance of the source, the type of source, the origin of the source and its purpose. This evaluation can also be achieved by using contextual knowledge to put the source in its proper historical context. To access the very highest marks, it is necessary to decide which sources are to be preferred and why, or to offer an alternative or modified hypothesis. When stating which sources are preferred, it is important to explain why and, similarly, with the alternative or modified hypothesis, it is necessary to explain the reasoning behind this. It is not sufficient to offer an alternative hypothesis without supporting material.

Question 2

This question asked candidates to assess the reasons why Siam was successful in resisting foreign colonisation while other parts of Southeast Asia were not. Answers might have focused on the geographical location, the diplomatic skills of its rulers, and the policies of modernisation. Some explanations centre on the desire of Britain and France to keep Siam as a buffer state and to avoid a common frontier by colonisation. The monarchs Rama IV (Mongkut) and Rama V (Chulalongkorn) in the period 1851–90 were able to play Britain and France off against one another. Although some concessions had to be made, the essence of the Kingdom was preserved. Siam could have been usefully compared with other areas that succumbed to colonisation. The focus of this question was on Siam, and then comparisons could have been made with other areas. The key point was to write an analytical essay, supported by relevant historical knowledge and a breadth of examples from several areas.

Question 3

This question asked candidates to assess the results of bureaucratic centralisation in colonial rule in Southeast Asia. It was a less popular question and several candidates tended towards a narrative description, rather than an analytical approach. An examination of the impact of colonial rule was needed

and, in particular, examination over a range of countries. Burma and the imposition of new political and legal systems and an Indian-style new administrative system would have been a good example; Malaya, where local power structures were less changed, albeit with greater British control, could have been another. In Dutch colonies, there was greater economic impact and less political impact. In the Philippines, there was more of a 'civilising' mission and the USA was more willing to accept a measure of devolution. Candidates might have considered administrative reforms, educational changes, transport, communications, economic control, policing and increasing political control. The varying impact of a western-model bureaucracy in each colony might have been examined, as well as the intention to institute a neutral bureaucracy. Contrasts between the British-American models and those of the French might usefully have been examined.

Question 4

This was a popular question, which asked candidates to look at the extent to which the coming of capitalism benefitted Southeast Asia under colonial rule. There were many differing factors that could have been included. The links between the primary producers and the capitalist world economy and the inevitable giving way of local markets to the world market, with the consequent exposure to new kinds of economic instability was a key issue. The wide ranging impact of the Wall Street Crash and the Great Depression from 1929 was an essential ingredient to this essay. The change from subsistence agriculture to cash crops and the volatility of the market produced much local hardship. However, the ability to be involved in cash crops such as rubber, timber, minerals, teas, opium, palm oil and oil brought new opportunities, too. Economic diversification was a key development, for example the introduction of rubber into Malaya, Siam, Vietnam, Cambodia and Sumatra, and the consequent benefit from the transport revolution in the West, which required mass tyre production. The key to a very good essay was to look at both the benefits and disadvantages that capitalism brought; this analysis needed to be supported by a broad range of examples.

Question 5

This was a very popular question, which asked candidates to assess the importance of political ideas for the growth of support for nationalism in Southeast Asia before 1941. One crucial point that some candidates missed was the date of the question. It was looking up to 1941, and not for the growth of nationalism in the Second World War or post-war nationalism. Mass nationalism was driven by the hope for improved economic conditions, social justice and participation on government. Economic policies during the colonial period had, in many cases, lowered living standards; yet educational provision had increased the access to new ideas. Increasing access to Higher Education in Western Europe had allowed knowledge of the French and American revolutions to be disseminated. The educated classes were able to discuss the past and this led to a growth in nationalism. The improvement in communications led to the wider propagation of nationalist ideas and knowledge of key events such as The Boxer Rebellion and the Russian Revolution, as well as resistance movements in India. The First World War led to greater breadth of ideas: self-determination and Marxism and consequent demands for change. Communism, anti-clericalism, socio-economic grievances, resentment against colonial rule and greater historical awareness all led to a growth in nationalism. The focus of the essay had, primarily, to be on ideas such as liberalism, socialism, self-determination and European nationalism and their impact.

Question 6

This was another very popular question, as it asked candidates to assess the impact of the Second World War on the growth of nationalism in Southeast Asia. The war revealed European weaknesses and the defeats by the Japanese encouraged nationalism. Japanese policies also played a key role, encouraging local regionalism and the recruitment of political leaders by the Japanese. Nationalists in Indonesia and Burma had access to the radio to propagate their ideas and create mass movements. The Japanese recruited young people who were resistant to the return of the colonial powers. Other groups resisted the Japanese, for example the communists in Vietnam. Co-operation by some groups with the West led to concessions in the Philippines, which gained independence in 1946. Britain accepted the independence of India and Burma, but not that of Malaya. The essay could have highlighted that there were greater changes in some areas than others. As well as nationalism, candidates could usefully look at pre-war nationalism, the changing attitude to colonialism in the West and the different socio-economic context after 1945. The war could have been seen as important for what happened under Japanese rule or the weakening of the European colonial powers. The key was to look at not only the impact of the war, but also at other factors, and to examine nationalism alongside socio-economic and geo-political factors.

Question 7

This question was not widely attempted. It asked candidates to assess the significance of import substitution policies in promoting economic development in Southeast Asia after 1945. Candidates needed to look at the motivation of Southeast Asia and the broad range of factors that affected economic growth. There was a desire for economic growth, restructuring of economies and the promotion of industry. The key elements were economic nationalism, a belief in central planning and a commitment to state intervention in the immediate post-independence period. Policies varied, but included: discrimination against non-native producers and restrictions on Indian and Chinese immigration; efforts to foster heavy industry and to establish a fairer distribution of wealth. Initially, there was much central control and investment. Primary production and then export-based industries were promoted. At the same time, the growth in the world economy helped stimulate demand for tropical products. A broad trend towards industry and services and away from agricultural production could have been examined and explained. As well as Import Substitution, the role of urbanisation and greater economic diversification, together with the growth of globalism, could have been compared and contrasted. Answers needed to offer an analysis of the key factor, but might also have contrasted this with other elements in economic growth after 1945.

Question 8

This was a popular question. It needed the candidates to look at the variety of causes of tension and disputes between the newly-independent states. Candidates could have looked at Indonesia's invasion of East Timor, conflicts between The Philippines and Malaysia, and also between Malaysia and Singapore. Disputes in the South China Sea over energy between Brunei, Indonesia, Malaya, The Philippines and Vietnam could have been analysed. Naval clashes, refugee problems and internal conflict, spilling into international conflict (for example the Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia), all provided further material that candidates could usefully have used and analysed. Better answers considered the different types of conflict and their causes, rather than just describing a series of conflicts. As always, analysis is to be preferred over simple narrative. There needed to be a clear focus on economic factors, but then an examination of other factors that have brought about tension and conflict, and all needed to be supported by a wide range of examples.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/31

Paper 31

Key Messages

Section A

Candidates did best when they went beyond a basic face-value interpretation of the sources and developed balanced arguments which were fully focused on the hypothesis in the question.

Section B

Candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are fully supported by accurate factual detail.

General Comments

Most candidates deployed their time effectively, spending an appropriate amount of time on each question, only a small minority failing to complete a fourth response. Very few candidates misread or ignored the rubric instruction not to answer both **Question 3 and Question 4**.

