

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/11 Document Question 11</p>

Key messages

- The most effective responses used relevant source content to support arguments in both sections of the question paper. Short quotations were adequate. However, the use of ellipses weakened source use in some answers. It is important that candidates show how the sources support the comparison in **part (a)** or the challenge/support argument in **part (b)**. Long quotations, and the use of ellipses, raise questions about how well the source has been understood.
- In **part (a)** the top level can be achieved by explaining why the sources are similar or different. This explanation must be based on a developed comparison which identifies and supports both similarities and differences and shows awareness of the context of the sources. Commentaries on the context are not relevant unless they are linked to the comparison of the sources in this way.
- In **part (b)** the purpose of evaluating the sources is to decide which side of the argument (support or challenge) is stronger. Sources should be contextualised and evaluated to decide whether they lend weight to the support or challenge argument. Commentaries on the provenance or reliability of sources are not creditworthy unless they are placed in context and linked to the 'how far' element of the question.

General comments

It was apparent that many candidates had planned their answers. However, in some instances plans were so long that responses were unfinished. It is important to decide how long to spend on planning so that a complete response can be presented. Planning and practise help candidates to make efficient use of the time in the exam and remain focused on the questions.

It is helpful for candidates to answer **part (a)** first. Those who elect to answer **part (b)** first often misjudge their timings and find it challenging to maintain the correct focus for **part (a)**. The question paper is designed to help candidates focus by addressing a two-source question first.

Most responses demonstrated positive characteristics, showing comprehension of the sources and understanding the required focus for each question. The majority of answers used source content and provided relevant quotations, or direct paraphrases, to support the comparison or support/challenge argument. The most perceptive responses understood that some sources were nuanced, recognising where it was possible to use a source for both support and challenge arguments. Some made effective use of their contextual knowledge to interpret the source beyond face value.

In each of the **(a)** questions candidates were required to make comparisons; about the Flight to Varennes in **Question 1(a)**, about President Wilson in **Question 2(a)** and the disorder during the Boxer Rebellion in **Question 3(a)**. Where answers were weak this often resulted from overlooking these specific terms. For example, a minority overlooked the word 'about' in **Question 1(a)** and considered whether the sources agreed 'with' the Flight. In **Question 2(a)**, some wrote detailed comparisons of the sources which were not focused on President Wilson. It is important that like-for-like comparisons are made. Weaker responses sometimes asserted similarities or differences for points which were not comparable. To be valid the comparison must be based on a detail, inference or sub-message which is addressed by both sources.

To achieve the higher levels, it is necessary to evaluate the sources by considering the context in which they were produced and this must be related to the question to be credited. In **part (a)** candidates first need to decide how the sources are similar and different and then to consider why the similarities or differences exist. In **part (b)**, effective responses understand that evaluative comments must be linked to the question to be relevant. It is useful for candidates to ask themselves whether their knowledge of the topic supports the

claims made in the sources. If so, that might increase the value of a source. Alternatively, if a source was written for a specific purpose or audience, they should consider how that affects its weight as evidence.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: France, 1774–1814

Question 1

(a) Read Sources A and B. How far do these sources agree about the King's Flight to Varennes?

Most responses made a relevant comparison between the sources. The most frequently discussed similarity was that the King had fled in secret. This was supported with effective use of source details. For example, many pointed out that the King had fled at night to avoid detection in Source A and linked this to the comment in Source B which claimed Louis had '*abandoned his post*'. Some comparisons fell short because they were based on misreading, for example arguing that both sources stated that Louis had a false passport. While this was true of Source B, it was not what Louis himself claimed in Source A. Many responses also identified a valid difference such as whether Louis XVI had contacted foreign powers or whether he was trying to leave the country. Many responses demonstrated contextual knowledge although this was sometimes quite general, being based on early events in the revolution, such as the storming of the Bastille, or on Louis' eventual execution which was not a foregone conclusion when the sources were written. Where contextual knowledge was used most effectively, responses demonstrated understanding of the political changes which were taking place in France and the circumstances surrounding the Flight to Varennes. The best responses understood the difference between the sources, explaining why the Republican clergyman took such a dim view of Louis' failed flight and why Louis was desperately trying to recover his reputation. Stock evaluation based on the idea that Source A was unlikely to be true as the King was probably lying, was seen quite frequently but was usually based on what the source said rather than contextual understanding of the situation he faced in 1792.

(b) 'Louis XVI supported the Constitution.' How far do the sources support this view?

Most candidates gave a two-sided response to the question and there was evidence of effective source use in many responses. Most identified Source A as a support source, explaining that when Louis XVI realised the people supported the Constitution, he agreed to accept it, stating that he had '*never hesitated to make a personal sacrifice*' for the nation. Others used the same point to argue that the King had not accepted the Constitution from the outset and only changed his mind when it became expedient to do so, hardly a sign of genuine support. Either argument was valid if properly explained and supported. Source B was universally seen as a challenge source with Louis being portrayed as running away, attempting to contact foreign powers and wishing to argue with the Assembly about its decrees. Source C was best used as a challenge source as it showed the King as a two-faced monarch who told different people what he thought they wanted to hear. Most candidates pointed out that this showed the King to be unreliable and not a genuine supporter of the Constitution. However, it was possible to make a support argument from the source, particularly as Source D showed Louis in the same indecisive position. A considerable proportion of responses recognised Source D as a nuanced source which could be used to show support for the Constitution but on a 'lesser of two evils' basis. Although Louis made his personal belief clear with his comment on the Rights of Man, '*senseless though they be*', he was prepared to put this aside for the greater good of France and to avoid war. Many responses demonstrated some contextual knowledge, often about the causes of the revolution, but only a few used this to evaluate the sources to decide whether the support or challenge element of the argument was stronger. Most attempts to evaluate were generic, often stating that the source was biased or unreliable because it was from a speech or letter without any links to the context or the question. Weaker responses often resulted from taking a one-sided approach to the question, while some described source content without making a clear link to the question.

