

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- This assessment focuses on source comprehension, analysis and evaluation so this should be central to candidates' approach.
- When reading sources candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source in order to understand the argument or point of view of the author. This means that the source should be viewed holistically rather than divided into individual sentences or part sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to that which the source as a whole has.
- Candidates should ensure that they look closely at the provenance of each source as they read them and consider how far this is useful when analysing the statement given. Candidates should consider the nature (what type of source it is), the origin (who wrote or produced the source), and purpose of sources before commenting on generic reliability or placing in a particular context.
- Time-keeping is vitally important. Candidates need to make sure they leave enough time to write complete answers to both questions.

In summary, the key message is for candidates to read the sources very carefully, making sure that they understand both the particular details of the source and its overall argument. This will mean candidates are better prepared to tackle both questions.

General comments

Most candidates clearly understood that the **(a)** question requires an identification of similarities and differences and that answers to **(b)** questions require an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the prompt in the question. Successful candidates appreciated that they needed to support the points they made with quotations from the relevant sources.

The focus of the **(a)** question is to identify similarity and difference. Less successful responses to part **(a)** often made inappropriate points of comparison; they claimed similarities for points which were not actually similar and differences for points which were not really different. Only valid similarities and differences can be credited. Another feature of less successful responses was to include large sections of contextual knowledge or stock paragraphs of 'evaluation' rather than tackling the main focus of the question. Although there are marks in the top level for commenting on the usefulness of the sources, the main focus of the question should be on making a developed comparison i.e. identifying similarities and differences.

In answering the part **(b)** question candidates need to ensure they read the question carefully and refer to all of the sources. A minority of candidates ran out of time, usually after writing long introductions which contributed little to their answer. If candidates are to do justice to their knowledge and understanding and subject skills, effective time management is an essential general skill.

Comments on specific questions

Section A, European Option

(a) Compare and contrast the political views expressed in Sources A and D

Stronger responses were able to identify valid similarities and differences between a conservative source and a liberal source. The most common misinterpretation in weaker responses was to argue that both sources supported the growth of the army. Attitude towards the army was in fact a difference: Source A was unconditional in its support; Source D was conditional. Another similarity which some candidates incorrectly identified was between Source A's Point 3, which focused on equality, and Source D's reference to 'freedom and liberty'. Equality and liberty are not similar.

(b) How far do Sources A to D support the view that Bismarck had widespread support for his policies?

Few candidates focused on the key word in the question, namely 'widespread'; if they had, then their analysis would have had a different focus. Most candidates were able to identify sources which both agreed and disagreed with the argument given in the question. Source A could be argued either way. Some interpreted it as challenging the assertion, in that it argued against the use of 'blood and fire' as well as being in favour of keeping 'smaller nations', while Bismarck in 1866 abolished many smaller German states. This latter example shows the need for careful reading. The relevant sentence reads 'no theft of crowns and ending smaller nations'. Some took this to mean that Source A is in favour of ending smaller nations. It wasn't. The 'no' at the start of the sentence applies to smaller nations as well as to theft of crowns. Some argued quite convincingly that Source A showed that Bismarck had support, basing their claim on Bismarck's strengthening of the army and his dislike of parliamentary rule. Both arguments were given equal credit. Source B, however, proved more challenging as some responses saw it as simply detailing Bismarck's policies. Stronger responses demonstrated good contextual knowledge, knowing that that Bismarck did reorganise the army against the opposition of the Prussian Landtag. The source shows that he did not bother to get popular support. Thus, it challenges the hypothesis. Some argued that because Bismarck's words were noted by Disraeli, a British politician, this showed widespread support across Europe. Some used this point about Europe when it came to analysing Source C. Source C talks about Europe following Bismarck's moves 'with great attention', which is not the same as support, however. The key sentence in Source C is the final one, about Bismarck's ability to grasp what the people really wanted, implying his popularity. This means that Source C supports the assertion, as the better answers argued. Those who argued that Bismarck himself was middle class did not have an accurate knowledge of Bismarck's background. Source D, as with Source A, could be used to support or challenge. The conditional nature of Source D's response to Bismarck's policies could be said to show limited support. On the other hand, the National Liberals were prepared to co-operate with Bismarck. However, the National Liberal party was formed in 1866–67 by German liberals who were won over by Bismarck's creation of the North German Confederation. Evaluation of these sources tended to be generic, such as 'Source B is reliable because it is a diary'. Evaluation needs to be specific in order to be credited.

Section B, American Option

(a) To what extent do Sources C and D agree about the process of naming the Republican Party?

Most candidates could identify some very basic similarities and differences, e.g. the meeting was held in Ripon but figures for the number of attendees differed. The roles of Greely and Bovay, for example, were more substantial points of comparison, and stronger candidates were able to identify these. Other similarities required some inferential skills, such as the fact that both sources show the process to be rather lengthy and complicated. The strongest responses were able to make such points and provided relevant supporting detail from the sources.

- (b) **'The formation of the Republican Party in 1854 posed a great threat to the party system.'**
How far do Sources A to D support this view?

If Sources C and D were usually well used in answers to (a), most candidates found it hard to use them effectively in answering (b). The most common comment about these sources was that they were all about the naming of the new party with nothing on its impact on the party system. This was not the case for Source C, which talks about the naming meeting forming a committee for the new party which consisted of Whigs, Free Soilers and Democrats. If three parties agree to work together, even if only in the small town of Ripon, then the new party must threaten the existing party system, dominated by Whigs and Democrats. Source D makes much the same point, if a little less explicitly, saying that the new party would 'combine the elements of the parties opposed to the extension of slavery'. Thus, both Sources C and D support the hypothesis. Candidates were more confident about the relevance of Sources A and B. For Source A, they used 'the deliberate purpose to make war' on one half of the states to argue that Source A supported the assertion. Others quoted the sentence which states 'Whigs and Democrats are invited to abandon their old party organisations' to argue the same way. Source B was usually interpreted as challenging the hypothesis. Most candidates quoted 'the Republican Party seems to me not to last very long' in support of their argument. Thus, even if candidates struggled to make Sources C and D relevant, they did well enough on Sources A and B. Some better answers evaluated the sources, usually concentrating on Source A, a speech by a party politician to a group of men likely to vote in subsequent elections. They then made the inference that Source A, in its analysis of the party system, is unreliable and cannot be trusted.

Section C, International Option

- (a) **Compare and contrast the views of Source B and Source C regarding the USA's membership of the proposed new international peacekeeping organisation.**

All candidates identified the obvious difference between the two sources: Source B opposed such membership while Source C supported it. In addition, Source B identified the dangers for the USA if it did join, while Source C warned of the dangers if the USA did not join. Many candidates found similarities harder to identify. The most obvious one was that they agreed that membership of an international peacekeeping organisation would involve the USA in world affairs, which would have profound consequences for the USA.

- (b) **'During 1944–45, Americans supported plans to create a new international peacekeeping organisation.'** How far do Sources A to D support the view?

The hypothesis required candidates to consider whether Americans – more than one – supported plans for the new peacekeeping organisation. Three of the four sources came from individuals: B, C and D. Explaining how individuals supported plans does not show whether Americans supported the plans. Candidates' analysis of Source D was credited because D Stettinius asserts that 'The people of the US believe' and 'We Americans believe'. Source C similarly refers to the plural 'We cannot fail them'. However, a close reading of Source C shows that Roosevelt is asking for the support of the Senate and the people. He is not sure that he will get it. Thus, Source C is less clear-cut in its support of the hypothesis than is Source D. However, Source C is spoken by the US President, elected by the US people. In fact, he had been re-elected in November 1944, five months previously. He could claim to speak for the majority of Americans. If candidates had made this point about Roosevelt, they would have gained credit for showing support for the assertion. Most, however, did so by focusing on Roosevelt's references to 'We', implying 'We, the people', to use the first words of the US constitution. Some good answers' analysis of Source B widened out to consider whether it represented Americans' views. Less successful answers stated, 'Source B is opposed to the new international organisation', which was not relevant enough to be credited. Better answers pointed out that Source B represented a minority view. Very few mentioned that, as Source B was written by an elected Senator, it represented the views of some Americans who voted for him. The remaining source, Source A, came from a government organisation rather than an individual. Some less successful candidates misread the provenance of Source A. They maintained it was written by Stettinius rather than to him. The content of Source A is neither clearly for nor clearly against the hypothesis. This caused some candidates to dismiss Source A as being of no help in addressing the hypothesis. Some candidates, however, argued that the State Department was in favour of joining an international peacekeeping organisation, as shown by 'it is to our advantage to have ... the most favourable public opinions possible.' The State Department should undertake an educational/propaganda campaign in favour of the USA joining an

international peacekeeping organisation. Thus, both the State Department, a collective body, and, if the State Department is successful, the American people would support membership of an international peacekeeping organisation. As always, careful analysis of the question and of the sources resulted in some good answers. Successful source evaluation usually focused on Source D. Addressing the conference, Stettinius, the leading government minister in charge of foreign policy, was bound to give a favourable view of it and American support for an international peacekeeping organisation. However, just because the US government was in favour does not necessarily mean that the American people were. Source D is unreliable.

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- This assessment focuses on source comprehension, analysis and evaluation so this should be central to candidates' approach.
- When reading sources candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source in order to understand the argument or point of view of the author. This means that the source should be viewed holistically rather than divided into individual sentences or part sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to that which the source as a whole has.
- Candidates should ensure that they look closely at the provenance of each source as they read them and consider how far this is useful when analysing the statement given. Candidates should consider the nature (what type of source it is), the origin (who wrote or produced the source), and purpose of sources before commenting on generic reliability or placing in a particular context.
- Time-keeping is vitally important. Candidates need to make sure they leave enough time to write complete answers to both questions.

In summary, the key message is for candidates to read the sources very carefully, making sure that they understand both the particular details of the source and its overall argument. This will mean candidates are better prepared to tackle both questions.

General comments

Most candidates clearly understood that the **(a)** question requires an identification of similarities and differences and that answers to **(b)** questions require an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the prompt in the question. Successful candidates appreciated that they needed to support the points they made with quotations from the relevant sources.

The focus of the **(a)** question is to identify similarity and difference. Less successful responses to part **(a)** often made inappropriate points of comparison; they claimed similarities for points which were not actually similar and differences for points which were not really different. Only valid similarities and differences can be credited. Another feature of less successful responses was to include large sections of contextual knowledge or stock paragraphs of 'evaluation' rather than tackling the main focus of the question. Although there are marks in the top level for commenting on the usefulness of the sources, the main focus of the question should be on making a developed comparison i.e. identifying similarities and differences.

In answering the part **(b)** question candidates need to ensure they read the question carefully and refer to all of the sources. A minority of candidates ran out of time, usually after writing long introductions which contributed little to their answer. If candidates are to do justice to their knowledge and understanding and subject skills, effective time management is an essential general skill.