The overall standard was satisfactory, although there was considerable variation in the quality of scripts. The most effective responses to the source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**) came from candidates who began by reading through all of the sources carefully, recording relevant information on a structured plan. This enabled them to display a clear and complete understanding of both sides of the argument, thereby ensuring that their responses were balanced and fully focused on the actual question throughout. Candidates who simply read and wrote about each source in turn invariably found it difficult to remain focused on the given hypothesis. Many candidates were able to go beyond 'face value' and interpret the sources fully in their historical context through provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and the effective deployment of appropriate contextual knowledge.

The best answers to the essay questions in **Section B** contained clear, consistent and sustained arguments which were fully focused on the requirements of the actual question and based on a balanced analysis of appropriate factual material. It is no coincidence that most such responses were preceded by a plan. Many responses relied too heavily on a narrative/descriptive approach, in which the appropriate and accurate factual material which they contained was not explicitly used to address the demands of the specific question set. A characteristic of weaker scripts was the lack of appropriate factual knowledge, so that responses tended to consist largely of vague and generalised statements or unsupported assertions.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Sources C and D were generally perceived as providing the strongest support for the hypothesis, arguing that U Thant was responsible for a major decline in the UN's credibility and financial stability as a result of his consistently weak approach to peacekeeping activities. The majority of candidates interpreted Sources A and B as providing further evidence of U Thant's ineffectiveness as UN Secretary-General. Conversely, Source E was universally seen as challenging the hypothesis by praising all aspects of U Thant's leadership of the UN, not least by maintaining its peacekeeping role at a time of extremely high international tension. As a result, the majority of responses tended to be rather unbalanced, with only limited evidence provided to challenge the hypothesis.

The most impressive responses contained a detailed analysis of the sources, based on effective provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and appropriate use of contextual knowledge. This enabled the development of more balanced arguments. Rather than an admission of failure, many candidates interpreted Source B as indicative of U Thant's frustration that key members of the UN were not keeping to the agreements they made when signing the Charter. Contextual knowledge was often used to show how U Thant's ten years in office witnessed a series of major world crises. Divisions within the Security Council, it was commonly argued, made it almost impossible for the UN to take effective action. The USA's effective dominance over the UN at the time (clearly evidenced in Source A) was often quoted as an example of the limitations imposed on U Thant; some candidates saw his attempts to challenge this dominance by allowing 'Red China' into the UN, together with his critical statements regarding American involvement in Vietnam, as the reason for growing American hostility towards him, as reflected in Source D. The fact that U Thant had been unanimously re-elected for a second term in office was used by some candidates to support the view that Source D's allegation that 'U Thant's only genuine supporters here were the Russians, and they only wanted him because he gave them no trouble' was the product of American bias. Similarly, Source A was often used to challenge the allegation in Source D that U Thant did little to confront the outbreak of hostilities; U Thant is clearly depicted in the cartoon making strenuous efforts to prevent confrontation between India and Pakistan.

It was evident that most candidates were aware of the need to go beyond a basic 'face value' interpretation of the sources, but their attempts to do so were often unconvincing. It was widely appreciated that Source E, as an extract from a Burmese newspaper, was unlikely to be critical of U Thant. This led many candidates to simply dismiss Source E as biased and, therefore, unreliable. Responses based on more detailed analysis demonstrated how such praise of U Thant is also reflected in Source B ('Now many rank him with Hammarskjold in ability and achievement'). Many candidates argued that Source C must be accurate and reliable because it contains facts; responses based on deeper analysis appreciated that what appears at face value to be facts are actually interpretations/opinions, and that, given the title of the article from which the extract is taken, it is not surprising that the source is heavily critical of U Thant.

Section B

Question 2

Virtually all candidates attempted this question and most were able to display sound knowledge of what the Marshall Plan entailed and the role which it played in escalating early Cold War tensions. The most impressive responses were fully-focused on the requirements of the question, providing a balanced assessment of the USA's motives for introducing the Plan. This involved providing evidence to demonstrate how and why Soviet expansionism in Eastern Europe posed a threat to American interests, together with detailed analysis of whether there was any justification for the USSR's branding of the Marshall Plan as 'dollar imperialism'. A small number of candidates argued very effectively that the two possible motives in the question are not mutually exclusive, that the USA needed to respond to Soviet expansionism precisely because of the threat which it posed to American economic interests in Europe. The majority of responses tended to lack balance, most arguing that the Marshall Plan was simply a part of the Truman Doctrine and, therefore, intended to prevent further Soviet expansion in Europe. Generally, the issue of American economic interests in Europe was less well understood. Weaker responses tended to ignore the specific question and write more generally about the development of the Cold War in the immediate post-war period, often based on a summary narrative of the historical debate.

Question 3

This question attracted a relatively large number of candidates, some of whom were able to produce excellent responses. These were based on a thorough understanding of the ways in which decolonisation created a power vacuum to which both the USA and the USSR needed to respond in order to preserve their international prestige and maintain their economic and political interests. Appropriate evidence was provided to support fully-focused arguments, some candidates even referring to the struggle for dominance in the UN which resulted from the influx of so many new members. Balance was created by analysis of the relative significance of other factors which encouraged Cold War globalisation. The majority of responses, however, tended to be more generalised and less-focused on the specific issue of decolonisation. Most candidates were able to write about a wide range of Cold War issues (Korea, Vietnam, the Middle East, Latin America, Africa), often in considerable detail, but were unable to link their factual knowledge to the specific demands of the actual question. A significantly large number of responses seemed to be addressing the rather different question of whether the USA or the USSR should be deemed responsible for globalising the Cold War.

Question 4

Most candidates were able to display generally sound factual knowledge relating to the Korean War. Perhaps as a result of this, the majority of responses tended to comprise narrative accounts of the war itself, focus on the specific requirements of the actual question being implicit only or confined to conclusions. The most impressive responses were characterised by clear differentiation between the two elements in the question, balanced analysis and deployment of factual knowledge, leading to the emergence of clear, well-supported judgements. A significantly large number of candidates wrote convincingly about who might be held responsible for the outbreak of the war, but provided little regarding its outcome beyond the basic fact that Korea remained divided at the 38th parallel. In particular, the role played by China was often not well understood. The weakest responses relied too heavily on assertion and/or historical inaccuracy; for example, the claim that Stalin 'ordered' Kim to invade South Korea as a way to further his own ambition for Soviet expansionism was not uncommon.

Question 5

Responses to this relatively popular question varied enormously in quality. The most effective were based on a clear understanding of what the 'crisis of communism' actually entailed, the ways in which the problems facing the USSR and China were similar but different and the motives behind the strategies adopted by Gorbachev and Deng. The majority of responses, while containing much the same factual detail, tended to be based on a more narrative approach, the reforms of Gorbachev and Deng outlined separately; as a result, there was only implicit reference to the 'compare and contrast' element of the question. The lack of analytical depth in such responses was evident in the common conclusion that the reason why Chinese communism survived the crisis while the USSR collapsed was simply because of the different policies adopted by Gorbachev and Deng. The weakest responses came from candidates who lacked understanding of the phrase 'crisis of communism' and ignored the timeframe given in the question. For example, it was not uncommon for candidates to write about the deteriorating relationships between Mao and Khrushchev which led to the Sino-Soviet split.