Section B: The Gilded Age and Progressive Era, 1870s to 1920

Question 2

- (a) **Read Sources A and D. Compare and contrast the views in these two sources as evidence about President Wilson.**

Some responses found it challenging to identify valid points of similarity and difference between the sources because they misread one or both of the sources. Source A was often interpreted as being negative about Wilson's efforts to improve the economy. Meanwhile, some misrepresented the argument of Source D, stating it showed the '*administration knows what is best for business*' but missing the comment '*It does not*' which followed. The most straightforward comparison to make was that both sources showed that Wilson was heavily involved in economic policy. Some recognised the sources showed Wilson's confidence in his own policies, citing the comment, '*Now watch her come*' from Source A and drawing a parallel with the statement in Source D that the President '*is always sure that he is right*.' A considerable proportion of candidates pointed out a difference between the sources, often focusing on the likely outcome of Wilson's intervention by explaining that while Source A suggested Wilson would achieve his aims, Source D argued otherwise. Most responses offered support from the sources to explain and develop their points. Weaker responses often resulted from a lack of focus on the question, making general comparisons instead of being focused on Wilson, and others tended to write about each source in turn without making a link between them. Many responses added a paragraph which compared the provenance or discussed reliability but which did not serve the needs of the question.

- (b) **How far do these sources agree that anti-trust legislation would benefit the US economy?**

Many responses made effective use of some sources and produced a balanced answer. However, it was notable that many lost sight of the question and wrote about whether anti-trust legislation would benefit the US without a clear focus on the economy. Sources A and B were both sources which could be used to support the prompt. Source A showed Wilson's confidence that his policies, including anti-trust legislation, would help the economy. However, many misread the source as giving a negative portrayal of Wilson's legislation. Source B was universally seen as being in favour of anti-trust legislation and most candidates included an explanation which showed how the economy would benefit. Some pointed out that this positive image was hardly surprising as Wilson was the author of the source. Source C was a nuanced source which recognised there was '*much to praise in the Clayton Anti-Trust Act*' but also expressing reservations about the enforcement of the act, seeing it as an attack on wealth. Although some responses understood the positive and negative viewpoints in the source, they did not include an explanation of whether the legislation would benefit the economy. Source D was used as a challenge source which argued that anti-trust legislation would only make a bad economic situation worse. While some candidates attempted to consider the provenance of the sources and comment on their reliability, this often fell short. It was common to see stock evaluation such as Source B was '*biased*' because it was from Wilson. Some one-sided responses were also seen and, as is the case in all **part (b)** questions, the set of sources will always provide evidence which can be used to address both sides of the argument.

Section C: Empire and the emergence of world powers, 1870–1919

Question 3

- (a) **Read Sources A and D. Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about the disorder during the Boxer Rebellion.**

Most answers supported at least one valid similarity, often that both sources agreed that local people were injured in the disorder or that the disorder entailed attacks on Christian places of worship. Some responses attempted to argue that the Boxers were solely to blame in both sources. Although they were '*stirring up trouble*' in Source A, Source D argued that the cause of the '*disaster*' was disputes between the Boxers and the Christians. A more effective similarity was that there was tension between the two groups and some blame for this was attributed to both sides. The most commonly seen difference was in the way the sources portrayed the army. Source A showed the army arresting rebels and conducting patrols with local people being harmed by mistake. On the other hand it was pointed out that Source D suggested unruly behaviour on the part of the army which contributed to the disorder. Where responses identified relevant comparisons, they often made effective use of source content to explain the similarity or difference.

It was possible to explain the differences between the sources by using contextual knowledge to show that Source A came from the start of the rebellion whereas Source D was from the time when the Boxer Protocol was being drawn up which brought the rebellion to an end. Weaker responses sometimes resulted from a lack of focus on the question, making general comparisons instead of being focused on the disorder or writing about the attitude of the government towards the Boxers. Others wrote about each source in turn without making a link between them.

(b) How far do the sources support the view that the Chinese authorities sympathised with the Boxers?

Most responses made effective use of the sources and developed a balanced argument. However, some showed uncertainty over the terms '*authorities*' and '*sympathised*' and this led to some misreading and confusion about the meaning of the sources. Source A could be used on both sides of the argument. To challenge, the source argued that attempts to deal with the rioting had been made and were strictly enforced. However, the last section of the source suggested some sympathy when the governor suggested that the US ambassador should '*not listen to the one-sided statement of missionaries*'. Although some tried to argue Source B as a challenge, Prince Qing expressing regret at the murder of the British missionaries, it was more accurately used to support. Evidence given in responses to support this position was the Prince's admission '*that the government was reluctant to act*' and even though soldiers were sent to protect the railway, he was doubtful if they would obey if ordered to fire on the Boxers. Source C was mostly used as a support, citing evidence of Yu Hsien being known as a promoter of the Boxer movement and of the Boxers being in '*high favour*' with many officials to support the argument. Some noted the link between Sources A and C and some questioned the reliability of the source based on its provenance. Source D was used to challenge the idea of sympathetic Chinese authorities, many quoting the argument that '*the imperial court intervened with full force*'. Weaker responses sometimes resulted from misreading sources such as Source D, therefore arguing that all the sources showed support from the authorities. A small minority of responses attempted to use their contextual understanding to evaluate the sources but generalised comments on reliability were more commonly seen.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/12 Document Question 12</p>

Key messages

- The most effective responses used relevant source content to support arguments in both sections of the question paper. Short quotations were adequate. However, the use of ellipses weakened source use in some answers. It is important that candidates show how the sources support the comparison in **part (a)** or the challenge/support argument in **part (b)**. Long quotations, and the use of ellipses, raise questions about how well the source has been understood.
- In **part (a)** the top level can be achieved by explaining why the sources are similar or different. This explanation must be based on a developed comparison which identifies and supports both similarities and differences and shows awareness of the context of the sources. Commentaries on the context are not relevant unless they are linked to the comparison of the sources in this way.
- In **part (b)** the purpose of evaluating the sources is to decide which side of the argument (support or challenge) is stronger. Sources should be contextualised and evaluated to decide whether they lend weight to the support or challenge argument. Commentaries on the provenance or reliability of sources are not creditworthy unless they are placed in context and linked to the 'how far' element of the question.