When analysing the sources, candidates needed to take care not to pick out sections of text which ran counter to the overall message of the source. An example from this paper can be found in **Section A**, Source C which was a source commenting on the nature of Piedmont's involvement in the Crimean War. Some candidates found it difficult to separate the language used in the source which tried to highlight the effectiveness of their contribution, with the overall message of the source, which pointed to the fact that they had gained little from being involved. Candidates should strive to contextualise sources rather than picking out small sections of text.

To achieve higher evaluation marks, it is necessary to explain why the nature, origin or purpose of the source makes it more or less useful when answering the question. One example was in **Section C** where two sources gave different opinions of the debate over the United States joining the League of Nations.

Successful candidates were able to contextualise these sources by referring to the language used and the wider debate at the time which took place in the press and Congress. When using these ideas, it is important that candidates explain why this makes the source more or less useful for the question, rather than just stating the date and saying it is unreliable.

Comments on specific questions

Section A, European Option

(a) To what extent do Sources A and B agree on the reasons for Piedmont's entering the Crimean War?

The key to this question was to consider the motives, as the two extracts came from very different sources. Source A came from a British source not intended for publication and gave an overview of what Piedmont might expect from involvement in the Crimean war. It showed that those who ruled the state expected to be able to gain internal strength in Italy which would help with the process of unification. Source B, as an official document, is more focused on restoring peace and stability through improving the position of Piedmont in European affairs. Whilst Source A is clear about dealing with revolutionaries, Source B is not so clear about what Piedmont will be able to do. Many candidates were able to recognise similarities and differences but less successful candidates tended not to focus sufficiently on the motives shown in each source and how this related to the question. Some responses included a lot of knowledge about the events which was not needed, and these answers would have been improved by focusing on identifying similarities and differences from within the content of the sources.

(b) 'The cause of Italian unification gained from Piedmont's involvement in the Crimean War.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?

Most candidates took the sources at face value when looking for information about the impact of the Crimean War on the unification ambitions of Piedmont. This meant that Source A was used to support the statement, as was Source B, as they highlight the various aims of the Crimean campaign. Candidates sometimes struggled to interpret Source C as it represents the views of Piedmont in a formal setting; better responses were able to analyse the source in order to challenge the statement and show that the war had not advanced Piedmont's aims. Better responses were able to link the contents of Source D with the involvement of Piedmont in the Crimean war, to show some support for the statement, as well as noting Cavour's doubts to challenge. Some struggled to use this source successfully as they could not draw a direct link with the Crimean war. Responses would often have been improved by discussing the difference between the first two sources that were written before the conflict, and Sources C and D which were written afterwards. This contextualisation could have been used to give the sources weight and distinguish between the aims that Piedmont had and the actual outcomes.

Section B, American Option

(a) To what extent do Sources A and B agree on the impact of the Dred Scott judgement on the issue of slavery?

Less successful responses tended to limit their answers to describing the Dred Scott judgement rather than using source evidence to comment on its impact on slavery. Candidates should remember that applying their knowledge of the period in order to analyse sources is the main focus of this question. Better responses were able to recognise that both sources saw the judgement as significant and that both felt that Congress would need to respond to the judgement. Responses sometimes omitted to identify appropriate differences, such as the focus of Source A seeing the judgement as the beginning of a struggle, and Source B considering it as an end to the argument. Contextual knowledge could be used here to aid understanding of how issues such as Dred Scott were often used as political tools in the sectional debate.

(b) 'The Dred Scott judgement was a huge setback for the abolitionist cause.' How far do Sources A to D support this assertion?

In order to get to the heart of this question, candidates were required to analyse all of the sources and apply knowledge to support or challenge the statement. Source C clearly argues that the

judgement was a huge setback to the Republican cause and most candidates were able to link this with abolitionism to support the statement. Sources A and B could be used to support the statement by focussing on the damage done to abolitionist groups; however, both also left open the option for anti-slavery campaigners to continue to fight. Source D, written by Abraham Lincoln, was used well by the best answers to analyse his views during the 1850s, although some responses tried to link this to his later activities during the Civil War. This sort of post hoc evaluation rarely led to creditable comment. Candidates should be prepared to understand the work and ideas of Lincoln before his election as well as afterwards. Weaker responses could have been improved by demonstrating an understanding of the impact of the key events of the period when judging and evaluating the sources as well as just knowing what happened.

Section C, International Option

(a) Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources A and B regarding President Wilson's proposals for a League of Nations.

Most responses were able to compare and contrast the opinions laid out in the two sources. Stronger responses identified the differences in the language used about Wilson and the League of Nations, as well as the possible impacts of the League. Some candidates focused their answers only on whether the United States should join the League, rather than the proposals of Wilson, which was an important distinction to make in this question. The best responses were able to contextualise the sources within the wider debate of the time.

(b) 'On his return home from Paris in 1919, President Wilson had every reason to believe that the USA would join the League of Nations.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?

Some less successful responses to this question were focused on whether or not the United States *should* join the League of Nations which, although related to the content of the sources and with some merit, was not the focus of the question asked. The best responses were able to recognise that the focus of the question was about whether the views of the public were reliable in the sources, and indeed whether that really mattered to Wilson when he returned from Paris. As such, Sources A and B gave clearly partisan views and showed the impact of the words of Senators on the debate. Perhaps the most vital source here was Source C, which showed the results of opinion polls. Many candidates took the raw figures as reliable and suggested this showed support for the League. However, better analysis showed that this was not the whole picture, and some candidates considered the 'missing' states of the mid-west which were more likely to be Republican, and the importance of the views of ex-servicemen. This kind of contextualisation meant that the best answers began to weigh the evidence from the sources, thus demonstrating their evaluation skills. Similarly, Source D could be used to both support and challenge the statement but needed some interpretation and contextualisation in order to be fully utilised in answering the question.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/13
Document Question

Key messages

- This assessment focuses on source comprehension, analysis and evaluation so this should be central to candidates' approach.
- When reading sources candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source in order to understand the argument or point of view of the author. This means that the source should be viewed holistically rather than divided into individual sentences or part sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to that which the source as a whole has.
- Candidates should ensure that they look closely at the provenance of each source as they read them and consider how far this is useful when analysing the statement given. Candidates should consider the nature (what type of source it is), the origin (who wrote or produced the source), and purpose of sources before commenting on generic reliability or placing in a particular context.
- Time-keeping is vitally important. Candidates need to make sure they leave enough time to write complete answers to both questions.

In summary, the key message is for candidates to read the sources very carefully, making sure that they understand both the particular details of the source and its overall argument. This will mean candidates are better prepared to tackle both questions.

General comments

Most candidates clearly understood that the **(a)** question requires an identification of similarities and differences and that answers to **(b)** questions require an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the prompt in the question. Successful candidates appreciated that they needed to support the points they made with quotations from the relevant sources.

The focus of the **(a)** question is to identify similarity and difference. Less successful responses to part **(a)** often made inappropriate points of comparison; they claimed similarities for points which were not actually similar and differences for points which were not really different. Only valid similarities and differences can be credited. Another feature of less successful responses was to include large sections of contextual knowledge or stock paragraphs of 'evaluation' rather than tackling the main focus of the question. Although there are marks in the top level for commenting on the usefulness of the sources, the main focus of the question should be on making a developed comparison i.e. identifying similarities and differences.

In answering the part **(b)** question candidates need to ensure they read the question carefully and refer to all of the sources. A minority of candidates ran out of time, usually after writing long introductions which contributed little to their answer. If candidates are to do justice to their knowledge and understanding and subject skills, effective time management is an essential general skill.

When analysing the sources, candidates needed to take care not to pick out sections of text which ran counter to the overall message of the source. An example from this paper can be found in **Section B**, Source B which was a source commenting on the changing opinion of Lincoln as the Republican candidate by a newspaper. In the source the editorial sets out their previous concerns about Lincoln but then says these no longer apply and that they support him. Some did not look at the whole source but picked out small sections of text to try and prove that the newspaper was against Lincoln. Candidates should strive to contextualise sources rather than picking out small sections of text.

To achieve higher evaluation marks, it is necessary to explain why the nature, origin or purpose of the source makes it more or less useful when answering the question. One example was in **Section A** where a source by Bismarck was used to look at the cause of unrest in the German states in 1848. Some candidates were

able to comment on the position of Bismarck in this period as a landowner and civil servant to contextualise and weigh his comments. However, others were distracted by the actions of Bismarck later in the century. When using these ideas, it is important that candidates explain why this makes the source more or less useful for the question rather than just stating the date and saying it is unreliable.

Comments on specific questions

Section A, European Option

(a) Compare and contrast the views in Sources B and C on the German constitution.

At face value, both sources largely agreed that a Constitution was desirable but had different ideas about the challenges facing a Constitution and the exact form it might take. Candidates who read the sources at face value omitted to pick up these issues and often only identified simple similarities or difficulties. Better responses were able to recognise differences, such as the desire for a federal Germany shown in Source B and a unified Germany discussed in Source C. Some candidates also commented on the similarity in the provenance of both authors, and then used this to discuss the views of the Frankfurt parliament in the period. This often led to some useful comparison and showed the value of contextualised knowledge when analysing sources.

(b) How far do Sources A to D show that the desire for unity was the most important cause of unrest in Germany in 1848?

Most candidates were able to recognise the Sources which clearly supported or challenged the statement, such as Source A, where Bismarck set out the economic causes of unrest, and Source D which discussed the desire for unity as the main focus of the 1848 revolutions. Candidates found Sources B and C more difficult to closely relate and needed to think carefully about how these sources viewed unity, before considering their wider views. Evaluation in this question was attempted by many candidates but some omitted to consider the time period of sources, especially Source A, and offered generic comments which were not useful for testing the sources in relation to the question. The best answers used contextual knowledge to argue that liberalism and nationalism were largely ideas of the middle classes, and this meant that unrest was used to justify these ideologies even if, as suggested by Bismarck, it had little to do with the real issues.

Section B, American Option

(a) To what extent do Sources A and B agree in their assessment of the Republican Party's choice of Lincoln as candidate to contest the 1860 presidential election?

Most candidates were able to identify differences between the sources by picking out sections of text which described the character of Lincoln in different ways. For example, Source B sees him as an outsider from politics, whereas Source A sees him as part of the party machine. Some candidates found similarities harder to identify but those who did were clear on the change of opinion by Source B and the relationship of Lincoln's candidacy to Seward's rejection. Better responses were able to use contextual knowledge to place the sources in terms of sectional allegiances, although some did misrepresent the location of North Carolina. Those that were most successful were able to use this contextual knowledge to look at the usefulness of the sources for answering the question.

(b) How far do Sources A to D support the assertion that Abraham Lincoln's candidacy divided the nation?