Question 6

This was a very popular question, and most candidates were able to produce balanced responses. The range, depth and accuracy of the factual support provided for the arguments which emerged, however, varied enormously in quality. The most impressive responses tended to view the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 as a watershed event, marking the end of brinkmanship and the emergence of a realisation that nuclear weapons and their proliferation needed to be controlled. The concept of MAD and the development of a series of treaties after 1962 were commonly seen as a reflection of this realisation, leading to détente and the use of nuclear weapons simply as a deterrent. While most candidates realised the importance of outlining the attempts to control nuclear weapons, coverage of the various treaties, their aims and impact, was often lacking in depth and, sometimes, assertive. For example, a common assertion was that the Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty made the world safer because it prevented non-nuclear countries from developing nuclear weapons. The weakest responses were characterised by generalisations lacking in factual support.

Question 7

This question was attempted by a relatively small number of candidates. Most were able to provide evidence to show the crucial role which the USA played in developing the international economy during the immediate post-World War II period. The significance of American aid and influence through the IMF, the World Bank and GATT was widely understood. The most impressive responses were able to show how American dominance over the international economy began to decline after the 1970s as a result of its own financial problems in the wake of the Vietnam War and the emergence of competitor economies, such as Europe, Japan and the Asian Tigers. Most responses, however, lacked coverage of the later period and were, therefore, significantly unbalanced.

Question 8

Responses to this question, addressed by a relatively small number of candidates, varied enormously in quality. Some candidates were able to produce sustained, fully-focused and balanced arguments, supported by appropriate factual material. The majority of responses, however, appeared to be based on the assumption that the 'inexperience and ambitions' of rulers was indeed the cause of the problems confronting newly-independent states, and, as a result, did not consider other factors which might have provided a counter-argument. The weakest responses were characterised by vague generalisations, unsupported by evidence in the form of specific examples.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/32

Paper 32

Key Messages

Section A: Candidates did best when they went beyond a basic face-value interpretation of the sources and developed balanced arguments which were fully focused on the hypothesis in the question.

Section B: Candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.

General Comments

In line with the requirements of the examination paper, the majority of candidates attempted the compulsory Source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**) and three of the essay questions from **Section B**. Most candidates deployed their time effectively, spending an appropriate amount of time on each question, only a small minority failing to complete a fourth response. Very few candidates misread or ignored the rubric instruction not to answer both **Question 3 and Question 4**.

The overall standard was satisfactory, although there was considerable variation in the quality of scripts. The most effective responses to the source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**) came from candidates who began by reading through all of the sources carefully, recording relevant information on a structured plan. This enabled them to display a clear and complete understanding of both sides of the argument, thereby ensuring that their responses were balanced and fully focused on the actual question throughout. Candidates who simply read and wrote about each source in turn invariably found it difficult to remain focused on the given hypothesis. Many candidates were able to go beyond 'face value' and interpret the sources fully in their historical context through provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and the effective deployment of appropriate contextual knowledge. Some candidates were clearly aware of the need to apply such analytical depth to their evaluation of the sources, but were unable to achieve this convincingly, relying almost exclusively on vague and unsubstantiated assertions regarding source reliability.

The best answers to the essay questions in **Section B** contained clear, consistent and sustained arguments which were fully focused on the requirements of the actual question and based on a balanced analysis of appropriate factual material. It is no coincidence that most such responses were preceded by a plan. Most responses relied too heavily on a narrative/descriptive approach, in which the appropriate and accurate factual material which they contained was not explicitly used to address the demands of the specific question set. A characteristic of weaker scripts was the lack of appropriate factual knowledge, so that responses tended to consist largely of vague and generalised statements or unsupported assertions.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Most candidates were able to produce balanced responses. Sources C and D were generally perceived as offering the strongest support for the hypothesis, arguing that the Resolution clearly stated that it was not acceptable for any country to acquire territory by war and that it therefore demanded 'a complete withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from all the territories' occupied during the Six Day War. Conversely, Source A's claim that Resolution 242 'did not require a total Israeli withdrawal' was universally seen as offering the strongest challenge to the hypothesis. Interpretations of Sources B and E varied enormously. Some candidates argued that, in introducing the Resolution to the Security Council, the UK delegation's intention was to ensure that

Israel withdrew from all of the occupied territory, while others suggested that the UK did not see such a withdrawal as an essential precursor of subsequent negotiations to create lasting peace in the region.

The most impressive responses contained a detailed analysis of the sources, based on effective provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and appropriate use of contextual knowledge. It was widely noted, for example, that Cold War rivalry existed in the Middle East at the time of the Six Day War, the USA siding with Israel while the USSR supported the Arab states. It was evident that most candidates were aware of the need to go beyond a basic 'face value' interpretation of the sources, but their attempts to do so were often unconvincing. For example, many candidates argued that Source A must be reliable because it was written, with the advantage of hindsight and time to undertake research, by an expert in international law, an argument which misses the significance of the writer's Israeli perspective. Similarly, it was widely suggested that Source D must be biased and unreliable because it comes from a representative of the USSR; without explanation regarding *how* and *why* the Source is biased, such statements are simply unsupported assertions. Another very common assertion was that Lord Caradon in Source E was seeking to make excuses for the weaknesses in the Resolution which he, as the UK's representative at the UN, had introduced. Responses based on deeper analysis suggested that the UK's main aim was to establish lasting peace in the Middle East, something which Lord Caradon did not believe would be achieved by simply returning to the pre-Six Day War boundaries.

Section B

Question 2

This was a popular question. The most impressive responses came from candidates who fully appreciated that the question demanded a detailed analysis of Truman's possible motives for instituting the Doctrine. This facilitated the development of fully-focused and balanced arguments. The majority of candidates based their responses on a narrative account of the historical debate; while this was clearly both relevant and appropriate, it did cause many answers to drift off the precise requirements of the question into more general accounts of the causes of the Cold War. Many responses tended to focus on Stalin's motives for taking control over Eastern Europe, debating whether his intention was simply to create a security 'buffer zone' or to encourage Soviet expansionism. Again, this was perfectly appropriate, but it was also necessary to explain why the USA would feel concerned by Stalin's actions, whatever their motive. While most candidates referred to the phrase 'dollar imperialism', relatively few explained its meaning or its implication as a possible motive for Truman's anti-Soviet stance. The weakest responses were characterised by unsupported assertions and chronological confusion.

Question 3

The quality of responses to this question varied enormously. The most impressive were characterised by clear understanding of the various factors which led to the ending of détente in the 1970s, together with focused analysis of the relative significance of actions taken by both the USA and the USSR. This facilitated the development of fully-focused and balanced arguments. The majority of responses lacked such range, depth and balance, the most common argument being that détente was ended as a result of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. A sizeable minority of candidates ignored the timeframe given in the question and wrote about earlier periods of détente.

Question 4

This was a popular question and most candidates appreciated that, in order to ensure balance, it was necessary to evaluate the relative culpability of Kennedy and Khrushchev as well as that of Castro himself. The most impressive responses were able to achieve this very effectively, deploying appropriate factual knowledge to support the development of a sustained and fully-focused argument. This usually involved in-depth analysis of the motives behind the ways in which the three leaders addressed the Cuban issue, as well as the impact of their actions. The majority of responses, while containing much the same factual detail, tended to be less focused on the specific requirements of the actual question, the extent of Castro's responsibility explicitly considered only in the conclusion following a largely narrative account of the crisis itself. The weakest responses were characterised by assertions based on limited or inaccurate factual support.