General comments

Most responses showed positive characteristics and demonstrated understanding that the **(a)** question requires identification and explanation of similarities **and** differences, and that **part (b)** requires an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the statement or view in the question. Most responses used source content and provided relevant quotations or direct paraphrases to support the comparison or explain whether the sources supported or challenged the view in question. Some responses included fragments of quotations with ellipses from the start and end of sentences which did not select and deploy the precise detail needed to strongly evidence their arguments.

In each of the **(a)** questions candidates were required to make comparisons based on evidence of the aims of the revolutionaries in **Question 1(a)**, comparing and contrasting views of the Chinese Exclusion Act in **Question 2(a)** and comparing and contrasting evidence about the sinking of the Maine in **Question 3(a)**. Where answers were weak, this often resulted from overlooking specific terms, for example not focusing on aims of revolutionaries but instead looking at the actions of the king. This was most noticeable in responses to **Question 1(a)**. To be valid, the comparison must be based on a detail, inference or sub-message which is addressed by both sources and relates to the question. Some responses contained detailed comparisons of the sources which were not focused on the question. Weaker responses sometimes asserted similarities or differences for points which were not comparable or simply wrote about the provenance.

Some responses lacked contextual understanding which would have encouraged more effective reading of the sources beyond face value. Knowledge is also key to achieving marks in the higher levels. In **part (a)**, achieving Level 4 is based on explaining the similarities or differences between the sources. This can be done using contextual knowledge. In **part (b)** the reward of higher-level marks requires evaluation of the sources to assess their weight as evidence. However, it should be noted that evaluating the sources is not creditworthy unless the evaluation is linked to the question. Many responses contain lengthy sections of background information or unfocused commentary on the bias and reliability of sources. More effective responses to **part (a)** explain how the sources are similar and different and to consider why the similarities or differences exist. For instance, in **Question 1(a)** it was possible to use knowledge of Marat himself and the political clubs to explain why the extent of radicalism differed between groups. In **part (b)**, it is useful for candidates to ask themselves whether their knowledge of the topic supports the claims made in the sources. If so, that might increase the value of a source. Alternatively, if a source was written for a specific purpose or



audience, they should consider how that affects its weight as evidence. Candidates could use their wider contextual knowledge of currents of revolutionary thinking for example Paine's Rights of Man to assess the question of the king's actions and the emergence of anti-monarchical political movements. In **Question 3(b)** it was possible to use contextual knowledge of the Yellow Press, in particular Hearst and Pulitzer with regard to US foreign policy, to assess the different causes of intervention in Cuba.

It was notable that many candidates had planned their time carefully and appropriately. However, some responses were undeveloped as a result of issues with time management. Many responses addressed **part (b)** first. This approach can have a negative impact on **part (a)** as a result of completing that part of the assessment last. It is worth bearing in mind that the assessment is structured to be helpful to candidates. By focusing on two sources, **part (a)** is designed to help the candidates ease themselves into the sources and the topic before moving onto **part (b)** which requires work on all four sources.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: France, 1774 – 1814

Question 1

(a) Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence of the aims of the revolutionaries.

Most responses identified relevant similarities between the sources; the most frequently discussed being that both agreed the King should lose his position. For the most part this was supported by effective use of source details, with Marat in Source A arguing he should 'answer with his head' and Source D arguing his position was not compatible with the Rights of Man. Fewer responses highlighted that the aims of the revolutionaries had become more radical. Some responses compared the sources as a whole without taking care to focus specifically on the **aims** of the revolutionaries. Many responses identified valid differences with the sources, with most candidates identifying the advocacy of terror by Marat and the legal process suggested by the petition, through 'serious debate by legislators'. Fewer responses identified the differences regarding the constructive aims discussed in Source D, aiming for a meritocracy 'accessible to all members of that state' and the destructive qualities of Source A. Weaker responses struggled to make clear points of comparison because of lack of robust chronological thinking about stages of the revolution. To make effective use of knowledge and reach Level 4, it was necessary to use relevant details to explain the similarities or differences between the sources.

(b) 'It was the Flight to Varennes that destroyed faith in the monarchy.' How far do these sources support this view?

Many candidates gave a substantial response to the question and there was evidence of effective source use in most answers. Source A was identified as a challenge source, with many candidates identifying that Marat's views demonstrated evidence of Republican views by 1790. Source D was also seen as a challenge source, with many candidates noting that it was based on the Rights of Man which predated the Flight to Varennes. However, some candidates also used Source D as a support source, noting its specific timing, which was valid. Most candidates dealt well with Source B, clearly identifying radical sentiments in direct response to the Flight to Varennes which also implied wide popular agreement to the sentiment of 'No more kings'. Source C appeared more difficult for many candidates. A number of responses struggled to contextualise the source because of confusion with other events, highlighting the need for detailed chronological understanding of the events of the revolution. Many candidates spent too much time attempting to explain details of the visual elements of the source rather than explaining the meaning in context. Responses which used their knowledge to evaluate the sources to decide whether the support or challenge element of the argument was stronger were seen very rarely. Many attempts to evaluate were generic, often stating that the source was biased or unreliable. Some responses dismissed sources such as Source A because it was dated before the event in the question, sometimes stating it was therefore irrelevant or neutral on the matter, rather than pinpointing the source showing existing revolutionary sentiment. It is important to emphasise that the sources will always offer opportunities to address both elements of the argument, and where sources pre-date events forming part of the question, this is signposting candidates towards other factors. All sources will be relevant to the view in question.