This question was generally well answered and most candidates were able to pick out the face-value points of support and challenge from the sources. Better answers moved on to look at the subtleties which were evident in the sources e.g. Source A, which suggests that the Republican Party was more divisive than Lincoln whom they regarded as a weak figure. Source C confused some candidates as a newspaper from a slave state which showed some support for Lincoln, but better responses were able to use contextual knowledge to suggest that this was evidence more of a dislike for Douglas (the great Compromiser) than of overwhelming support for Lincoln himself. The best answers were able to give some sense of the complexity of the question and some suggested that the division existed before Lincoln himself became the candidate.

Section C, International Option

- (a) **Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources B and C regarding the USA's involvement in the proposed League of Nations.**

Candidates dealt well with this question and were able to recognise elements of the debate over joining the League Nations to identify similarities and differences between the sources. Weaker responses sometimes just discussed the 'pros and cons' of the League rather than the specific question of the involvement of the United States, but better answers were able to recognise where the authors supported the League but differed in their opinions about the US joining. The best answers were able to evaluate the sources using contextual knowledge to assess their utility.

- (b) **How far do Sources A to D support President Wilson's claim that a majority of the American people supported the idea of a League of Nations?**

The key to this question was to recognise that Source A, from Wilson himself, could be used to test the other sources, and many candidates were able to structure their responses in this way. This led to clear support and challenge being given for the statement and the best of these responses focussed specifically on the question of a majority of Americans. The best responses used their contextual knowledge to place the sources in a chronology they understood. For example, Source C was written after the Covenant was published, so that the writer was able to give his opinions on the document. Source D was well used in some cases and the discussion over how much public opinion polls are useful led to some higher-level analysis. Some candidates also cross-referenced Source D with Source A to show a continuity of public opinion between March and December. As ever, successfully contextualising the sources often led to the answers which addressed the question most clearly.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/21
Outline Study

Key messages

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

General comments

In line with the requirements of the examination, most candidates attempted two complete questions from one Section of the paper. In general, candidates used their time effectively, devoting an appropriate amount to each question. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in at least some of their answers, but less successful candidates were unable to sustain consistent quality across all four of their responses. Some candidates produced satisfactory or better responses to one part of a question, yet weak (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part. Part **(a)** and Part **(b)** questions have a fundamental difference in focus. Some successful candidates appreciated this and attempted the two Part **(a)** questions consecutively, followed by the two Part **(b)** questions (or vice-versa). Part **(a)** questions are about causation. Answers which were effective showed detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. Causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of a number of factors, both long and short-term. Responses were most effective when they clearly focused on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they inter-acted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance.

The identification and explanation of some relevant causal factors was made by most candidates, but less successful answers tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. The weaker responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology; they were over-reliant on vague and generalised assertions lacking appropriate factual support.

In Part **(b)** awareness that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways was a characteristic of good answers. To be valid, an interpretation must be based on a thorough analysis of appropriate and accurate factual material, and must show due consideration of alternative viewpoints. These questions require candidates to develop such interpretations, to make reasoned judgements and to justify their arguments in a clear, consistent and sustained manner. The most impressive responses were based on the development of consistent and balanced arguments, explicitly focused on the requirements of the specific question, leading to reasoned and fully-supported conclusions. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Less successful responses fell into one of two categories – relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth; narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance (often by ignoring time frames given in the question).

Comments on specific questions

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

Question 1: France, 1789–1814

(a) Why was Napoleon popular with the French people?

Many excellent responses explained the reasons for Napoleon's popularity with the French people through references to his military successes restoring French national pride, his improvement in relations with the Catholic Church through the Concordat pleasing the majority of French people, who were Catholics, and the introduction of the Civil Code giving legal sanction to some of the important developments of the 1790s (e.g. abolition of feudalism). More limited responses could have been improved by avoiding a narrative of Napoleon's actions with no link to causation.

(b) 'Social and economic factors provide the best explanation for government instability between 1789 and 1795.' How far do you agree?

The more effective responses were able to analyse the role of social factors, such as the burdens placed upon the Third Estate, along with economic factors, such as government debt, in creating political instability in the period. This was then balanced with an analysis of how other factors, such as Louis XVI's lack of political skill, the flight to Varennes, and growing radicalism within France further created political instability. Less successful responses tended to describe events rather than analysing their relative significance with explicit reference to the requirements of the question. As a result, these responses produced narrative accounts of the causes and development of the French Revolution within the period.

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

(a) Why did industrialisation have such an impact on the middle classes?

Good answers were able to provide explanations of how industrialisation benefitted the middle class through the opportunities for entrepreneurship and the creation of jobs such as engineers and managers, provided by, for example, the growth of railways. In turn, the increased wealth that this provided improved the lifestyle of the middle class and this led to their growing status and a greater participation in politics. Weaker responses showed some confusion over who constituted the middle class, and so produced information not focused on the question.

(b) Assess the reasons why industrialisation had so great an impact on political structures by the end of the nineteenth century. Refer to any two countries in your answer.

The most effective responses were based on a genuine attempt to identify and analyse the implications of industrialisation on political structures. This usually involved an understanding of how the rise of the middle class affected existing political structures, reference being made, for example, to Britain's 1832 Reform Act. In such responses, the changes in the situation of the working class went beyond the simple change brought about by the development of Trade Unions, to link this to changes in working practices and the increased need for education, which in turn led to political activism amongst the working classes. However, very rarely was the question's requirement to refer to more than one country addressed. Weaker responses lacked focus on the precise requirements of the question and relied too heavily on generalised, unsupported and, often, inaccurate assertions. Candidates wrote about the social and economic effects of the Industrial Revolution, for example by describing the harsh living and working conditions experienced by factory employees.

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

(a) Why was France hostile to Germany in the years before 1914?

Good responses provided explanations of how the humiliation France felt at her defeat in the Franco-Prussian war, the loss of the provinces of Alsace and Lorraine, and the large indemnity she had to pay, created an atmosphere of hostility in her relations with Germany. These were supported further by references to the Moroccan crises as examples of German provocation and

aggression which added to French hostility. Candidates could have improved their responses by avoiding lengthy descriptions of the alliances drawn up by Germany to isolate France.

(b) To what extent were Great Power rivalries responsible for Balkan instability in the period from 1900 to 1914?

Most candidates were able to demonstrate good knowledge of the role of Great Powers such as Austria and Russia in causing instability in the Balkans between 1900 and 1914. This was assessed against other causal factors, such as the legacy left by declining Ottoman power and Balkan nationalism. The most effective responses were based on a consistently analytical approach, so that concluding statements were both supported and followed logically from what had come before. Less successful responses tended to be largely narrative in approach, describing various events with little (or assertive only) reference to the requirements of the question.

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

(a) Why was the Provisional Government formed in 1917?

Successful responses focused on the reasons for the government's formation, such as the Tsar's abdication, the power vacuum this created and Grand Duke Michael's stance of not accepting the crown unless it was offered to him by a constituent assembly. Less well focused responses dealt with the broader causes of the Russian Revolution, and some strayed into irrelevance with details of events post-February 1917.

(b) 'A period of major reforms' Discuss this view of Russia in the period from 1900 to 1914.

The majority of candidates made a genuine effort to remain fully-focused on the requirements of the question. Many responses argued in support of the view that the period was one of major reforms, with references to the political reforms of the October Manifesto and Stolypin's reforms in the countryside. Counter arguments were seen in the references to the limited franchise, the Russification programme and the Fundamental Laws' impact on the October Manifesto. Other, less focused, responses provided much lengthy narrative detail about the 1905 Revolution.

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

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

(a) Why did the USA advocate an 'open door' policy towards China in the later nineteenth century?

There were too few answers to make comment appropriate.

(b) How far, in the period 1897–1934, did US policy towards the states of the Caribbean and Central America remain consistent?

There were too few answers to make comment appropriate.

Question 6: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–1877

(a) Why did military rule of the South come to an end in 1877?

The most impressive responses came from candidates who were able to provide a detailed explanation of the political and constitutional motives which led to the Compromise of 1877, and, thereby, the end of military rule in the South, between the Republican Party and Southern Democrats. Weaker responses lost the question's focus and confused the end of military occupation with the end of the Civil War.

(b) Which side did more to limit civil liberties during the Civil War: North or South?

Effective responses referred to the suspension of *habeas corpus* and other civil liberty restrictions, such as press censorship and the deployment of military courts, and sought to make some assessment as to whether it was the North or the South which did the most to limit civil liberties. Some candidates misinterpreted the question, confusing civil liberties with civil rights; as a result,

they wrote about the problems faced by slaves in the southern states or issues relating to the post-Civil War period.

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

(a) Why did Theodore Roosevelt fail to win the 1912 presidential election?

Responses which were effective explained how Theodore Roosevelt splitting the Republican vote, and seeming to go against the convention of a presidency limited to two terms, caused him to lose the election of 1912. Other responses could have been improved by avoiding narrative accounts of what were Theodore Roosevelt policies when he had been president.

(b) Assess the impact of the USA's high tariff policy on the economy in the late nineteenth century.

Effective responses displayed good knowledge of the role of high tariffs in protecting fledgling American industries by making foreign imports more expensive and contributing to higher profits for American companies. Some responses balanced this, for example, in the acknowledgement that protection from effective foreign competition led to less efficient practices surviving, and the cost of living was increased because imported goods were more expensive. Less focused responses described the later nineteenth century without reference to high tariffs.

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

(a) Why are the 1920s often referred to as the Jazz Age?

Most candidates were able to provide explanations of why the 1920s were referred to as the Jazz Age through reference to the music's popularity because of the focus on enjoyment and entertainment. This was further enhanced through the popular dance crazes and social changes such as the rise of independent young women, the flappers. Other candidates could have improved their responses by keeping the question's focus and avoiding generalised descriptions of the 1920s.

(b) 'The most stupendous invasion of the spirit of liberty' (Herbert Hoover, 1936). How justified is Hoover's criticism of the New Deal?

The best responses grasped that the question's focus was political rather than economic. This meant assessment was made of how far increasing federal government regulation undermined not only states' rights, but also the spirit of American free enterprise, seen as a building block of American democracy. This was balanced against the fact that Hoover's attempts at tackling the economic crisis had proved to be too little, too late. Therefore, the size of the task Franklin Roosevelt faced called for an innovative response and he was democratically elected in 1932, whilst Hoover had been clearly rejected by the American voters. Weaker responses produced narrative accounts of the New Deal measures undertaken by Franklin Roosevelt's administration.

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

Question 9: International Relations, 1871–1918

(a) Why, after 1890, did Britain become increasingly concerned about Germany's intentions?

Good responses provided appropriate explanations for Britain's increasing concern, such as the seemingly growing provocations and confrontational stance of Germany under Kaiser William II, as seen in the Kruger telegram. The rapid increase in Germany's naval strength seemed to be designed to challenge British maritime supremacy, rather than safeguard German access to overseas colonies, and German actions in the Moroccan crises appeared openly aggressive. Other candidates could have improved their responses by avoiding descriptive accounts of the alliance system, sometimes going all the way back to 1873 and the first League of the Three Emperors.