Question 5

Most candidates were able to display sound knowledge of the various factors which led to deteriorating relations between China and the USSR. The majority of responses adopted a largely narrative approach so that focus on the precise requirements of the actual question was implicit only or confined to introductions and conclusions. The most successful responses were characterised by detailed analysis of the relative significance of the two countries' perceptions of communism and the ways in which these magnified other contentious issues, facilitating the development of balanced and well-supported arguments.

Question 6

The most impressive responses came from candidates who demonstrated a clear understanding of the term 'proliferation' and were, as a result, able to produce balanced arguments which were fully-focused on the precise requirements of the question. The majority of candidates wrote more generally, often in considerable detail, about attempts to control the **development** of nuclear weapons, so that relevance to the key issue of proliferation was, at best, implicit only. As in previous years, coverage of the various treaties was often marred by chronological confusion and unsupported assertions regarding their impact.

Question 7

There were some impressive responses, based on a balanced assessment of appropriate factual evidence. Several candidates were able to show understanding of the various factors which adversely affected the American economy after the 1970s, but did not then demonstrate how these factors impacted on the USA's dominant role within the international economy. The weakest responses were characterised by vague generalisations and unsupported assertions.

Question 8

There were too few responses to this question to allow for appropriate general comments.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/33

Paper 33

Key Messages

Section A: Candidates did best when they went beyond a basic face-value interpretation of the sources and developed balanced arguments which were fully focused on the hypothesis in the question.

Section B: Candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are fully supported by accurate factual detail.

General Comments

Most candidates deployed their time effectively, spending an appropriate amount of time on each question, only a small minority failing to complete a fourth response. The overall standard was satisfactory, although there was considerable variation in the quality of scripts. The most effective responses to the source-based question (**Section A: Question 1**) came from candidates who began by reading through all of the sources carefully, recording relevant information on a structured plan. This enabled them to display a clear and complete understanding of both sides of the argument, thereby ensuring that their responses were balanced and fully focused on the actual question throughout. Candidates who simply read and wrote about each source in turn invariably found it difficult to remain focused on the given hypothesis. Many candidates were able to go beyond 'face value' and interpret the sources fully in their historical context through provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and the effective deployment of appropriate contextual knowledge. Some candidates were clearly aware of the need to apply such analytical depth to their evaluation of the sources, but were unable to achieve this convincingly, relying almost exclusively on vague and unsubstantiated assertions regarding source reliability.

The best answers to the essay questions in **Section B** contained clear, consistent and sustained arguments which were fully focused on the requirements of the actual question and based on a balanced analysis of appropriate factual material. It is no coincidence that most such responses were preceded by a plan. Most responses relied too heavily on a narrative/descriptive approach, in which the appropriate and accurate factual material which they contained was not explicitly used to address the demands of the specific question set.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Most candidates were able to produce balanced responses which were focused on the requirements of the question. Sources B and C were generally perceived as offering the strongest support to the hypothesis, representatives of both the USSR and Venezuela extending a warm welcome to new members of the UN. Conversely, Sources D and E were seen as challenging the hypothesis, the USA and its western allies fearing that the influx of so many new members threatened their effective control over the UN. Most candidates suggested that Source A held a balanced view, the USSR seeing the influx of new members as an opportunity to extend its own influence within the UN while the USA interpreted it as a threat to its dominance.

The most impressive responses contained a detailed analysis of the sources, based on effective provenance evaluation, cross-referencing and appropriate use of contextual knowledge. It was widely noted, for example, that Khrushchev (Source B) had a vested interest in portraying the Soviet Union as an ardent supporter of newly-independent states since this would help to extend the USSR's international influence, both inside and outside the UN. Some candidates saw this as an attempt to 'shift the international balance of power in favour

of the Soviet Union' as suggested in Source A, not least because of Khrushchev's sarcastically emotive comment that 'certain Western countries' were contemplating ways to limit the number of newly-independent states being admitted into the UN. The divisive effects of Cold War rivalry within the UN were commonly perceived as a reason for the Venezuelan representative's warm welcome to new members. Some candidates were able to show how it was the possibility of growing General Assembly power (the 'tyranny of the majority') which so alarmed the USA as outlined in Sources D and E.

It was evident that most candidates were aware of the need to go beyond a basic 'face value' interpretation of the sources, but their attempts to do so were often unconvincing. For example, many candidates suggested that, as an article from the US Department of State, Source A must inevitably be biased; without evidence to show *how* the article is biased, such statements are simply unsupported assertions. Similarly, it was widely claimed that Source B is unreliable because it is taken from a speech by the Soviet leader; again, it was necessary to provide detailed explanation of, and justification for, such a claim.

Section B

Question 2

Most candidates were able to display sound knowledge of the issues and events which led to increasing tensions between the USA and the USSR during the immediate post-war period. The most impressive responses were characterised by analytical depth and balanced assessment of appropriate factual evidence, leading to the development of clear, sustained and well-argued judgements. Most responses, while containing much the same factual detail, lacked such depth; for example, the reasons why the USA interpreted Soviet actions in Eastern Europe as a threat to American interests were not explained. Many candidates focused almost exclusively on Stalin's motives for taking control over large areas of Eastern Europe, debating whether they were aggressive or based on the Soviet need for security. While clearly relevant to the question, this approach meant that American policies, such as the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan, were assumed to be in response to Soviet actions; Truman's other possible motives, such as maintaining and strengthening American economic influence in Europe, were often neglected. Some candidates based their answers on a descriptive account of the historical debate so that relevance to the specific requirements of the actual question was, at best, implicit only.

Question 3

The most effective responses came from candidates who were able to create balance in two different ways – firstly, by demonstrating how factors other than American actions were also responsible for globalising the Cold War (such as decolonisation and the spread of communist influence); secondly, by showing how American involvement in global issues often had motives other than simply containment (such as in Cuba and the Middle East). The majority of responses lacked such analytical depth and were largely based on the assumption that all American involvement in global issues was due to its persistence with the policy of containment. As a result, most candidates addressed the slightly different question of whether the USA or the USSR was more responsible for the globalisation of the Cold War. A large number of responses simply provided narrative accounts of various events (such as the Korean War, the Cuban missile crisis, the Vietnam War etc.) with little reference to the actual question.

Question 4

This was a popular question, and most candidates were able to produce well-reasoned arguments, supported by detailed factual evidence, to justify the view that the USA 'had' to become involved in the Vietnam War. Developing valid arguments to challenge this view, however, seemed to prove more challenging, the majority of candidates drifting into narrative accounts of the war itself and the reasons for American failure. As a result, many responses lost focus on the precise requirements of the specific question, a common conclusion being that the Americans should not have become involved in the Vietnam War because they eventually lost it. The most effective responses were able to demonstrate how American involvement in the Vietnam War was based on a fundamental misunderstanding of its underlying causes, together with exaggerated fear of the threat posed by communism.

Question 5

Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound knowledge of the various factors which contributed to the collapse of the Soviet Union. The most impressive responses were based on clear understanding of how and why the USSR had suffered from economic problems over a long period of time, and how these problems conspired with other factors to impose increasing pressure on the integrity of the Soviet Union. It was

analysis of the ways in which the various factors which led to the collapse of the USSR inter-connect which was missing from the majority of responses. As a result, most responses tended to become lists of causal factors, each outlined in isolation so that the relative significance of economic problems was not afforded due consideration. The weakest responses, while containing much accurate and appropriate factual material, relied too heavily on unsupported or unexplained assertions; for example, many candidates simply asserted that it was Gorbachev's reforms, such as glasnost and perestroika, which led to the demise of the Soviet Union, while others argued that it was his ending of the Brezhnev Doctrine which led to nationalism both in Eastern Europe and within the USSR itself.