Section B: The Gilded Age and Progressive Era, 1870s to 1920

Question 2

- (a) Compare and contrast the views in these two sources as evidence about the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882.**

Most responses dealt with this question very well and could clearly draw similarities and differences between the two sources. Some responses added a paragraph of contextual knowledge, or a discussion of the provenance and reliability, which did not serve the needs of the question. Contextual knowledge could have been used to explain the similarities or differences between the sources and the wider debate on immigration in the US for example the response to riots which created further restrictions for immigrants such as the Geary Act of 1892. Most responses offered support from the sources to explain and develop their points. However, there were some who asserted that the sources were similar or different but did not provide relevant material from both sources to support their comparison.

- (b) 'Americans were positive about immigration.' How far do these sources support this view?**

Most responses made effective use of the sources to support and challenge the idea that Americans were positive about immigration. Source A was argued as a challenge source, with most candidates identifying hostile language with the references to 'the unemployable', 'the undesirable' and the 'dumping ground'. Source B was largely argued as a challenge source and many candidates identified the comments such as 'he is a menace', 'he cheapens my labour', 'he brings in disease' in particular. However, it was a nuanced source which could also be used in support, with Uncle Sam declaring that 'he brings in brawn and muscle', as a reminder of the need for immigrant labour for large infrastructure projects in the US. Source C was also used effectively to both support and challenge with many candidates identifying that attitudes changed after the Chinese Exclusion Act. Source D was used as a support source presenting a positive view and some candidates qualified the source using effective contextual knowledge to emphasise that shortages of labour were no longer a key issue by the time the source was produced. While some candidates attempted to consider the authorship of the sources, this was often perfunctory and attempts to comment on reliability added little to the attempted evaluation.

Section C: Empire and the emergence of world powers, 1870 – 1919

Question 3

- (a) Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about the sinking of the Maine.**

This question required candidates to compare evidence about the sinking of the Maine in Havana Harbour in February 1898. Most candidates were able to recognise both similarities and differences in the sources as detailed in the mark scheme. Many answers identified that the cause was an explosion, 'It was some form of high explosive that destroyed the Maine', and 'the destruction of the Maine was caused by an exterior explosion'. Many responses also identified the lack of clarity regarding responsibility for the sinking; in Source B 'guesswork is pointless' and Source C concedes that 'responsibility remains to be decided'. Most responses identified relevant differences on the exact number of casualties. The best responses began to use their knowledge of the period to explain the differences between the sources using provenance in context which went beyond rote evaluation, in particular their knowledge of the 'War Message' to Congress by President McKinley. To make effective use of contextual knowledge and reach Level 4, it was necessary to use relevant details to explain the similarities or differences between the sources. However, many attempts to evaluate were generic, often stating that the source was biased or unreliable because it was from a speech or newspaper editorial without any links to the context or the question.

- (b) How far do these sources support the view that US intervention in Cuba was provoked by Spanish actions?**

Most responses engaged with the sources thoughtfully to offer support and challenge for the assertion that US intervention was provoked by Spanish actions. Source A was well used as a support source and together with the 'horrible miseries' referred to in Source C, the provocations of Spanish mistreatment were clearly identified by most candidates in support of the view. Source B was used less well, with some candidates failing to identify the comments on the Spanish

government as a divergent opinion put forth by the US press. Source D was used far more effectively as a challenge source, with most candidates using the enthusiasm for American expansion as a valid challenge to the view. The best answers used their knowledge of the period to evaluate the sources and explain how this evaluation made them more or less useful when answering the question. Contextual knowledge about 'Yellow journalism' and Joseph Pulitzer's *New York World* and William Randolph Hearst's *New York Journal* were employed very successfully by the best responses. This was also particularly seen with evaluation of Source C where candidates with a good grasp of McKinley's diplomatic initiatives and knowledge of the increasingly bellicose American public mood, successfully used this to evaluate the sources in context. Source D was particularly used well as a challenge together with contextual knowledge of the concept of manifest destiny, supporting the view that 'Fellow Americans, we are God's chosen people' and the notions of 'American energy' in the source. However, many responses described the provenance of the sources using general evaluation, and few used this to test how useful the sources were when answering the question. These responses could be strengthened if they made clear comments about how the nature, origin or purpose impacted on the utility of the source for answering the question rather than attempting a general evaluation.



HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/13 Document Question 13</p>

Key messages

- The most effective responses used relevant source content to support arguments in both sections of the question paper. Short quotations were adequate. However, the use of ellipses weakened source use in some answers. It is important that candidates show how the sources support the comparison in **part (a)** or the challenge/support argument in **part (b)**. Long quotations, and the use of ellipses, raise questions about how well the source has been understood.
- In **part (a)** the top level can be achieved by explaining why the sources are similar or different. This explanation must be based on a developed comparison which identifies and supports both similarities and differences and shows awareness of the context of the sources. Commentaries on the context are not relevant unless they are linked to the comparison of the sources in this way.
- In **part (b)** the purpose of evaluating the sources is to decide which side of the argument (support or challenge) is stronger. Sources should be contextualised and evaluated to decide whether they lend weight to the support or challenge argument. Commentaries on the provenance or reliability of sources are not creditworthy unless they are placed in context and linked to the 'how far' element of the question.

General comments

Most responses showed positive characteristics and demonstrated understanding that the **(a)** question requires identification and explanation of similarities and differences, and that **part (b)** requires an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the statement or view in the question. Most responses used source content and provided relevant quotations or direct paraphrases to support the comparison or explain whether the sources supported or challenged the view in question.