(b) To what extent was it imperial rivalry in Africa that created the threat to peace in Europe?

Effective responses focused explicitly on incidents in Africa which seemed to threaten the wider peace, such as Franco-Italian rivalry over Tunis and Anglo-French confrontation at Fashoda,

alongside the desire for colonies in Africa helping to fuel a growing sense of nationalism amongst European powers. This was then assessed against examples of how Africa provided opportunities to settle rivalry and maintain peace, such as the Treaty of Berlin (1885), the peaceful resolution of the Fashoda crisis and resultant improved Anglo-French relations. Often this assessment was enhanced further through an examination of how factors such as the alliance system, instability in the Balkans and, after 1890, the seemingly erratic behaviour of Kaiser William II all threatened peace in Europe. Less good responses produced a narrative account of the Scramble for Africa and/or the Berlin Conference (1884–1885).

Question 10: International Relations, 1919–1933

(a) Why did France agree to the terms of the Dawes Plan?

Most responses displayed sound knowledge of the reasons for France's acceptance of the Plan, such as France's awareness that her hard-line approach, as seen in the Ruhr occupation, had failed and merely weakened Germany's ability to pay reparations, and had undermined France's relations with Britain, which had to be restored in the interests of national security. Other responses could have been improved by avoiding lengthy descriptions of the Plan and confusions with details from the later Young Plan.

(b) To what extent did the Treaty of Versailles satisfy France?

Many candidates were able to identify appropriate evidence in support of the statement: the high reparations demanded of Germany, the reduction in German armed forces to below a defensive capability and the de-militarisation of the Rhineland, providing some security on France's eastern border with Germany. This was balanced, often, by reference to America's refusal to ratify the treaty creating concern for France over future American support in any conflict with Germany, and Britain's aim to see the German economy recover undermining France's desire to permanently weaken Germany. Weaker responses produced a narrative account of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles without reference to the question's focus.

Question 11: International Relations, 1933–1939

(a) Why did Spain lack political stability in the period from 1933 to 1936?

Good responses were able to explain the roles that the regional divisions of Spain, the disunity between the various left-wing groups, and opposing policies taken by the governments of the right and left in this period had in creating political instability. Weaker responses focused on the Spanish Civil War, outlining various reasons why the Republicans were defeated and/or why Italy and Germany decided to support the Nationalists.

(b) 'Hitler's foreign policy was based on the desire to gain revenge for Germany's defeat in the First World War.' How far do you agree?

The most effective responses came from candidates who were able to remain fully focused on the question's requirements, providing detailed analysis of a wide range of factual evidence to develop balanced arguments and reach reasoned conclusions. Responses which were less successful tended to lack balance, candidates providing perfectly valid arguments in support of the hypothesis, but finding little to challenge it by identifying other motives which Hitler may have had. Less focused responses adopted a purely narrative approach, describing Hitler's actions, to varying degrees of depth of accuracy.

Question 12: China and Japan, 1919–1945

(a) Why was the Kuomintang able to gain control over most of China by 1928?

The most effective responses were based on a clear understanding of the significance of Chiang Kai-shek's Northern March and the reasons behind its success in gaining control over much of China. Some candidates were able to write in considerable detail about the importance of Chiang's own military training, the significance of Soviet military support, the disorganisation of the Warlord armies and the KMT's close liaison with the CCP and the weakening of the CCP following the Purification Movement. Other responses could have been improved by focusing on causation rather than description.

(b) To what extent did Sun Yat-sen share the views of the Chinese Communist Party?

The most impressive responses were characterised by the development of fully-focused and balanced arguments. These were centred on assessment of the respective approaches to democracy, nationalism and economic policies. It was argued that while both shared the belief that China had to be free from foreign control, there were differences over attitudes to democracy, with Sun Yat-sen's views being more western influenced, and the economy, with the CCP favouring extensive land redistribution. Weaker responses produced narrative accounts of the respective views.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/22
Outline Study

Key messages

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

General comments

In line with the requirements of the examination, most candidates attempted two complete questions from one Section of the paper. In general, candidates used their time effectively, devoting an appropriate amount to each question. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in at least some of their answers, but less successful candidates were unable to sustain consistent quality across all four of their responses. Some candidates produced satisfactory or better responses to one part of a question, yet weak (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part. Part **(a)** and Part **(b)** questions have a fundamental difference in focus. Some successful candidates appreciated this and attempted the two Part **(a)** questions consecutively, followed by the two Part **(b)** questions (or vice-versa). Part **(a)** questions are about causation. Answers which were effective showed detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. Causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of a number of factors, both long and short-term. Responses were most effective when they clearly focused on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they inter-acted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance.

The identification and explanation of some relevant causal factors was made by most candidates, but less successful answers tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. The weaker responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology; they were over-reliant on vague and generalised assertions lacking appropriate factual support.

In Part **(b)** awareness that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways was a characteristic of good answers. To be valid, an interpretation must be based on a thorough analysis of appropriate and accurate factual material, and must show due consideration of alternative viewpoints. These questions require candidates to develop such interpretations, to make reasoned judgements and to justify their arguments in a clear, consistent and sustained manner. The most impressive responses were based on the development of consistent and balanced arguments, explicitly focused on the requirements of the specific question, leading to reasoned and fully-supported conclusions. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Less successful responses fell into one of two categories – relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth; narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance (often by ignoring time frames given in the question).

Comments on specific questions

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

Question 1: France, 1789–1814

(a) Why did the Directory Fall?

This question was generally well answered. Many candidates showed a good understanding of general problems facing any government in France at this stage of the Revolution as well as the specific weaknesses of this particular manifestation of ‘revolutionary’ government. A few weaker answers were confused about the difference between Robespierre’s rule and that of the Directory, and some did not fully understand Napoleon’s role at this stage of the Revolution, suggesting he was one of the Directors.

(b) ‘Internal divisions were the main reasons why the Counter-revolutionaries failed between 1789 and 1795.’ How far do you agree?

Good answers were able to identify possible groups who were against the revolution and explain why they were unsuccessful, either specifically or generally – the failure of the king to provide leadership and direction being a common theme of successful responses. Weaker answers often described in general terms why there was a revolution, and why the monarchy ended in 1792, and/or the effects of the Reign of Terror. They were often unclear about what ‘counter-revolutionary’ meant.

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

(a) Why was the development of steam power so important to the industrial revolution?

There were some very effective answers to this question with a clear understanding of the impact of steam power in production of goods, the growth of factories, the development of transport and the overall growth of trading possibilities. Weaker answers only dealt with one of these, or just described the early development of steam power, without considering its results.

(b) Assess the economic effects of industrialisation by 1890. Refer to any two countries in your answer.

Good answers were able to explain the economic changes brought about by the industrial revolution and were able to apply this to two (or more) countries – usually Great Britain plus either France or Germany. They were also able to explain changes in pace and type of developments over a period of time – i.e. up to 1890. Weaker responses often focused just on social changes and problems, rather than dealing with the economic issues, and did not cover the specified time period.

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

(a) Why did the assassination of Franz Ferdinand have such serious results?

This question was answered well. Most were well aware of the consequences of the assassination and were able to write about them in considerable (sometimes too much) detail. Weaker responses tended to be just a description of what happened; better ones were able to explain why specific actions had serious repercussions.

(b) ‘Decisions to go to war in 1914 were taken for defensive reasons.’ How far do you agree?

Less successful answers gave a country-by-country analysis, trying to show how their actions might be interpreted as defensive or not defensive, or described the causes of the First World War. The best answers showed a good grasp of the complexities of decision-making in the capitals of Europe at this time, and recognised that some actions could often be interpreted in both ways depending on viewpoint.

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

(a) Why was the Tsarist regime disliked so much by 1905?

There are a number of relevant factors here and good responses showed a clear awareness of both long and short-term problems of the Tsarist regime, including the events of early 1905. Weaker answers just described the events of Bloody Sunday and subsequent actions or the weaknesses of the Tsar as a ruler, with little detail of specific problems.

(b) ‘A great revolutionary leader.’ Assess this view of Lenin.

Less successful answers just described Lenin’s role in the Russian Revolution. Better responses gave serious consideration to what might be judged ‘great’ in the action Lenin took and responded accordingly, with the best answers presenting a balanced view, showing what he did that might qualify him for the epithet and other factors that might undermine this view. Most candidates stopped, quite reasonably, at the Revolution of Oct/Nov 1917, but some good candidates went beyond this and showed a clear grasp of Lenin’s importance in the development and defence of the Revolution in this period. However, this was not essential to achieving the higher-level marks.

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

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

(a) Why did the USA play a leading role in European powers agreeing to the Dawes Plan in 1924?

Most candidates understood the economic consequences of the Treaty of Versailles in terms of the effects on Germany, and recognised the US need to encourage economic growth in Europe. They were also able to explain reasons why it took the US to create the Dawes Plan, because of the mutual antagonisms between certain European countries.

(b) How far does the Mexican American War of 1846–8 deserve to be known as ‘Mr Polk’s War’?

Some candidates were able to set the war in a clear context of Manifest Destiny and US expansionist tendencies as well as Polk’s own personal objectives in this area. These produced good responses. Others had clearly limited knowledge of the period and struggled to link Polk with the war, resulting in basic description of the key events in the outbreak of the war and identification of the outcomes.

Question 6: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–1877

(a) Why did the slave states divide in 1861?

Few successful answers were seen in response to this question. A majority of the weakest responses did not understand the concept of the division of the slave states, and as a result most responses lacked a clear focus.

(b) How successful were President Johnson’s plans for reconstructing the South?

Weaker answers suffered from a lack of clarity about the meaning of ‘re-construction’, coupled with a lack of a clear idea as to which policies were Lincoln’s, which were Johnson’s, and which were the product of the Radical Republicans in Congress. The results were generally not well focused and limited in their effectiveness.

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

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

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

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

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

Question 9: International Relations, 1871–1918

- (a) **Why did Britain experience difficulty in defeating the Boers in the period from 1880 to 1902?**

There were some very sound responses that demonstrated clearly the significance of key factors such as the nature of warfare, especially Boer tactics, under-estimation of the enemy, the quality of British troops, etc. Less successful candidates tended to write a narrative account of the wars without really engaging with these issues.

- (b) **'The Anglo-Japanese Alliance of 1902 benefited Japan more than Britain.' How far do you agree?**

There were some reasonable responses to this question which demonstrated what each country gained from this alliance. A significant problem however was the issue of balance. Many candidates were able to identify advantages for Japan taking their investigation from the Russo-Japanese War right through to the end of World War One. However, there was often not a comparable appreciation of possible gains for the British. Often these are less easy to categorise but the advantages of a supportive ally in the far East, given British interests there, could have been developed a lot more effectively in most instances.