Question 6

There were some exceptional responses, based on a clear understanding of concepts such as massive retaliation, brinkmanship, MAD and flexible response, and how and why these strategies developed over time. The majority of candidates, however, found it difficult to retain focus on the precise requirements of the actual question. Most responses took the form of narrative accounts of the nuclear arms race and the various attempts to control it; while this approach often contained implicit relevance to the USSR's increasing nuclear capability, there was generally little attempt to link this to American nuclear strategies. Reference was commonly made to MAD, but generally with inadequate understanding of its chronological development and, often, based on the inaccurate assumption that it was a treaty signed by both the USA and the USSR with the aim of preventing nuclear war.

Question 7

There were too few responses to this question to allow for appropriate general comments.

Question 8

There were too few responses to this question to allow for appropriate general comments.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/41

Paper 41

Key Messages

The development of conclusions to essays is a key element in reaching the highest grades. Conclusions which build on the points discussed and reach a considered judgement are necessary. While the introduction to an essay sets out the methodology and range of factors to be discussed, the conclusion should evaluate and compare the significance of those factors having looked at them in detail in the body text. A strong conclusion will show that a candidate has the confidence to make a judgement and justify it. Weaker conclusions will repeat what has been said in the introduction or summarise the factors already discussed.

General Comments

This year very few weak scripts were seen, and many schools produced high quality answers. There was evidence of good teaching and careful attention to previous Principal Examiner Reports. It was noticeable that schools tackled a range of questions rather than just focusing on the most popular topics.

Of the key words in questions, some candidates did not understand that 'relative' importance means comparing the factors mentioned to reach a judgement about how important each is. Candidates are encouraged to have the confidence to make supported judgements.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

This question was answered well. It was pleasing to see that candidates knew detailed information about how Gezo, Glele and Jaja ran their states and could relate this knowledge to the question. Other factors such as transport facilities, the availability of palms, and British law enforcement/encouragement of legitimate trade were explained well and used effectively.

Question 2

Most candidates argued that the Arabs had a more significant impact, and this was valid if supported. A strong answer could have suggested that the Arabs were more significant in the earlier part of the period and the Europeans later, once colonisation had begun. Developed examples on both sides were needed and many candidates who also discussed the comparative significance of both groups produced an excellent answer.

Question 3

For high marks candidates needed to focus on the changes brought about by the scramble for colonies and discuss their significance. Answers which just showed knowledge of the four or five triggers of the scramble or general answers on humanitarian, economic, social and Eurocentric factors did not achieve a high mark. Answers showing specific examples of colonisation and its impact, together with an understanding that there were shorter and longer term effects of the 1884–85 Berlin West Africa Conference did well.

Question 4

Questions on Samori Toure are always popular. Only a few candidates confused details about him with the Ethiopian rulers. Most candidates were able to construct an argument using excellent details about Samori's armies, how he trained them and repaired their weapons, used local commanders and spies, developed successful tactics and resisted the French for sixteen years. Other factors such as his economic and social organisation, charismatic personality and achievement of religious unity were used effectively for evaluation as were weaknesses of the French and the weaker points of Samori's military policies.

Question 5

Some candidates made a very good attempt to answer this question. The Buganda political scene was complicated and the question required more than a narrative of the reigns of Mutesa and Mwanga. Candidates writing generally about the social and humanitarian work of Christian missionaries did not do well. Two much better approaches could have been used – identifying the actions of Christian missionaries and actions of the Kabakas and Katikiros, then assessing the political impact of these actions, or, taking the political developments and identifying relevant responsibilities within that frame. Those candidates able to evaluate the relative importance of each factor, whichever method of assessment they chose, did well.

Question 6

Although this question was very straightforward, candidates who failed to note the 'after 1900' wrote answers without strong focus. The question required an explanation of Indirect Rule for the British and Association for the French. Assimilation was only valid for French policy if the 4 Communes were specified, as they retained this method of administration. Candidates who gave a good explanation of each policy and were able to give detailed examples of impact in correct geographical areas usually achieved higher marks than those who adopted a comparative approach.

Question 7

This year a fairer balance between Lewanika and Prempeh was demonstrated, with candidates seeing positives and negatives on each side. Specific details of the aims, policies and actions of both rulers were required to access higher marks.

Question 8

The challenge here was to identify those grievances which constituted 'resentment against colonial rule' and those which could be used for the other side of the argument. There was no rigid division so quality of response depended upon the way the chosen factors were used in the argument. One good approach was to differentiate between long-term and short-term factors, or to separate specific grievances against the British South Africa Company or German authorities from more general factors underlying the troubles. Most candidates did this well. For really high marks the challenge was to produce a clear and supported evaluation of the comparative significance of all the factors.

Question 9

It was very pleasing to note how several candidates were able to use Bishop Crowther effectively in this question by analysing his legacy and the effects of Social Darwinism, rather than using him as an example of an Independent African Churchman. Some candidates were able to give explicit examples of the appeal of Islam, notably in West Africa, and were able to show why the Independent African Churches appealed more than the Christian mission churches in some areas. The general spread of both religious groups was well understood.

Question 10

Specific examples of the railway network in the chosen area were needed rather than just general assertions about negative or positive results. The Congo was only valid as an example if linked to the Central African railways and the export of minerals. Candidates who showed detailed geographical knowledge and named examples such as Visram for East Africa did well.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/41

Paper 41

Key Messages

The development of conclusions to essays is a key element in reaching the highest grades. Conclusions which build on the points discussed and reach a considered judgement are necessary. While the introduction to an essay sets out the methodology and range of factors to be discussed, the conclusion should evaluate and compare the significance of those factors having looked at them in detail in the body text. A strong conclusion will show that a candidate has the confidence to make a judgement and justify it. Weaker conclusions will repeat what has been said in the introduction or summarise the factors already discussed.

General Comments

This year very few weak scripts were seen, and many schools produced high quality answers. There was evidence of good teaching and careful attention to previous Principal Examiner Reports. It was noticeable that schools tackled a range of questions rather than just focusing on the most popular topics.

Of the key words in questions, some candidates did not understand that 'relative' importance means comparing the factors mentioned to reach a judgement about how important each is. Candidates are encouraged to have the confidence to make supported judgements.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

This question was answered well. It was pleasing to see that candidates knew detailed information about how Gezo, Glele and Jaja ran their states and could relate this knowledge to the question. Other factors such as transport facilities, the availability of palms, and British law enforcement/encouragement of legitimate trade were explained well and used effectively.

Question 2

Most candidates argued that the Arabs had a more significant impact, and this was valid if supported. A strong answer could have suggested that the Arabs were more significant in the earlier part of the period and the Europeans later, once colonisation had begun. Developed examples on both sides were needed and many candidates who also discussed the comparative significance of both groups produced an excellent answer.

Question 3

For high marks candidates needed to focus on the changes brought about by the scramble for colonies and discuss their significance. Answers which just showed knowledge of the four or five triggers of the scramble or general answers on humanitarian, economic, social and Eurocentric factors did not achieve a high mark. Answers showing specific examples of colonisation and its impact, together with an understanding that there were shorter and longer term effects of the 1884–85 Berlin West Africa Conference did well.