In each of the **(a)** questions candidates were required to make comparisons based on attitudes towards the King **Question 1(a)**, evidence about the reasons for opposing female emancipation in **Question 2(a)** and comparing and contrasting evidence about the sinking of the Lusitania in **Question 3(a)**. Where answers were weak, this often resulted from overlooking specific terms, for example not focusing on attitudes towards the King but instead the King's intentions or activities. This was most noticeable in responses to **Question 1(a)**. To be valid, the comparison must be based on a detail, inference or sub-message which is addressed by both sources and relates to the question. Weaker responses sometimes asserted similarities or differences for points which were not comparable or simply wrote about the provenance. When analysing the sources, some candidates just looked for similar words without thinking about their context. Thus, candidates should be careful to look at the whole source, not dissected sections of it, when making links to the questions and further judgements.

Some responses lacked contextual understanding which would have encouraged more effective reading of the sources beyond face value. Knowledge is also key to achieving marks in the higher levels. In **part (a)**, achieving Level 4 is based on explaining the similarities or differences between the sources. This can be done using contextual knowledge. In **part (b)** the reward of higher-level marks requires evaluation of the sources to assess their weight as evidence. However, it should be noted that evaluating the sources is not creditworthy unless the evaluation is linked to the question. Many responses contain lengthy sections of background information or unfocused commentary on the bias and reliability of sources. More effective responses to **part (a)** explain how the sources are similar and different and to consider why the similarities or differences exist. For instance, in **Question 1(a)** it was possible to use knowledge of the foreign powers to help evaluate the sources. In **part (b)**, it is useful for candidates to ask themselves whether their knowledge of the topic supports the claims made in the sources. If so, that might increase the value of a source. Alternatively, if a source was written for a specific purpose or audience, candidates should consider how that



affects its weight as evidence. For example, for **Question 3**, candidates could use their wider contextual knowledge of the Atlantic dimension of the Second World War to evaluate the German position toward the US.

It was notable that many candidates had planned their time carefully and appropriately. However, some responses were undeveloped as a result of issues with time management. Many responses addressed **part (b)** first. This approach can have a negative impact on **part (a)** as a result of completing that part of the assessment last. It is worth bearing in mind that the assessment is structured to be helpful to candidates. By focusing on two sources, **part (a)** is designed to help the candidates ease themselves into the sources and the topic before moving onto **part (b)** which requires work on all four sources.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: France, 1774 – 1814

Question 1

(a) Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence of attitudes towards the King

Most responses identified relevant similarities between the sources; the most frequently discussed being that there was widespread mistrust of King's intentions. For the most part this was supported by effective use of source detail. Many responses identified valid differences with the sources, although some candidates found this more difficult. Many candidates identified differences as to whether the King himself was to blame or whether he was being corrupted by the nobility. Weaker responses struggled to make clear points of comparison because they appeared to not know enough about the chronology of events of 1792. These responses often compared the sources without a focus on the question, and this meant that they were sometimes confused by the ideas described in the sources and could not draw clear comparisons; some responses compared the sources as a whole without taking care to focus specifically on **attitudes** towards the King. Very few responses recognised the King's power of veto, demonstrating a lack of depth of knowledge regarding the stages of the revolution. It is vital that candidates have closely studied the syllabus and understand the period before attempting to answer these source questions.

(b) How far do these sources agree that foreign intervention was the most serious threat to France in 1792?

Many candidates gave a substantial response to the question and there was evidence of effective source use in most answers. Source A was identified as a nuanced source which could be used to argue either in support or challenge of the view. Source C was well used as a support source identifying Brunswick as commander of the Prussian forces representing a serious threat. Source D was also seen as a challenge source, with many candidates noting its specific timing, meaning that in context this could be argued as a supporting source showing that the people of Paris were radicalised by Brunswick's threats, meaning that the threat of intervention had directly led to the attack on the Tuileries. Many candidates also used Source D as a challenge source identifying radical actions by the people to be the real threat, although some candidates spent too much time attempting to explain details of the visual elements of the source rather than explaining their meaning in context. Source C was also valid in use as a challenge source, in respect to Brunswick having been prompted by concern for disorder in France. A number of responses struggled to contextualise Source B as a challenge, because of confusion surrounding the actions of the King, highlighting the need for detailed chronological understanding of the events of the revolution. Responses which used their knowledge to evaluate the sources to decide whether the support or challenge element of the argument was stronger were seen very rarely. Many attempts to evaluate were generic, often stating that the source was biased or unreliable.

Section B: The Gilded Age and Progressive Era, 1870s to 1920

Question 2

(a) Compare and contrast these sources as evidence about the reasons for opposing female emancipation.



Most responses dealt with this question very well and could clearly draw similarities and differences between the two sources. The most frequently explained similarity was the vested interests aligned against female emancipation, and many candidates identified the opposition coming from the Republican Party in both sources. Differences included social and religious reasons for churches to oppose the measure and different views of the political parties' responses. Most responses offered support from the sources to explain and develop their points and the best responses used wider contextual knowledge of the fight for female emancipation to evaluate the reasons for different reasons of opposition.

(b) How far do the sources support the view that the main argument in favour of female emancipation was that it would improve government in the United States?

This question was well attempted, and responses showed an ability to use the sources carefully to support and challenge the assertion given in the question. Source A was argued as a support source, with most candidates identifying strongly supportive statements. 'All who desire good government will benefit by granting the vote to women and cutting the vote of the slums'. Source B also supported the view, with evidence of women given the vote in individual states contributing to reform. Source C supported the argument indirectly in that it could be assumed that in breaking the power and reducing the influence of the Trusts and Liquor interests, better quality government would follow. However, Source C was used most effectively to challenge the view by highlighting other reasons for female emancipation. Source D presented some confusion for some candidates, with some of Roosevelt's rhetoric presenting a position which did not match candidates' expectations of Roosevelt's views from their contextual knowledge. However, it was important to relate the source to the specific focus of the question of improvement of government. As a whole, weaker responses generally resulted from losing focus on the question, in particular a general discussion of the content of each source rather than the focus on improvement of government. While some candidates attempted to consider the authorship of the sources, this was often perfunctory and attempts to comment on reliability added little to the attempted evaluation.

Section C: Empire and the emergence of world powers, 1870 – 1919

Question 3

(a) Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about the sinking of the Lusitania.