Question 10: International Relations, 1919–1933

- (a) **Why did France feel isolated and vulnerable in the period from 1919 to 1924?**

Candidates who attempted this question seemed generally very knowledgeable about France's discontent with the Treaty of Versailles. Less successful answers were restricted to a narrative approach. Better answers were able to successfully make connections between the Treaty and the situation in the years that followed, in terms of the falling away of potential support from the USA and GB as well as the (to French eyes) increasingly sympathetic treatment of Germany, especially after the French occupation of the Ruhr.

- (b) **To what extent did the Treaty of Versailles reflect President Wilson's desire to create a 'peace without victory'?**

Some of the better responses demonstrated a fair idea of the tone and purpose of the 14 points (though clearly detailed knowledge of all 14 was not necessary to being able to answer the question) and this was sufficient to enable them to link Wilson's key ideas to the terms of the Treaty in order to consider the degree of congruence between them. Good answers showed a balance between elements that showed some concessions to the 14 points and terms which clearly ignored Wilson's aims, supported by the use of relevant details. Less successful candidates just wrote about the terms of the treaty in a very descriptive way.

Question 11: International Relations, 1933–1939

- (a) **Why did the Spanish army generals begin a revolt in July 1936?**

Some candidates described the key events in Spain prior to 1936 without really addressing the question, but better responses showed how the complexities and increasing polarisation of Spanish politics led to the army's decision that they needed to intervene. Good answers linked social, economic and political factors to produce well-reasoned analysis.

- (b) **'Hitler thinks he has outsmarted me, but actually it is I who have tricked him.' How far do you agree with Stalin's opinion regarding the signing of the Nazi-Soviet Pact?**

Most candidates were able to identify the key features of the Nazi-Soviet Pact and better ones were able to explain why both Hitler and Stalin were happy to sign what, on face value, seemed an unlikely 'alliance'. Less successful answers were missing a reasoned judgement on Stalin's assertion. Some explained clearly why it was Hitler who had tricked Stalin and therefore Stalin was wrong in his judgement, but found it more difficult to explain the alternative view, though the best answers did recognise that Stalin had at least as much to gain, if not more, from the delay in warfare that the Pact gave him.

Question 12: China and Japan, 1919–1945

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/23
Outline Study

Key Messages

- In Part **(a)** questions, candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a range of factors to show how they inter-reacted and reaching a judgement regarding their relative significance.
- In Part **(b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.
- Candidates should ensure they focus on the date parameters set for the question and that they observe appropriate geographical or other imitations to their answers.

General comments

In line with the requirements of the examination, most candidates attempted two complete questions from one Section of the paper. In general, candidates used their time effectively, devoting an appropriate amount to each question. Most candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in at least some of their answers, but less successful candidates were unable to sustain consistent quality across all four of their responses. Some candidates produced satisfactory or better responses to one part of a question, yet weak (and, in some cases, no) answers to the other part. Part **(a)** and Part **(b)** questions have a fundamental difference in focus. Some successful candidates appreciated this and attempted the two Part **(a)** questions consecutively, followed by the two Part **(b)** questions (or vice-versa). Part **(a)** questions are about causation. Answers which were effective showed detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. Causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of a number of factors, both long and short-term. Responses were most effective when they clearly focused on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they inter-acted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance.

The identification and explanation of some relevant causal factors was made by most candidates, but less successful answers tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. The weaker responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology; they were over-reliant on vague and generalised assertions lacking appropriate factual support.

In Part **(b)** awareness that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways was a characteristic of good answers. To be valid, an interpretation must be based on a thorough analysis of appropriate and accurate factual material, and must show due consideration of alternative viewpoints. These questions require candidates to develop such interpretations, to make reasoned judgements and to justify their arguments in a clear, consistent and sustained manner. The most impressive responses were based on the development of consistent and balanced arguments, explicitly focused on the requirements of the specific question, leading to reasoned and fully-supported conclusions. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Less successful responses fell into one of two categories – relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth; narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance (often by ignoring time frames given in the question).

Comments on specific questions

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

Question 1: France, 1789–1814

(a) Why was there a ‘terror’ in France between 1792 and 1794?

This was quite a popular question and on the whole candidates had a reasonable knowledge and understanding of the events in France in the early 1790s. What distinguished the good from the less successful was the difference between describing the things that happened and explaining their consequences. Less successful candidates tended to give an account of the ‘terror’ or of what went immediately before; better answers were able to show how specific factors increased tensions and how a specific combination of factors produced the ‘terror’.

(b) ‘An enlightened dictator.’ Assess this view of Napoleon.

Most candidates demonstrated reasonable levels of knowledge about Napoleon. Less successful answers took a narrative approach, but better answers built a case for and against Napoleon as a dictator, while the best evaluated Napoleon’s achievement by focusing on the key word: ‘enlightened’. Moderate responses tended to concentrate on ‘dictator’ which was only part of the question, though they were often able to build a case for and against the idea of Napoleon as a dictator. The most successful candidates were able to link this to enlightened ideas as expressed through the revolution.

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

(a) Why were tariffs and international trade important to the industrial revolution?

There were some sound responses on the importance of international trade, both in terms of markets for goods and sources of raw materials, with some specific examples. Fewer candidates had anything significant to add about tariffs, but some good answers did make reference to the Zollverein.

(b) How important were governments in bringing about an industrial revolution? Refer to any two countries in your answer.

Candidates generally were aware of a number of factors that contributed to the growth of industry and explained these reasonably well, but they were not able to identify specific actions taken by governments in this process, and thus were unable to reach the highest levels by producing any sort of comparative analysis or judgement. A few candidates tried to use America as an example which is not in the syllabus for this section of the paper.

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

(a) Why were the Balkans unstable by 1914?

Successful candidates were aware of the principal causes of tensions in the Balkans and were able to write about them at some length. The most successful were able to make judgments about the cumulative effects of these problems, demonstrating the links between them, and showing how these resulted in growing instability in the region. A few candidates just focused on the issues in 1914 and could have produced better responses by paying more attention to the background to these events.

(b) ‘No single country should be blamed for causing World War 1.’ How far do you agree?

Candidates were often able to produce a detailed list of causes of the First World War. The degree of success with this question depended on how well they were able to set this knowledge in the specific context of the question set. A simple outline of the main causes limited the potential mark to the basic level awarded of simple description. A more successful strategy was a country -by- country consideration of the degree of culpability of the major players: Germany, Austria, Russia and Britain. Candidates who performed well produced a balanced account of the case for and

against the possible candidates in this debate, or for the alternative that there was no single country to blame but that it was an accumulation of causal factors.

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

(a) Why were political reforms introduced in Russia after 1905?

Good answers went beyond a basic account of the 1905 revolution and its immediate effects, to explain, not only why reforms were introduced, but also why they were limited (i.e. why they were designed to give away as little as possible).

(b) The Provisional Government stood no chance of survival.' How far do you agree?

The 'agree' side of the argument posed few difficulties, though some responses needed to move beyond the simple description of key events in order to achieve a better mark. The difficulty, for many, came in constructing an effective counter argument, and better answers did this mainly by adopting a counterfactual approach, i.e. they examined the critical mistakes of the Provisional Government and considered how a different decision at key points might have significantly altered its fortunes. A few high-level responses were able to use the actual title of the government to establish that something 'provisional' was only meant to be a short-term measure anyway.

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

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

(a) Why was the USA hostile to the rise of Japan from the late 19th century onwards?

There were a limited number of responses to this question and less successful answers were deficient in analysis and explanation. Candidates need to be aware of the time scale of questions like this. For example, 'late 19th century' does not need to include the early contact with Japan with Commodore Perry's expedition etc. At the same time, a few candidates recognised that the open-ended nature of the question allowed them to consider relations right through to the late 1930s. Most responses would have been improved by moving beyond a simple narrative account of the relations between the two and trying to establish an explanation of US concerns.

(b) How successful was US policy towards the states of Central America and the Caribbean from 1846 to 1898?

Some answers would have been improved by recognising that when clear dates are given they are a definitive limit to the scope of the essay that is expected, and that the same applies to specific geographical areas. Some less successful candidates wrote predominantly about the events of 1898 and afterwards, paying little attention to the development of US policy from the outbreak of the Mexican-American war up to the Spanish-American War. Successful candidates were aware of, and stuck to, these limits. Equally some candidates included areas as diverse as Peru, Chile and the Philippines within the scope of their essays and clearly this diminished the effectiveness of their responses.

Question 6: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–1877

(a) Why was there opposition in the North to Lincoln's presidency prior to the 1864 election?

This was a popular, and often quite well answered, question. Candidates' work was divided clearly into two main groups. The first of these was the group who were able to identify those who opposed Lincoln's attempt to win a second term. The second group were able to explain why Lincoln was opposed, for a variety of reasons, by several different groups and individuals. The latter group were more successful in their responses.

(b) 'Promised much, achieved little.' How accurate is this assessment of President Grant's reconstruction policy?

Some less successful answers treated 'reconstruction' as a single topic and were not able to distinguish which elements of reconstruction were down to Lincoln, Johnson or Grant. An insufficiently detailed grasp of the timing of the passage and endorsement of the Reconstruction

Amendments caused problems for some candidates. Better responses did look at measures introduced by Grant and areas in which he failed to follow up on the foundations laid in the immediate aftermath of the Civil War, and were able to offer some explanation for his achievements and inadequacies.

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

(a) Why did the Progressive movement gain support in the 1890's and early 1900's?

Successful candidates tended to concentrate on the amendments that reflected the aims of the Progressive movement (17–19) and explain why people supported them. The best answers went beyond this to examine the underlying social political and economic trends that increased the appeal of the Progressive movement and its leaders.

(b) 'More of a consequence of industrialisation than a cause.' How valid is this view of technological innovations of the later 19th century?

This question was not well answered. The chronological time frame of the question was ignored by some candidates, who wrote enthusiastically about Ford's introduction of the production line techniques that happened in the early 20th Century. Coupled with this, some candidates had difficulty in differentiating between the two elements of the explanation and ended up providing sound but limited descriptions of industrial development in the late 19th Century. The best answers recognised, and could explain to a reasonable level, the complex interaction between industrialisation and innovation.

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

(a) Why did Franklin Roosevelt remain so popular with the American people in the period from 1932 to 1941?

Candidates generally showed a good understanding of the work of F D Roosevelt. It is important, however, to remain fully aware of the limitations set by the specific question that is asked and, in this case, it was about his popularity, and did not require a detailed description/listing of the agencies of the New Deal, which is what some less successful candidates provided. Candidates who discussed his charisma, use of 'fireside chats' on the radio and the weakness and divisions of the opposition did better on this question.

(b) How far did the New Deal mark the end of laissez faire values and policies?