Question 4

Questions on Samori Toure are always popular. Only a few candidates confused details about him with the Ethiopian rulers. Most candidates were able to construct an argument using excellent details about Samori's armies, how he trained them and repaired their weapons, used local commanders and spies, developed successful tactics and resisted the French for sixteen years. Other factors such as his economic and social organisation, charismatic personality and achievement of religious unity were used effectively for evaluation as were weaknesses of the French and the weaker points of Samori's military policies.

Question 5

Some candidates made a very good attempt to answer this question. The Buganda political scene was complicated and the question required more than a narrative of the reigns of Mutesa and Mwanga. Candidates writing generally about the social and humanitarian work of Christian missionaries did not do well. Two much better approaches could have been used – identifying the actions of Christian missionaries and actions of the Kabakas and Katikiros, then assessing the political impact of these actions, or, taking the political developments and identifying relevant responsibilities within that frame. Those candidates able to evaluate the relative importance of each factor, whichever method of assessment they chose, did well.

Question 6

Although this question was very straightforward, candidates who failed to note the 'after 1900' wrote answers without strong focus. The question required an explanation of Indirect Rule for the British and Association for the French. Assimilation was only valid for French policy if the 4 Communes were specified, as they retained this method of administration. Candidates who gave a good explanation of each policy and were able to give detailed examples of impact in correct geographical areas usually achieved higher marks than those who adopted a comparative approach.

Question 7

This year a fairer balance between Lewanika and Prempeh was demonstrated, with candidates seeing positives and negatives on each side. Specific details of the aims, policies and actions of both rulers were required to access higher marks.

Question 8

The challenge here was to identify those grievances which constituted 'resentment against colonial rule' and those which could be used for the other side of the argument. There was no rigid division so quality of response depended upon the way the chosen factors were used in the argument. One good approach was to differentiate between long-term and short-term factors, or to separate specific grievances against the British South Africa Company or German authorities from more general factors underlying the troubles. Most candidates did this well. For really high marks the challenge was to produce a clear and supported evaluation of the comparative significance of all the factors.

Question 9

It was very pleasing to note how several candidates were able to use Bishop Crowther effectively in this question by analysing his legacy and the effects of Social Darwinism, rather than using him as an example of an Independent African Churchman. Some candidates were able to give explicit examples of the appeal of Islam, notably in West Africa, and were able to show why the Independent African Churches appealed more than the Christian mission churches in some areas. The general spread of both religious groups was well understood.

Question 10

Specific examples of the railway network in the chosen area were needed rather than just general assertions about negative or positive results. The Congo was only valid as an example if linked to the Central African railways and the export of minerals. Candidates who showed detailed geographical knowledge and named examples such as Visram for East Africa did well.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/41

Paper 41

Key Messages

The development of conclusions to essays is a key element in reaching the highest grades. Conclusions which build on the points discussed and reach a considered judgement are necessary. While the introduction to an essay sets out the methodology and range of factors to be discussed, the conclusion should evaluate and compare the significance of those factors having looked at them in detail in the body text. A strong conclusion will show that a candidate has the confidence to make a judgement and justify it. Weaker conclusions will repeat what has been said in the introduction or summarise the factors already discussed.

General Comments

This year very few weak scripts were seen, and many schools produced high quality answers. There was evidence of good teaching and careful attention to previous Principal Examiner Reports. It was noticeable that schools tackled a range of questions rather than just focusing on the most popular topics.

Of the key words in questions, some candidates did not understand that 'relative' importance means comparing the factors mentioned to reach a judgement about how important each is. Candidates are encouraged to have the confidence to make supported judgements.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

This question was answered well. It was pleasing to see that candidates knew detailed information about how Gezo, Glele and Jaja ran their states and could relate this knowledge to the question. Other factors such as transport facilities, the availability of palms, and British law enforcement/encouragement of legitimate trade were explained well and used effectively.

Question 2

Most candidates argued that the Arabs had a more significant impact, and this was valid if supported. A strong answer could have suggested that the Arabs were more significant in the earlier part of the period and the Europeans later, once colonisation had begun. Developed examples on both sides were needed and many candidates who also discussed the comparative significance of both groups produced an excellent answer.

Question 3

For high marks candidates needed to focus on the changes brought about by the scramble for colonies and discuss their significance. Answers which just showed knowledge of the four or five triggers of the scramble or general answers on humanitarian, economic, social and Eurocentric factors did not achieve a high mark. Answers showing specific examples of colonisation and its impact, together with an understanding that there were shorter and longer term effects of the 1884–85 Berlin West Africa Conference did well.

Question 4

Questions on Samori Toure are always popular. Only a few candidates confused details about him with the Ethiopian rulers. Most candidates were able to construct an argument using excellent details about Samori's armies, how he trained them and repaired their weapons, used local commanders and spies, developed successful tactics and resisted the French for sixteen years. Other factors such as his economic and social organisation, charismatic personality and achievement of religious unity were used effectively for evaluation as were weaknesses of the French and the weaker points of Samori's military policies.

Question 5

Some candidates made a very good attempt to answer this question. The Buganda political scene was complicated and the question required more than a narrative of the reigns of Mutesa and Mwanga. Candidates writing generally about the social and humanitarian work of Christian missionaries did not do well. Two much better approaches could have been used – identifying the actions of Christian missionaries and actions of the Kabakas and Katikiros, then assessing the political impact of these actions, or, taking the political developments and identifying relevant responsibilities within that frame. Those candidates able to evaluate the relative importance of each factor, whichever method of assessment they chose, did well.

Question 6

Although this question was very straightforward, candidates who failed to note the 'after 1900' wrote answers without strong focus. The question required an explanation of Indirect Rule for the British and Association for the French. Assimilation was only valid for French policy if the 4 Communes were specified, as they retained this method of administration. Candidates who gave a good explanation of each policy and were able to give detailed examples of impact in correct geographical areas usually achieved higher marks than those who adopted a comparative approach.

Question 7

This year a fairer balance between Lewanika and Prempeh was demonstrated, with candidates seeing positives and negatives on each side. Specific details of the aims, policies and actions of both rulers were required to access higher marks.

Question 8

The challenge here was to identify those grievances which constituted 'resentment against colonial rule' and those which could be used for the other side of the argument. There was no rigid division so quality of response depended upon the way the chosen factors were used in the argument. One good approach was to differentiate between long-term and short-term factors, or to separate specific grievances against the British South Africa Company or German authorities from more general factors underlying the troubles. Most candidates did this well. For really high marks the challenge was to produce a clear and supported evaluation of the comparative significance of all the factors.

Question 9

It was very pleasing to note how several candidates were able to use Bishop Crowther effectively in this question by analysing his legacy and the effects of Social Darwinism, rather than using him as an example of an Independent African Churchman. Some candidates were able to give explicit examples of the appeal of Islam, notably in West Africa, and were able to show why the Independent African Churches appealed more than the Christian mission churches in some areas. The general spread of both religious groups was well understood.

Question 10

Specific examples of the railway network in the chosen area were needed rather than just general assertions about negative or positive results. The Congo was only valid as an example if linked to the Central African railways and the export of minerals. Candidates who showed detailed geographical knowledge and named examples such as Visram for East Africa did well.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/51

Paper 51

Key Messages

This is the final examination paper for the 9697 syllabus. If your school or college wishes to take Cambridge International Examinations AS and/or A Level History, it needs to transfer its attention to the 9389 specification, a syllabus first examined in June 2014.