This question required candidates to compare evidence about the sinking of the Lusitania. Most candidates were able to recognise the differences in the sources as detailed in the mark scheme, although some of the similarities presented more challenge to some candidates. The best responses began to use their knowledge of the period to explain the differences between the sources using provenance in context which went beyond rote evaluation, in particular their knowledge of the tensions between the US and Germany after the start of World War and their knowledge of the extent of US trade with Britain. To make effective use of contextual knowledge and reach Level 4, it was necessary to use relevant details to explain the similarities or differences between the sources. However, many attempts to evaluate were generic, often stating that the source was biased or unreliable because it was from a speech or private memorandum without any links to the context or the question.

(b) How far do the sources support the view that the US maintained a position of neutrality up to 1917?

Most responses made effective use of the sources to support and challenge the idea that the US maintained a position of neutrality up to 1917. Sources C and D were used well to support the view with many candidates recognising the details that President Wilson 'silenced and suppressed' any support for the Allies 'by his making the artificial quality of neutrality a positive virtue'. Sources A and B were used as challenge sources, with the latter presenting some difficulties for candidates with less detailed knowledge of the positions of wartime diplomacy. Source D was used effectively as a challenge source, with many candidates using the idea of 'greater deference' to Germany than to Britain as a valid challenge to the view. The strongest responses used knowledge of the period to evaluate the sources and explain how this evaluation made them more or less useful when answering the question, weighing up the evidence from the sources. However, there were still a number of responses which struggled to contextualise the sources because of a lack of detailed knowledge which was required to do this effectively.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/21 Outline Study 21</p>

Key messages

- In Part **(a)** questions, candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a range of factors to show how they are connected and reach a supported conclusion about why something happened.
- In Part **(b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.
- A good awareness of the chronology of key events will help candidates to link factors accurately and build an effective argument.

General comments

Part **(a)** questions are about causation. Effective answers were distinguished by detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. This is because causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of several factors, both long and short-term. The most effective responses focused clearly on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they were connected and produced reasoned conclusions. The identification and explanation of some relevant causal factors was made by most candidates. Less successful answers tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. The weaker responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology; they were over-reliant on vague and generalised assertions lacking appropriate factual support. In Part **(b)** the awareness that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways was a characteristic of strong answers. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Responses which were less successful fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question; relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance (often by ignoring timeframes given in the question).

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Modern Europe, 1750–1921

Question 1: The Industrial Revolution in Britain, 1750–1850.

(a) Explain why many people in Britain supported the idea of free trade.

Strong responses were able to identify and explain a number of reasons as to why there was support for the idea of free trade in Britain. These responses could have been improved by showing the connection between the reasons. Less successful answers identified a reason or reasons whilst weaker responses were unsure about what free trade entailed, seeing it as a form of barter.

(b) To what extent was industrialisation caused by technological changes?

Strong responses were able to produce high-quality analysis based on the deployment of appropriate factual evidence to aid the development of fully focused and balanced arguments. This meant that technological changes were assessed against the roles of agricultural, political, and financial

developments in enabling Britain to experience industrialisation. Other responses provided unbalanced answers by focusing only on technological changes or other factors. Weaker responses wrote descriptive accounts of technological changes and/or agricultural improvements with no link to industrialisation being shown. There was some confusion seen in the references to trains allowing workers to commute to the factories and cotton being grown in Britain.

Question 2: Liberalism and nationalism in Germany, 1815–71

(a) Explain why Prussia went to war with Denmark in 1864.

Responses which were successful identified and explained several causes of the war of 1864 and a number showed a clear grasp of the intricacies of the dynastic aspect of the conflict's origins. Less successful answers identified a cause or causes. Weaker responses lost the question's focus and provided a narrative of the war and its results or wrote at length about the wars of 1866 and 1870–71.

(b) To what extent was the development of German nationalism in the period 1815–50 brought about by cultural factors?

Some strong answers were seen, displaying a firm grasp of the various aspects of what constituted 'cultural factors' (language/literature/music/painting) analysing and assessing their role against other influences (shared experience of victory over Napoleon/growth of an educated middle class/the Zollverein/the events of 1848–49). Other responses focused solely on 'cultural factors' or other influences. Weaker responses lost the question's focus by ignoring the timeframe and wrote about Bismarck.

Question 3: The Russian Revolution, 1894–1921

(a) Explain why Trotsky was important for Bolshevik success in October 1917.

Effective responses were characterised by the identification and explanation of several key factors (his roles in the Petrograd Soviet and the Military Revolutionary Committee/his relationship with Lenin/his powers of persuasion and oratory). Less successful responses identified a factor or factors. The weaker responses showed confusion in focusing on Trotsky's role in the Russian Civil War.

(b) How far was the 1905 Revolution caused by economic discontent?

Answers which were successful were able to provide accurate accounts of the forms of economic discontent and their role in the outbreak of the 1905 Revolution. This was balanced with an examination of other influences such as the nature of the Tsarist regime, the various nationalities' anger over the policy of Russification, the Russo-Japanese War and 'Bloody Sunday.' Other responses focused on economic discontent or other factors, resulting in an imbalanced assessment. Weaker answers displayed confusion over chronology in giving accounts of the events of February and October 1917.

Section B: The history of the USA, 1820–1941

Question 4: The origins of the Civil War, 1820–61

(a) Explain why the Whig Party declined rapidly in the 1850s.

Good responses showed clear knowledge of the reasons for the rapid decline of the Whig Party in the 1850s – growing sectional divide over slavery – weakened leadership – creation of the Republican Party. These responses could have been improved by showing the connection between the reasons. Other responses were able to identify a reason or reasons. Weaker responses lost the question's focus on the Whig Party and the 1850s timeframe by writing about splits in the Democratic Party in the 1860 election.

(b) How successful was the Missouri Compromise?