Less successful candidates wrote generally about the New Deal and its opponents rather than focussing on whether it marked the end of laissez faire values and policies. The meaning of 'laissez faire' seemed to be unfamiliar to some candidates who responded to this question, and even those who were familiar with it were not always sure about the specific nature of its politics and values. The majority of responses were simply descriptive with very limited attempts at comparative explanations.

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

Questions 9–12

None of the questions in section C were completed in sufficiently large numbers to make meaningful comment possible.

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- It is important to spend sufficient time on reading and thinking about the extract before beginning to write the answer. Thinking about the extract should include making notes of phrases and sentences that seem particularly significant in pointing towards the historian's interpretation, so that the answer can be properly planned and structured.
- The best answers demonstrate an understanding that the historian's main interpretation (from now on referred to as the '*Big Message*') will encompass the extract as a whole, and that they should therefore view the extract as a whole.
- It is important candidates focus on what the question is asking them to do. It asks what can be learnt from the extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it. It does not ask what the extract says. Answers that are limited to repetition or paraphrasing of the extract cannot be rewarded highly.

General comments

The move towards producing more concise, focused and relevant answers, noted in previous reports, continued in this examination. It is becoming rare to see answers that effectively ignore the extract and write only about the context. Almost all candidates perceive the extract as an interpretation, and make some attempt to use the content of the extract as support. The issue now, then, is how effectively this is done.

By far the most important task facing candidates is to view the extract as a whole, rather than as a series of unrelated messages. Almost all candidates construct their answers by working through the extract paragraph by paragraph. This is not necessarily the best approach, and often produces inferences about the interpretation that might be supportable based on a single paragraph, but not when the extract is taken as a whole. Thus when candidates move on to the next paragraph, and find something contradictory, they tend to view this as the historian simply changing their interpretation, which is logically unsustainable, and, more significantly for the examination, an indicator of lack of understanding.

An associated issue is labelling. Historians' approaches are often given labels: revisionist, functionalist, traditionalist and so on. Candidates use these labels which, if done properly, can help to provide a structure around which an answer can be built. Sometimes, though, the labelling is incorrect, either because of misunderstanding of what the extract says, or because the label itself is misunderstood. The confusion can be compounded when candidates perceive different approaches in different sections of the extract, or even in individual words and phrases. Candidates need to be aware that an extract will only have one '*Big Message*', and that if the historian is, for example, traditionalist, s/he cannot also be revisionist. Of course, there are approaches that synthesise aspects of other approaches – post-revisionism on the Cold War can include the idea that both sides share blame – but this does not mean that part of such an extract would be traditionalist and another part revisionist.

There is evidence that some candidates do not read the extract closely enough. Whenever an extract includes claims made not by the historian but by one of the people mentioned in the extract, there will be many candidates who nonetheless take the claim as the historian's, often drawing an inference from it that is totally opposite to the true meaning.

Some responses placed too much emphasis on demonstrating their factual knowledge of the topic. These answers are structured in such a way that knowledge is used to explain or extend the content of the extract, so that if a particular event or development is mentioned, then the answer will tell you more about it. This is a misunderstanding of the question, which asks for the extract and knowledge to be used to *explain the*

interpretation. Thus, everything that is included in the answer can only be relevant to the extent that it helps to illuminate the inferences the candidate is making about the historian. Knowledge can, of course, be knowledge of interpretations (i.e. the historiography) as well as knowledge of events, but rather like labelling, attempts by candidates to draw parallels between the extract and what they know of other historians will only work when they are accurate, and all too often a name, word or phrase will make candidates jump to conclusions about the extract as a whole.

When first reading the extract, a good question for candidates to ask themselves is ‘What is this extract about?’ They can be sure that if, say, the extract is about Truman, or about bystanders of the Holocaust, then this is what the Big Message will be about. It is notable that relatively few answers use such awareness as a starting point. Some candidates spend time considering what the extract is *not* about, which can also be a useful analytical move, but only if used to comment on the historian’s interpretation, rather than to chastise the historian for forgetting or omitting something. There are still examples of candidates attempting to evaluate the reliability of what the extracts say. Invariably this produces meaningless generalisations about how the historian might, with a little more effort or insight, have come up with a better interpretation. This kind of evaluation is not required by the question.

Comments on specific questions

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote the extract is that by the end of the First World War, the end of the Empire was in sight, even if the British themselves had not yet realised it. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract, which suggested that the British were losing interest in Empire and were moving towards making concessions towards those they ruled, even though these concessions could never be enough. The weakest answers fell into two broad categories. First, those that repeated or paraphrased points in the extract without engaging with the historian’s interpretation, and second, those that wrote about Imperialism with no reference to the extract. Some candidates thought the extract was about causes of Empire.

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that Hitler’s plans for war against the Soviet Union implied his intention to annihilate the Jews, but the precise nature of the genocidal process was determined by the circumstances of war. The best responses recognised both these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Many answers saw the interpretation as intentionalist, a reasonable conclusion given the portrayal of Hitler as the instigator and motivator of the Holocaust. Complete understanding included awareness of how war shaped the kind of Final Solution that ultimately emerged, which meant that answers that perceived a synthesis interpretation were more persuasive. This question revealed widespread misunderstanding of the terms ‘functionalism’ and ‘structuralism’, which were used almost interchangeably by many candidates, and neither of which fitted the interpretation as a whole. Many seemed to think that functionalism was about how the Nazi state functioned. The weakest answers fell into two broad categories. First, those that repeated or paraphrased points in the extract without engaging with the historian’s interpretation, and second, those who wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote the extract is that it was Truman who made a post-war settlement between the USA and the USSR impossible, because of his misunderstandings and over-simplified view of US-USSR relations. The best responses recognised both these aspects of the interpretation, and illustrated them using material from the extract. As Truman was the clear focus of the extract, and as he was clearly blamed, the interpretation could only satisfactorily be labelled revisionist. There were plenty of answers that saw the blame placed on Truman but also thought the historian was balancing this by blaming the USSR too, or at least was a post-revisionist arguing that the true cause of the Cold War was mutual mistrust. This did not demonstrate complete understanding, though, as it failed to accommodate the extent to which the historian exonerated Stalin. The weakest answers fell into two broad categories. First those that repeated or paraphrased points in the extract without engaging with the historian’s interpretation, and second those that wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/32
Interpretations Question

Key messages

- It is important to spend sufficient time on reading and thinking about the extract before beginning to write the answer. Thinking about the extract should include making notes of phrases and sentences that seem particularly significant in pointing towards the historian's interpretation, so that the answer can be properly planned and structured.
- The best answers demonstrate an understanding that the historian's main interpretation (from now on referred to as the '*Big Message*') will encompass the extract as a whole, and that they should therefore view the extract as a whole.
- It is important candidates focus on what the question is asking them to do. It asks what can be learnt from the extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it. It does not ask what the extract says. Answers that are limited to repetition or paraphrasing of the extract cannot be rewarded highly.

General comments

The move towards producing more concise, focused and relevant answers, noted in previous reports, continued in this examination. It is becoming rare to see answers that effectively ignore the extract and write only about the context. Almost all candidates perceive the extract as an interpretation, and make some attempt to use the content of the extract as support. The issue now, then, is how effectively this is done.

By far the most important task facing candidates is to view the extract as a whole, rather than as a series of unrelated messages. Almost all candidates construct their answers by working through the extract paragraph by paragraph. This is not necessarily the best approach, and often produces inferences about the interpretation that might be supportable based on a single paragraph, but not when the extract is taken as a whole. Thus when candidates move on to the next paragraph, and find something contradictory, they tend to view this as the historian simply changing their interpretation, which is logically unsustainable, and, more significantly for the examination, an indicator of lack of understanding.

An associated issue is labelling. Historians' approaches are often given labels: revisionist, functionalist, traditionalist and so on. Candidates use these labels which, if done properly, can help to provide a structure around which an answer can be built. Sometimes, though, the labelling is incorrect, either because of misunderstanding of what the extract says, or because the label itself is misunderstood. The confusion can be compounded when candidates perceive different approaches in different sections of the extract, or even in individual words and phrases. Candidates need to be aware that an extract will only have one '*Big Message*', and that if the historian is, for example, traditionalist, s/he cannot also be revisionist. Of course, there are approaches that synthesise aspects of other approaches – post-revisionism on the Cold War can include the idea that both sides share blame – but this does not mean that part of such an extract would be traditionalist and another part revisionist.

There is evidence that some candidates do not read the extract closely enough. Whenever an extract includes claims made not by the historian but by one of the people mentioned in the extract, there will be many candidates who nonetheless take the claim as the historian's, often drawing an inference from it that is totally opposite to the true meaning.

Some responses placed too much emphasis on demonstrating their factual knowledge of the topic. These answers are structured in such a way that knowledge is used to explain or extend the content of the extract, so that if a particular event or development is mentioned, then the answer will tell you more about it. This is a misunderstanding of the question, which asks for the extract and knowledge to be used to *explain the interpretation*. Thus, everything that is included in the answer can only be relevant to the extent that it helps

to illuminate the inferences the candidate is making about the historian. Knowledge can, of course, be knowledge of interpretations (i.e. the historiography) as well as knowledge of events, but rather like labelling, attempts by candidates to draw parallels between the extract and what they know of other historians will only work when they are accurate, and all too often a name, word or phrase will make candidates jump to conclusions about the extract as a whole.

When first reading the extract, a good question for candidates to ask themselves is 'What is this extract about?' They can be sure that if, say, the extract is about Truman, or about bystanders of the Holocaust, then this is what the Big Message will be about. It is notable that relatively few answers use such awareness as a starting point. Some candidates spend time considering what the extract is *not* about, which can also be a useful analytical move, but only if used to comment on the historian's interpretation, rather than to chastise the historian for forgetting or omitting something. There are still examples of candidates attempting to evaluate the reliability of what the extracts say. Invariably this produces meaningless generalisations about how the historian might, with a little more effort or insight, have come up with a better interpretation. This kind of evaluation is not required by the question.

Comments on specific questions

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote the extract is that there were both advantages and disadvantages for the Indian economy under British rule, but that on balance the Indian people benefitted. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract, which by focusing almost entirely on economic aspects and by effectively ignoring social and political impacts, this gave a broadly favourable view of Empire. The weakest answers fell into two broad categories. First, those that repeated or paraphrased points in the extract without engaging with the historian's interpretation, and second, those that wrote about Imperialism with no reference to the extract.