General Comments

As this is the very last 9697 examination, it would seem time to reflect on change and continuity, key historical concepts, since the syllabus was first introduced in the early 1990s. Change takes the form of perceived improvements in the standards achieved. For the compulsory source-based question, it is pleasing to report that now most candidates analyse, although still only a few evaluate, the four sources. For the essay questions, now most candidates attempt to answer the question, using relevant knowledge to do so. For the source-based question, continuity consists of candidates' great reluctance to evaluate the sources they have to consider. Source evaluation tends to take second place to source analysis, as a result of which it receives only the briefest of considerations. Most essays, if more relevant in argument, continue to lack the convincing relevant and detailed evidence to support the points being made. This group of candidates tended to write relevant answers to the questions they faced without providing the evidence fully to support their arguments. A secure foundation of knowledge is required to underpin a convincing historical argument.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

Most candidates were able to identify the position taken by each source in relation to the hypothesis. Sources A, D and E clearly challenged the hypothesis while Sources B and C supported it. Few took their answer to the next, all-important, step by evaluating the four sources for reliability. With regard to the cartoon, some avoided the issue by saying that its provenance gave no specific details to enable evaluation. The cartoon itself gave some information which could be checked since it had the slave referring to Seward and Garrison, two leading figures in the abolitionist movement. The man giving a gun to the slave referred to a higher law, which had been the theme of a major speech made by Seward in 1850. Garrison was the leading abolitionist of the era. Thus the cartoon could have been cross-referenced to accessible contextual knowledge, making it more reliable. Of the other supportive sources, Source D comes from the other leading abolitionist of the time, Frederick Douglass, speaking to a group of abolitionist women in a Northern state. His assertions can be given more substance by a brief reference to the work of the Underground Railway. The second written source supporting the hypothesis is Source E, a Southern source. It is contradicted by the other source from the South, Source B. Which is the more reliable? Source E is written some six years after Source B and can be supported by evidence of Northern states 'formally and defiantly nullified' by Northern legislatures. Source B, by contrast, is more a statement of hope. The fifth source, C, is from US President Fillmore, the man who had signed the Fugitive Slave Act – though few candidates mentioned this detail. He was bound to support the Act. Thus, overall, the sources rejecting the hypothesis proved the more reliable.

Section B

Question 2

Questions on westward expansionism are usually popular, and this was no exception. Virtually all answers referred to the Frontier thesis of Frederick Jackson Turner. Few mentioned that his thesis was his retrospective view of developments of the previous century and thus open to dispute. The best responses

questioned the importance of the frontier in reinforcing the democratic values of the USA. Most concentrated on the access to resources which the westward expansion of the frontier gave to nineteenth-century America. Weaker answers did little more than describe the development of the transcontinental railroad and the linking of East- and West-coast America.

Question 3

Questions on the Civil War and Reconstruction era are popular, though this was less so than its predecessors. The few who did answer the question had little knowledge of the details of the so-called Compromise. Instead, they explained how the 1877 agreement marked the end of Republican dominance of US politics and the return to power in the South of the Democrats, who then went on to introduce Jim Crow laws. Such answers were given suitable credit.

Question 4

Questions on the Gilded Age are often avoided, or chosen by candidates who sometimes lack relevant knowledge and understanding. This question on American agriculture proved something of an exception to that rule. Most candidates who answered the question explained how the problems faced by American farmers, especially in the Mid-West and on the Great Plains, gave rise to the Populist movement, which in turn helped bring about the emergence of the Progressive party. This was most pleasing to see.

Question 5

Questions on race relations are popular, even if most candidates know much more about the civil rights era of the 1950s and 1960s than any other period. They knew the broad difference between Du Bois and Washington, the former more of a political activist, the latter an educational gradualist. Candidates wanted to link the two men with the civil rights movement, rather than to consider them in the context of the times in which they lived. Most overlooked the reference to the early twentieth century in the question. By doing so, they limited the marks they could receive.

Question 6

Answers to this question fell into one of two categories. The few who had a detailed knowledge of the policies of President Hoover were able to write sound and relevant answers to the question. Those who knew little about Hoover's presidency apart from *laissez-faire* and Hoovervilles wrote only the most general of answers, which could receive only limited credit.

Question 7

The very few candidates who attempted this question were not always well prepared and often quoted only general detail. Coverage rarely stretched beyond Pearl Harbour at the start and Yalta at the finish of the war. The years in between received little, if any attention.

Question 8

This question attracted a few candidates who had only a general understanding of the topic. Candidates knew of the emergence of rock and roll in the 50s and of the Beatles-led music of the 60s but the question asked candidates to explain the reasons for the emergence of this culture rather than describe its main features. The baby boom of the 40s and 50s, the relative affluence of the post war economic boom, access to college education were among the factors which should have been explained and analysed.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/52

Paper 52

Key Messages

This is the final examination paper for the 9697 syllabus. If your school or college wishes to take Cambridge International Examinations AS and/or A Level History, it needs to transfer its attention to the 9389 specification, a syllabus first examined in June 2014.

General Comments

As this is the very last 9697 examination, it would seem time to reflect on change and continuity, key historical concepts, since the syllabus was first introduced in the early 1990s. Change takes the form of perceived improvements in the standards achieved. For the compulsory source-based question, it is pleasing to report that now most candidates analyse, although still only a few evaluate, the four sources. For the essay questions, now most candidates attempt to answer the question, using relevant knowledge to do so. For the source-based question, continuity consists of candidates' great reluctance to evaluate the sources they have to consider. Source evaluation tends to take second place to source analysis, as a result of which it receives only the briefest of considerations. Most essays, if more relevant in argument, continue to lack the convincing relevant and detailed evidence to support the points being made. This group of candidates tended to write relevant answers to the questions they faced without providing the evidence fully to support their arguments. A secure foundation of knowledge is required to underpin a convincing historical argument.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

Most candidates were able to identify the position taken by each source in relation to the hypothesis. Sources A, D and E clearly challenged the hypothesis while Sources B and C supported it. Few took their answer to the next, all-important, step by evaluating the four sources for reliability. With regard to the cartoon, some avoided the issue by saying that its provenance gave no specific details to enable evaluation. The cartoon itself gave some information which could be checked since it had the slave referring to Seward and Garrison, two leading figures in the abolitionist movement. The man giving a gun to the slave referred to a higher law, which had been the theme of a major speech made by Seward in 1850. Garrison was the leading abolitionist of the era. Thus the cartoon could have been cross-referenced to accessible contextual knowledge, making it more reliable. Of the other supportive sources, Source D comes from the other leading abolitionist of the time, Frederick Douglass, speaking to a group of abolitionist women in a Northern state. His assertions can be given more substance by a brief reference to the work of the Underground Railway. The second written source supporting the hypothesis is Source E, a Southern source. It is contradicted by the other source from the South, Source B. Which is the more reliable? Source E is written some six years after Source B and can be supported by evidence of Northern states 'formally and defiantly nullified' by Northern legislatures. Source B, by contrast, is more a statement of hope. The fifth source, C, is from US President Fillmore, the man who had signed the Fugitive Slave Act – though few candidates mentioned this detail. He was bound to support the Act. Thus, overall, the sources rejecting the hypothesis proved the more reliable.

Section B

Question 2

Questions on westward expansionism are usually popular, and this was no exception. Virtually all answers referred to the Frontier thesis of Frederick Jackson Turner. Few mentioned that his thesis was his retrospective view of developments of the previous century and thus open to dispute. The best responses

questioned the importance of the frontier in reinforcing the democratic values of the USA. Most concentrated on the access to resources which the westward expansion of the frontier gave to nineteenth-century America. Weaker answers did little more than describe the development of the transcontinental railroad and the linking of East- and West-coast America.