Successful answers provided a balanced assessment supported by a clear knowledge and understanding of the topic. Other answers focused on one aspect, successful or unsuccessful, with most focusing on the unsuccessful aspect of the Missouri Compromise. Less successful answers described the details of the Missouri Compromise. Weaker answers produced confused accounts of the Compromise of 1850 and the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854.

Question 5: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–77

(a) Explain why the availability of resources was important to the outcome of the Civil War.

Stronger responses were detailed, identifying and explaining North-South resource differences. Other responses identified a factor or factors. Weaker responses were confused over the meaning of 'resources.'

(b) 'The main reason for the Emancipation Proclamation was Lincoln's desire to end slavery.' How far do you agree?

The most impressive answers were based on focused, balanced and well supported assessment of the extent to which the Emancipation Proclamation was the result of Lincoln's desire to end slavery. Lincoln's attitude towards, and actions against, slavery (e.g., his first address to Congress in December 1861/legislation signed in April 1862 ending slavery in the District of Columbia) were set against other considerations based around winning the war (e.g., degrading the Southern economy/preventing any likelihood of British and French recognition of the Confederacy/increasing the manpower of the Union forces through the recruitment of former slaves/creating a clear cause to fight for). Less successful answers were unbalanced, focusing either on Lincoln's desire to end slavery or others influences. Weaker answers were often confused, seeing the Emancipation Proclamation as a postwar action.

Question 6: The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal policies, 1920–41

(a) Explain why many on the liberal left opposed the New Deal.

Successful responses were able to provide accurate examples of those on the liberal left who opposed the New Deal and clearly explain the reasons for this opposition. Less successful responses identified either a reason or reasons. The weaker responses showed confusion over the 'liberal left' and attributed views to them which were antithetical to their outlook.

(b) To what extent was lack of government regulation to blame for the Great Crash?

Good answers achieved a clear assessment and balance. They were able to set the lack of government regulation against alternative factors within the focus of the origins of the Great Crash. Other responses were imbalanced providing details on either the lack of government regulation or other factors. Weaker responses lost the question's focus and wrote at length about the Great Depression.

Section C: International History; International Relations, 1870–1945

Question 7: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1920s

(a) Explain why Germany suffered an economic crisis in the early 1920s.

Answers which were successful identified and explained a number of reasons for the economic crisis Germany suffered in the early 1920s. A number of answers were able to show the connections between the various reasons. Other answers identified a reason or reasons. Weaker answers ignored the question's timeframe and wrote about the impact of the Great Crash of 1929 on Germany's economy.

(b) 'The structure of the League was the main reason for its weakness in the 1920s.' How far do you agree?

Good responses were able to assess the extent to which the League's structure was the main cause of its weakness in the 1920s by examining against it other influences (e.g., no United States of America presence/bias against small states/the notion of 'a victors' club'). Responses which were less successful focused on the structure aspect or other factors, producing an imbalanced assessment. Weaker responses produced a descriptive account and/or lost the question's focus by writing about events from the 1930s (Manchuria/Abyssinia).

Question 8: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1930s

- (a) Explain why Hitler doubted that Britain and France would go to war in support of Poland in September 1939.**

Successful answers displayed good knowledge and understanding which allowed them to identify and explain a number of reasons, with many seeing the connections between them. Answers which were less successful identified a reason or reasons.

- (b) 'The World Disarmament Conference failed because of French refusal to consider significant disarmament.' How far do you agree?**

Responses which were successful were able to produce high-quality responses, based on the deployment of appropriate factual evidence to aid the development of fully focused and balanced arguments. These responses assessed France's actions against other influences (e.g., Hitler's approach to disarmament and withdrawal from the Conference/growing militarism, as seen in Japan's invasion of Manchuria). Less successful responses were imbalanced focusing on France's position or other influences and lacked depth in evidential support. Weaker responses showed confusion by seeing Hitler's rearmament being well advanced and/or writing about the Spanish Civil War/the Munich crisis.

Question 9: China and Japan, 1912–45

- (a) Explain why Japan became an expansionist power in the 1930s.**

The identification and explanation of several factors led to the production of successful responses. A common feature of less successful responses was a focus on Japan's modernisation and industrialisation in the late 19th century with no reference to developments in the 1930s.

- (b) To what extent had the Kuomintang succeeded in establishing control over China by 1928?**

Answers which were successful provided a balanced assessment supported by appropriate factual evidence. These answers were aware of Sun Yat Sen's 'Three principles' on which a unifying campaign was based and that Chiang Kai Shek was able to partially unite the country as a consequence of the Northern Expedition. Also, there was an understanding that the fracturing of the Kuomintang (KMT) and Chinese Communist Party alliance in 1927 would lead to long term problems for the KMT, but the detail on this did not stretch the given timeframe. There was an awareness that the warlord issue had not been overcome totally, with areas still outside KMT control. Less successful answers were either imbalanced and/or displayed limited evidence to support their argument. Weaker answers ignored the question's timeframe and wrote at length about events in the 1930s such as the Long March.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/22 Outline Study 22</p>

Key messages

- In Part **(a)** questions, candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a range of factors to show how they are connected and reach a supported conclusion about why something happened.
- In Part **(b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.
- A good awareness of the chronology of key events will help candidates to link factors accurately and build an effective argument.

General comments

Part **(a)** questions are about causation. Effective answers were distinguished by detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. This is because causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of several factors, both long and short-term. The most effective responses focused clearly on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they were connected and produced reasoned conclusions. The identification and explanation of some relevant causal factors was made by most candidates. Less successful answers tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. The weaker responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology; they were over-reliant on vague and generalised assertions lacking appropriate factual support. In Part **(b)** the awareness that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways was a characteristic of strong answers. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Responses which were less successful fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question; relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance (often by ignoring timeframes given in the question).

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Modern Europe 1750 – 1921

Question 1: The Industrial Revolution in Britain, 1750–1850.