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that the West could have done more to rescue European Jews, but they did not because they did not wish to. The best responses recognised both these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. They understood that the extract was about bystanders, and many showed awareness that the interpretation was typical of early views of bystanders, which were critical in nature. Many candidates were able to read inferences that were close to what the extract argued, but candidates could have improved their answers by providing more detailed conclusions— for example, many asserted that the extract says the Allies did nothing to help, or that the Allies were to blame for the Holocaust. Even though the extract did not deal directly with Holocaust causation, weaker answers often attempted to attach a label to it, generally intentionalism, on the basis that the Nazis intended to kill the Jews. The weakest answers fell into two broad categories. First, those that repeated or paraphrased points in the extract without engaging with the historian's interpretation, and second, those that wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote the extract is that American policy towards the Soviet Union was driven by their economic ideology, and the unwillingness of the USA to compromise on this made agreement between the two sides impossible. The best responses recognised both these aspects of the interpretation, and illustrated them using material from the extract. They recognised that the emphasis on US economic policy was typical of revisionist historians, and noted that not only does the interpretation place a good deal of blame on the USA, it also stresses that the USSR posed no comparable threat to the USA. It was this second point that was missed in many answers, which instead seized upon phrases such as 'The Russians.....were inflexible and ruthless in Eastern Europe' to claim that the historian was placing blame on the Soviet Union. Alternatively, weaker responses took the second paragraph at face value to conclude that the historian was favourable towards the USA, a good example of how misleading it can be to take aspects of the extract in isolation. The weakest answers fell into two broad categories. First, those that repeated or paraphrased points in the extract without engaging with the historian's interpretation, and second, those that wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- It is important to spend sufficient time on reading and thinking about the extract before beginning to write the answer. Thinking about the extract should include making notes of phrases and sentences that seem particularly significant in pointing towards the historian's interpretation, so that the answer can be properly planned and structured.
- The best answers demonstrate an understanding that the historian's main interpretation (from now on referred to as the '*Big Message*') will encompass the extract as a whole, and that they should therefore view the extract as a whole.
- It is important candidates focus on what the question is asking them to do. It asks what can be learnt from the extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it. It does not ask what the extract says. Answers that are limited to repetition or paraphrasing of the extract cannot be rewarded highly.

General comments

The move towards producing more concise, focused and relevant answers, noted in previous reports, continued in this examination. It is becoming rare to see answers that effectively ignore the extract and write only about the context. Almost all candidates perceive the extract as an interpretation, and make some attempt to use the content of the extract as support. The issue now, then, is how effectively this is done.

By far the most important task facing candidates is to view the extract as a whole, rather than as a series of unrelated messages. Almost all candidates construct their answers by working through the extract paragraph by paragraph. This is not necessarily the best approach, and often produces inferences about the interpretation that might be supportable based on a single paragraph, but not when the extract is taken as a whole. Thus when candidates move on to the next paragraph, and find something contradictory, they tend to view this as the historian simply changing their interpretation, which is logically unsustainable, and, more significantly for the examination, an indicator of lack of understanding.

An associated issue is labelling. Historians' approaches are often given labels: revisionist, functionalist, traditionalist and so on. Candidates use these labels which, if done properly, can help to provide a structure around which an answer can be built. Sometimes, though, the labelling is incorrect, either because of misunderstanding of what the extract says, or because the label itself is misunderstood. The confusion can be compounded when candidates perceive different approaches in different sections of the extract, or even in individual words and phrases. Candidates need to be aware that an extract will only have one '*Big Message*', and that if the historian is, for example, traditionalist, s/he cannot also be revisionist. Of course, there are approaches that synthesise aspects of other approaches – post-revisionism on the Cold War can include the idea that both sides share blame – but this does not mean that part of such an extract would be traditionalist and another part revisionist.

There is evidence that some candidates do not read the extract closely enough. Whenever an extract includes claims made not by the historian but by one of the people mentioned in the extract, there will be many candidates who nonetheless take the claim as the historian's, often drawing an inference from it that is totally opposite to the true meaning.

Some responses placed too much emphasis on demonstrating their factual knowledge of the topic. These answers are structured in such a way that knowledge is used to explain or extend the content of the extract, so that if a particular event or development is mentioned, then the answer will tell you more about it. This is a misunderstanding of the question, which asks for the extract and knowledge to be used to *explain the interpretation*. Thus, everything that is included in the answer can only be relevant to the extent that it helps

to illuminate the inferences the candidate is making about the historian. Knowledge can, of course, be knowledge of interpretations (i.e. the historiography) as well as knowledge of events, but rather like labelling, attempts by candidates to draw parallels between the extract and what they know of other historians will only work when they are accurate, and all too often a name, word or phrase will make candidates jump to conclusions about the extract as a whole.

When first reading the extract, a good question for candidates to ask themselves is 'What is this extract about?' They can be sure that if, say, the extract is about Truman, or about bystanders of the Holocaust, then this is what the Big Message will be about. It is notable that relatively few answers use such awareness as a starting point. Some candidates spend time considering what the extract is *not* about, which can also be a useful analytical move, but only if used to comment on the historian's interpretation, rather than to chastise the historian for forgetting or omitting something. There are still examples of candidates attempting to evaluate the reliability of what the extracts say. Invariably this produces meaningless generalisations about how the historian might, with a little more effort or insight, have come up with a better interpretation. This kind of evaluation is not required by the question.

Comments on specific questions

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote the extract is that the British ordered their Empire in such a way as to reflect the hierarchical nature of their own society, and ornamentalism was the means used to bring the Empire together. The best responses recognised both these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. The idea of ornamentalism was understood well by more successful candidates, who could show that it was a two-way process between Britain and the Empire, constructing a shared vision of what the Empire represented. An important aspect of hierarchy was the way that it defined individual relationships between ruler and ruled more by rank than race. Weaker answers fell into two broad categories. First, those that repeated or paraphrased points in the extract without engaging with the historian's interpretation, and second, those that wrote about Imperialism with no reference to the extract.

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that, whatever his ultimate intentions, it was Hitler who made anti-Semitism central to Nazism, but that although anti-Semitism was an essential causal factor of the Holocaust, without Hitler it would not have been sufficient. The best responses recognised both these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Most candidates saw the interpretation as intentionalist, but needed to provide a more detailed explanation, with an understanding of the distinctions drawn between what the historian saw as necessary and sufficient causal factors. Weaker responses were deflected into writing, often at considerable length, about Hitler's anti-Semitism, rather than concentrating on the overarching argument about why the Holocaust happened. Others missed the main message of the interpretation by insisting that it was anti-Semitism that caused the Holocaust, often spending too much time on the Germans as 'willing executioners'. The weakest answers fell into two broad categories. First, those that repeated or paraphrased points in the extract without engaging with the historian's interpretation, and second, those that wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote the extract is that the USA was determined to impose its economic system on the post-war world, and that the failure to coerce or seduce the Soviet Union into cooperation led to the policy of containment. The best responses recognised both these aspects of the interpretation, and illustrated them using material from the extract. The argument that the USA attempted to use its economic strength to achieve hegemony is typically revisionist, as better candidates recognised. However, because the extract was not in the main explicitly critical of the USA, many candidates were misled and deflected by individual sentences and phrases into thinking that the USA was actually being praised. A good example of this was the reference to 'bold, imaginative, sophisticated endeavours (of which) the Marshall Plan was the most stunning'. The fact that this particular comment was followed by 'This was hegemony with a vengeance' was often omitted. Inevitably, candidates who took this route would conclude either that the interpretation was traditionalist, or if they succeeded also in finding some anti-American material, post-revisionist. The weakest answers fell into two broad categories. First, those that repeated or paraphrased points in the extract without engaging with the historian's interpretation, and second, those that wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

Paper 9389/41
Depth Study

Key messages

- It is important that candidates focus on the specific nature of the question set.
- To achieve the highest bands there should be evidence of analysis and sustained judgment throughout the answer, not just in a brief final paragraph.
- It is important to ensure that there is relevant and accurate detail provided to back up points made. Assertive responses can only be awarded marks in the lower Levels.
- Each paragraph should have a clear objective. This helps in demonstrating an understanding of the range of relevant factors and a breath of supporting evidence.

General comments

Many answers showed a good quality of analytical thinking. There was a willingness to give direct answers and develop them carefully. Successful responses tried to 'assess the reasons' when asked and give a firm answer when asked 'how far?' Less successful answers to the 'How far' type of question tended to just list the case for, followed by the case against, and then did not include a judgement which directly answered the question. The best responses in this type of question invariably started with a clear judgement and then developed their case. Awareness of alternative views and the need for balance is still important however. A lack of depth was often a feature of less successful answers. To achieve the highest Levels candidates need to argue good range of points and these should be developed in terms depth of knowledge. There was much more to Mussolini's economic policies, for example, than just a list of the various 'Battles'. As demonstrate in the mark scheme, there is no requirement that responses should contain the views of historians. Some candidates included lengthy historiographical commentary rather than providing their own analysis in response to the question.

Comments on specific questions

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

1 How successful was Lenin in establishing communism in Russia?

The better responses to this popular question usually started with a picture of what communism involved in theory before setting out the arguments each way. Many argued that while Lenin may not have gone as far as he wished to, he had laid a basis on which others could build. There were quite a number of weaker responses which gave descriptions of War Communism and the NEP where the relevance of these two factors was not made clear.

2 Assess the impact of Mussolini's social and economic policies in Italy.

Responses which avoided a descriptive approach, listing the various 'Battles' and tried to assess the impact of both Mussolini's social and economic policies, did well. The best responses usually looked at the social and economic position of Italy when Mussolini came to power in 1922 and then compared it with the situation towards the end of the 1930s. There was good evidence of depth of knowledge demonstrated in the stronger responses, with detailed knowledge of Mussolini's relationship with the Church and the Corporate State seen.

3 Assess the reasons why there was so little opposition to Stalin's rule in Russia.

There were some very good responses to this question which kept the focus firmly on the 'assess' and 'so little' parts of the question. Some weaker responses thought the question primarily concerned Stalin's rise to power and provided little assessment on the post-1930 period. Factors like the Terror and the cult of personality were well developed, and there were some very good comments about the fact that many Russians actually supported the development of the type of socialism that Stalin seemed to be encouraging.

4 'Weimar politicians must bear the responsibility for the Nazi rise to power by 1934.' How far do you agree?

This was a very popular question and it produced some strong responses. Weaker responses tended to focus too much on the period between 1919 and 1929 and neglected to deal with the critical events between 1931 and 1933. The level of detail on the machinations of the politicians themselves was, in some cases, very good and there were many well-developed arguments.

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

Questions 5–8

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

Depth Study 3: International History, 1945–1991

9 'The 1968 Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty had achieved little by 1975.' How far do you agree?

Success in the question depended on getting the focus right. The good responses looked at what the 1968 Treaty set out to achieve, and what had been achieved by 1975, and then argued out whether it was 'little' or not. Weaker responses had a focus either on the Cold War background of the earlier part of the 1960s, or focussed their response on the reasons for Détente. The level of detail was usually good, with the strongest responses utilising it effectively to support analysis.

10 'Détente had already broken down before the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.' How far do you agree?

This was a popular and usually competently done question. Weaker responses often included long descriptions of Reagan and factors after 1979. Better responses kept the focus firmly on the correct period and debated it well. Most saw it as the final straw in a process where both sides shared responsibility. There were many well developed and well supported arguments.