Question 3

Questions on the Civil War and Reconstruction era are popular, though this was less so than its predecessors. The few who did answer the question had little knowledge of the details of the so-called Compromise. Instead, they explained how the 1877 agreement marked the end of Republican dominance of US politics and the return to power in the South of the Democrats, who then went on to introduce Jim Crow laws. Such answers were given suitable credit.

Question 4

Questions on the Gilded Age are often avoided, or chosen by candidates who sometimes lack relevant knowledge and understanding. This question on American agriculture proved something of an exception to that rule. Most candidates who answered the question explained how the problems faced by American farmers, especially in the Mid-West and on the Great Plains, gave rise to the Populist movement, which in turn helped bring about the emergence of the Progressive party. This was most pleasing to see.

Question 5

Questions on race relations are popular, even if most candidates know much more about the civil rights era of the 1950s and 1960s than any other period. They knew the broad difference between Du Bois and Washington, the former more of a political activist, the latter an educational gradualist. Candidates wanted to link the two men with the civil rights movement, rather than to consider them in the context of the times in which they lived. Most overlooked the reference to the early twentieth century in the question. By doing so, they limited the marks they could receive.

Question 6

Answers to this question fell into one of two categories. The few who had a detailed knowledge of the policies of President Hoover were able to write sound and relevant answers to the question. Those who knew little about Hoover's presidency apart from *laissez-faire* and Hoovervilles wrote only the most general of answers, which could receive only limited credit.

Question 7

The very few candidates who attempted this question were not always well prepared and often quoted only general detail. Coverage rarely stretched beyond Pearl Harbour at the start and Yalta at the finish of the war. The years in between received little, if any attention.

Question 8

This question attracted a few candidates who had only a general understanding of the topic. Candidates knew of the emergence of rock and roll in the 50s and of the Beatles-led music of the 60s but the question asked candidates to explain the reasons for the emergence of this culture rather than describe its main features. The baby boom of the 40s and 50s, the relative affluence of the post war economic boom, access to college education were among the factors which should have been explained and analysed.

HISTORY

Paper 9697/53

Paper 53

Key Messages

This is the final examination paper for the 9697 syllabus. If your school or college wishes to take Cambridge International Examinations AS and/or A Level History, it needs to transfer its attention to the 9389 specification, a syllabus first examined in June 2014.

General Comments

As this is the very last 9697 examination, it would seem time to reflect on change and continuity, key historical concepts, since the syllabus was first introduced in the early 1990s. Change takes the form of perceived improvements in the standards achieved. For the compulsory source-based question, it is pleasing to report that now most candidates analyse, although still only a few evaluate, the four sources. For the essay questions, now most candidates attempt to answer the question, using relevant knowledge to do so. For the source-based question, continuity consists of candidates' great reluctance to evaluate the sources they have to consider. Source evaluation tends to take second place to source analysis, as a result of which it receives only the briefest of considerations. Most essays, if more relevant in argument, continue to lack the convincing relevant and detailed evidence to support the points being made. This group of candidates tended to write relevant answers to the questions they faced without providing the evidence fully to support their arguments. A secure foundation of knowledge is required to underpin a convincing historical argument.

Comments on Specific Questions

Question 1

Most candidates were able to identify the position taken by each source in relation to the hypothesis. Sources A, B and D clearly challenged the hypothesis while Source C supported it, as did Source E, if with a little qualification. Few took their answer to the next, all-important, step by evaluating the four sources for reliability. Candidates tended to dismiss Sources A and E, if for different reasons: Source A was about one man rather than all slaves; Source E stated the hopes of slaves, rather than the reality of their experiences on the run. To dismiss the sources on such grounds is to confuse 'prove' and 'support': supporting an historical assertion is easier than proving it. In fact, historical generalisations such as the one being considered here are almost impossible to prove. Source A does not support the hypothesis, even though it focuses on a single slave. Source E does support the hypothesis in that it shows many slaves willing to risk dangers to get to what they believe will be a better life.

As often, evaluating the sources proved harder for candidates than analysing them. If Source D is to be believed, Source E's portrayal of a better life is unreliable. However, Source D itself can be questioned because it comes from a newspaper from the deepest South and is itself undermined by Source C, the autobiography of an ex-slave. Autobiographies are notoriously self-serving. However, the extract from Henson's account contained in Source C is packed with facts which could be checked, making it potentially more reliable than many autobiographies. When it comes to the question of ex-slaves being drunk, there is a clear contradiction between Sources C and D. Which is more reliable, and why? Source B supports the critical view of Source D, but both are from Southern newspapers which are likely to emphasise the negative features of the Underground Railroad. There is plenty within the five sources to evaluate, even if contextual knowledge of the reality of the Underground Railroad might be limited.

Section B

Question 2

Few candidates identified the aims of US federal policies, which made measuring the success of those policies almost impossible. Instead candidates tended to describe various aspects of nineteenth century treatment of Native Americans; the number who mentioned the Trail of Tears of the 1830s was surprisingly high. Had candidates identified the likely aims of US policies – and these aims are themselves a matter of considerable debate – then answers might have been more focused.

Question 3

Questions on the Civil War and Reconstruction era are popular and this proved no exception, Though the period covered was very brief – four years at best, less than two if you compare Grant and Lee as leaders of the two sides' military forces – there were many points of comparison which could be made. Knowledge of the campaigns and battles was generally sound, even if some described Grant as leading the Northern armies at the battle of Gettysburg. As part of their comparisons, most candidates placed the two men in their differing contexts, especially political, which showed a sound appreciation of the complexities which are an important part of any civil war.

Question 4

This question attracted too few candidates to be able to produce a report.

Question 5

Some candidates misguidedly thought this question was mainly about the New Deal. Its main focus was the lives of African Americans. Because most candidates had studied the New Deal and its impact in terms of American society in general, they lacked the specific knowledge about how Roosevelt's policies affected African Americans. They did know that few, if any, New Deal reforms were targeted at the African American community. Some candidates made the valid point that this lack of focused support was a consequence of the administration's reliance on the support of white Democrats in the South. Others made points about the 'Black Cabinet', formed in 1936 to ensure that African American interests were not forgotten. Even if there was some lack of detailed knowledge about the New Deal, others placed the question in the context of the 'long march' towards civil rights in the twentieth century. This long term perspective showed how little the New Deal helped improve African American lives, if more so in the South than in the North.

Question 6

The topic was a familiar one as, was the focus of the question. The key word, however, was overlooked by most candidates. Rather than 'evaluate' the causes of the Roaring Twenties, they described or explained them. The economic boom of most of the 1920s, the emergence of consumer credit and the *laissez-faire* policies of the Republican administrations of the time were all explained and illustrated. The best responses went one step further by providing a reasoned, evidence-based argument as to the relevant importance of the factors they covered.

Question 7

This question attracted too few candidates to be able to produce a report.

Question 8

This question was intended to require candidates to reconsider the very common belief that the mass media of the time affected popular perceptions, that the growth of television, in particular, had a great effect upon the people who watched it. Reactions to the images of the Vietnam War are almost always quoted in support of the conventional wisdom that the new media had great effects. Few of those who chose this question were willing to challenge this view, and usually dismissed the assertion. The best answers put the Vietnam War in the context of two decades where the media had a much less prominent political role, not including their anti-Soviet messages of the Cold War era, from the Red Scare onwards.