11 How consistent were Mao Zedong's economic policies in the period from 1950 to 1966?

There was usually a good level of knowledge demonstrated in the answers to this question, but some responses could have been improved by focusing on the 'consistent' part of the question. A narrative/descriptive approach proved not to work well as conclusions seemed to be difficult to arrive at. The best responses started with a clear answer to the question of 'consistency' and then developed their case, demonstrating awareness of alternative views.

12 Assess the reasons why, having supported his invasion of Iran, the USA opposed Saddam Hussein's invasion of Kuwait.

The majority of responses showed detailed knowledge of the second part of the question and there was also some very good assessment of US reasons behind their decision. However, a number of less successful responses ignored completely the first part of the question, or gave it only cursory attention, which limited attainment there. While the focus needed to be on the invasion of Kuwait, the reasons for the support of the Iran invasion needed consideration.

Depth Study 4: African History, 1945–1991

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

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

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

HISTORY

Paper 9389/42
Depth Study

Key messages

- It is important that candidates focus on the specific nature of the question set.
- To achieve the highest bands there should be evidence of analysis and sustained judgment throughout the answer, not just in a brief final paragraph.
- It is important to ensure that there is relevant and accurate detail provided to back up points made. Assertive responses can only be awarded marks in the lower Levels.
- Each paragraph should have a clear objective. This helps in demonstrating an understanding of the range of relevant factors and a breath of supporting evidence.

General comments

Many answers showed a good quality of analytical thinking. There was a willingness to give direct answers and develop them carefully. Successful responses tried to 'assess the reasons' when asked and give a firm answer when asked 'how far?' Less successful answers to the 'How far' type of question tended to just list the case for, followed by the case against, and then did not include a judgement which directly answered the question. The best responses in this type of question invariably started with a clear judgement and then developed their case. Awareness of alternative views and the need for balance is still important however. A lack of depth was often a feature of less successful answers. To achieve the highest Levels candidates need to argue good range of points and these should be developed in terms depth of knowledge. There was much more to Mussolini's economic policies, for example, than just a list of the various 'Battles'. As demonstrate in the mark scheme, there is no requirement that responses should contain the views of historians. Some candidates included lengthy historiographical commentary rather than providing their own analysis in response to the question.

Comments on specific questions

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

1 Assess Trotsky's contribution to the establishment of the Bolshevik regime in Russia in the period from 1918 to 1924.

There were some very good responses seen to this question which kept the focus firmly on Trotsky and tried to assess his overall impact on the establishment of the regime. Some argued very cogently that without his contribution towards military victory in the Civil War, as well as his overall support for Lenin and role in events such as Brest-Litovsk and Kronstadt, there would have been no Bolshevik regime by 1924. Less successful responses tended to include little focus on Trotsky and wrote primarily about Lenin or why White incompetence was so important in the victory of the Red Army.

2 How successful were Mussolini's economic policies between 1922 and 1941?

The better responses invariably reflected initially what the criteria for success might be in the context of Italy in the period, and also kept the focus firmly on Mussolini's economic policies. Less successful responses often included a lot of detail offered on the Lateran Treaty and the murder of Matteotti which was irrelevant to this question. There were some quite competent narratives, listing the various 'Battles', but whether this led to success or otherwise tended to be omitted. The sound responses generally argued that, while Italy managed to avoid the economic blizzard which hit, for example, Germany in the early 1930s, there was little concrete success.

3 'The main aim of all Stalin's policies was to gain maximum power for himself.' How far do you agree?

There were some good arguments seen in many responses, showing awareness of recent debates on the issue. Most suggested that Stalin wanted power in order to ensure that socialism became established in Russia, and that factors like the Terror and the cult of personality were a means to an end. Some responses spent a lot of time on his rise to power in the 1920s, which was of limited relevance. Responses which kept the focus firmly on the question set were more successful.

4 To what extent did the Nazis change German society?

The best responses usually looked at German society in 1933 and then compared it to that of 1939. This could lead to some very thoughtful reflections and good analysis. Weaker responses tended to describe policy towards women and young people, and often included long descriptions of the Holocaust, without really dealing with the question of 'extent.'

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

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

Depth Study 3: International History, 1945–1991

9 How far do you agree that Khrushchev's gamble in placing nuclear weapons in Cuba ended successfully?

This was both a popular and well-done question. The better responses avoided the temptation to focus on the causes of the crisis and kept it on the outcome as far as Khrushchev was concerned. Thoughtful reflection on what the criteria for 'success' in this context might be was seen in the best responses. Some responses stressed that what might be seen as a success for Russia, in that MAD was avoided, was less successful for Khrushchev himself and was to play a part in his downfall. The level of detail seen was invariably very good and if the focus was kept firmly on the 'how far' part of the question, candidates did very well.

10 To what extent did détente in the 1970s reduce superpower tensions?

While there were many good descriptions of the détente process, very few responses included an assessment of 'extent' or discussed the issue of superpower tension as a whole. Some less successful answers focused on why détente failed, but that was not the question asked. The best responses looked at the relationship between the two superpowers, the USA and USSR (and sometimes put China in to the frame as well), at the beginning of the process in 1970, and then looked at the relationship in 1979. That enabled them to grasp the extent to which the tension had (or had not) been reduced.

11 Assess the reasons why the Great Leap Forward was a disaster.

While there were often some very good descriptions of the Great Leap Forward, there was reluctance amongst more limited responses to assess the reasons as to why it could be seen as a disaster. Detail predominated, with limited analysis evident. The best responses looked at the various reasons why the Great Leap Forward had such a poor outcome, and commented carefully on them while also suggesting which might have been the most important reason, and why.

12 'The Camp David Agreements achieved little of significance.' How far do you agree?

The best responses set out with a clear judgement on whether much of significance had been achieved by the Agreements, and developed their case clearly. Weaker responses usually listed a case for and then a case against and came, either to no decision, or a brief conclusion suggesting that they 'might have done' with no indication of the reasoning behind it.

Depth Study 4: African History, 1945–1991

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

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

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

HISTORY

Paper 9389/43
Depth Study

Key messages

- It is important that candidates focus on the specific nature of the question set.
- To achieve the highest bands there should be evidence of analysis and sustained judgment throughout the answer, not just in a brief final paragraph.
- It is important to ensure that there is relevant and accurate detail provided to back up points made. Assertive responses can only be awarded marks in the lower Levels.
- Each paragraph should have a clear objective. This helps in demonstrating an understanding of the range of relevant factors and a breath of supporting evidence.

General comments

Many answers showed a good quality of analytical thinking. There was a willingness to give direct answers and develop them carefully. Successful responses tried to 'assess the reasons' when asked and give a firm answer when asked 'how far?' Less successful answers to the 'How far' type of question tended to just list the case for, followed by the case against, and then did not include a judgement which directly answered the question. The best responses in this type of question invariably started with a clear judgement and then developed their case. Awareness of alternative views and the need for balance is still important however. A lack of depth was often a feature of less successful answers. To achieve the highest Levels candidates need to argue good range of points and these should be developed in terms depth of knowledge. There was much more to Mussolini's economic policies, for example, than just a list of the various 'Battles'. As demonstrate in the mark scheme, there is no requirement that responses should contain the views of historians. Some candidates included lengthy historiographical commentary rather than providing their own analysis in response to the question.

Comments on Specific Questions

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

1 How far had a socialist economy been established in Russia by 1924?

The best responses maintained a wider focus than just War Communism and the NEP. They usually considered in some detail what a socialist economy was and reflected on how far Russia had travelled towards it by 1924. Less successful responses usually just focussed on the implications of War Communism and the NEP and not at issues like state planning and control as well as land and factory ownership. These responses tended to lay out a case 'for' followed by a case 'against' without reaching any judgement.

2 'Mussolini stayed in power for so long because he was a popular leader.' How far do you agree?

There were some very good responses to this question which considered, in some depth, the various factors which kept Mussolini in power. These ranged from the lack of any alternative and bad memories of his predecessors, to his use of propaganda and support by various elites. The best responses tried hard to prioritise the factors mentioned and come to a sustained judgment on which was the most important and why. Less successful candidates tended to describe the various 'Battles' and his relationship with the Pope and omitted to indicate what the link was between their descriptions and the question set.

3 Assess the social impact of Stalin's economic policies.

The better responses kept their focus firmly on the 'social impact' part of the question and did not spend significant time describing Stalin's industrialisation and collectivisation programmes. There were some excellent responses which looked in detail not only at the broader social impact, for example, of collectivisation on rural workers, but also looked at the implications of these policies on women, youth and families. As always, getting the right focus and having the appropriate depth of knowledge differentiated the successful responses from the more limited ones. Weaker responses usually described the policies without reflecting on what their impact was on Russian society.

4 How successful were Nazi economic policies?

The better responses considered carefully what the criteria for 'success' might be in the circumstances of the 1930s before they started to develop a case. Many argued that while unemployment did go down rapidly, the methods used to achieve the reduction had unfortunate implications for the future. The autarky programme was also well covered and commented on. There was good analysis and depth included within many responses. Less successful responses tended to describe the various policies, from autobahns to the 'guns v butter' issue, without coming to any conclusion.

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

Too few responses were seen to make general comment appropriate.

Depth Study 3: International History, 1945–1991

9 To what extent was the USA responsible for causing the Cuban missile crisis?

This was a very popular question, and candidates produced some very sound responses. Responses which dealt with the question about 'extent' did exceptionally well, particularly if the answer started with a firm view and then went on to develop the case, while also considering possible alternative views. Less good responses were characterised by descriptions of the whole crisis or split their essay into three sections covering the responsibility of the USA, Russia and then Castro, but without reaching any conclusion as to which might be the more responsible and why.

10 'It was the Soviet Union's increasing influence in the Third World which led to the end of détente by 1979.' How far do you agree?

There was often a real depth of knowledge shown, but a reluctance to come to a view as to what might be the principal reason for the end of détente. Less successful answers tended to give narrative lists of what the Russians did or did not do, followed by a narrative list dealing with the USA, without any judgement or conclusion. They also tended to focus on Reagan's presidency, which was irrelevant to a question with 1979 as its end date. The better responses typically started with a firm view of where they felt most responsibility lay (and there was quite a divergence of views on this) and then developed their case in depth.

11 Analyse Deng Xiaoping's motives in first approving, and subsequently abolishing, the Democracy Wall.

Too few responses to this question were seen to make general comment appropriate.

12 Should the outcome of the Six Day War be seen as a result of Israeli strength or Arab weakness?

There were some very interesting arguments seen in the better responses, with a good degree of depth of knowledge. Many responses showed real reflection and good planning, which not only considered the two factors in the question, but also looked at wider issues, such as support from Russia and the USA. Less successful responses, often showing a good depth of knowledge, tended to just describe Israeli strengths and then Arab weaknesses and not come to any conclusion.

Depth Study 4: African History, 1945–1991

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

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

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