(a) Explain why the slave trade was important to the growth of industry.

Effective responses provided a very creditable account of the triangular trade and how it worked. The link between the production of goods to take to Africa, the demand for slaves to work on plantations in the Americas and the provision of basic raw materials to facilitate the growth of production in the cotton mills of Lancashire was clearly explained and, in the best responses, linked to the general growth of entrepreneurship and investment which fuelled further growth. For example: *It helped Britain gain raw materials. British ships transported slaves from Africa to North America as free labour for their colonies there. The land there was good for growing cotton and slaves meant it was produced cheaply. This then provided the British textile industry with large supplies of raw material to increase production and increase profits. These were then invested in further developments fuelling the development of the industrial revolution.* Weaker responses fell into

several categories. Some thought the slaves were simply brought back to Britain to work in factories whilst others were unclear about which parts of the world were involved.

(b) 'The middle classes benefited the most from industrialisation.' How far do you agree?

There were some very good answers to this question. These had a good understanding of who the middle class were and provided clear analysis of entrepreneurship and investment and the benefits gained from the promotion of new processes (with appropriate examples like Richard Arkwright and James Watt). Candidates were able to explain how the growth of industry led to a growth in other middle class professions and how the middle classes began to exert greater influence politically referring especially to the Great Reform Act of 1832. The best responses provided some comparison with other groups – the aristocracy and the lower classes. Some responses just claimed life was bad for the lower classes, but better ones recognised that there was improvement here too but that it was less pronounced: *However, the middle classes were not the only ones who benefitted from industrialisation. Some workers still enjoyed higher wages because of it and some used this to learn new skills and improve their position. But for most the rise in cost of food more than took up the extra wages they earned so the lower classes still struggled to afford the basic food they needed.* Weaker responses were unclear about who the middle class were and include skilled workmen, even some factory workers, in their consideration of the middle class.

Question 2: Liberalism and nationalism in Germany, 1815–71

(a) Explain why the Carlsbad Decrees of 1819 were issued.

There were several effective responses from candidates who knew what the decrees were for and why they were passed. Most emphasised the role of Metternich and fear of the rise of nationalism. Only a few stronger responses, however, recognised that this fear might have been driven by the effect that nationalism could have on the Austrian Empire and most focused heavily in the rising tide of candidate activism and the aftermath of Napoleonic occupation without considering the wider implications the imposition of these decrees.

(b) 'German nationalism caused the war fought by Denmark in 1864 against Prussia and Austria.' How far do you agree?

Few responses showed an understanding of the importance of Schleswig Holstein for growing German nationalism with some responses suggesting that the Duke of Augustenburg was the Danish candidate for the vacant dukedom. There were few mentions of the Salic Law which banned the new king of Denmark from being Duke because he was descended from a female relative of the former king, though there were some who mentioned this, and these responses showed good understanding of the wider issues too. Several stronger answers were built about Bismarck and his manipulation of the situation to Prussia's advantage including setting the scene for a war with Austria in the near future: *However, another cause of the war against Denmark was Bismarck's objective of creating a situation for confrontation with Austria. His ambition was to establish Prussian superiority over Germany and push out Austria. By getting Austria involved in the dispute over Schleswig Holstein he got Austria involved in taking over the 2 duchies and then was able to use conflict over how this worked to provoke war with Austria a few years later. Bismarck used liberal support for taking back the Duchies to further his own ambitions for Prussia not because he supported nationalism.* Strong responses on 'other factors' were sometimes unbalanced because of a limited grasp of the specific issue of succession to control of Schleswig-Holstein and why it was significant challenge for German nationalists.

Question 3: The Russian Revolution, 1894–1921

(a) Explain why 'Bloody Sunday' weakened the Tsarist regime in 1905

Less effective responses usually just described the events of Bloody Sunday, often in full and fairly accurate detail, before asserting that this made the Tsar unpopular. Such answers did not get beyond the lower levels of the mark scheme. Stronger responses were able to link this to an already worsening situation for the Tsar and considered the aftermath of the event including the wider outbreak of the 1905 Revolution and the compromise solution eventually reached in the October Manifesto which, on the face of it, represented a considerable weakening of the Tsar's political powers.

(b) To what extent was Bolshevik success in October 1917 caused by the errors of the Provisional Government?

The issues leading to the successful Bolshevik Revolution of October 1917 were generally well understood. Many candidates were able to catalogue, in varying degrees of detail, the failures of the Provisional Government from continuing the war with Germany to arming the Bolsheviks when threatened by the advances of General Kornilov. Many also considered the active role played by the Bolsheviks and their leadership in securing a position of strength from which to challenge the Provisional Government mentioning the leadership of Lenin and the April Theses and the role of Trotsky in enacting the Revolution. However only the best responses considered the relative importance of these different factors, and many others simply ended their essay with a summative assertion. For example: *Therefore, it is clear that the Bolsheviks success in October 1917 was mainly caused by the errors of the Provisional Government, which opened up opportunities for the Bolsheviks to gain public support and weaken opposition. Although other factors did contribute to it.* This may be true but without some references back to the main arguments presented it does not justify the judgement that is being made here.

Section B: The History of the USA 1820–1941

Question 4: The origins of the Civil War, 1820–61

(a) Explain why implementing the Compromise of 1850 caused problems.

The best responses began with a summary of what the Compromise of 1850 involved before going on to explain how different aspects of the compromise led to growing issues. Most candidates, for example were aware of the tougher version of the Fugitive Slave Act that was part of the Compromise and the difficulties that it created in legal terms, especially in the northern states: *While the Compromise of 1820 had added only 2 states to the Union the Compromise of 1850 was more extensive including California and the lands recently gained from Mexico. The most impactful change, however, was the Fugitive Slave Act which gave slave owners not only the right to re-capture slaves but also to force federal agents and local law officers to help with this process or face fines for refusing. This created great resentment in the Northern states and raised tensions over the issue of slavery.* Many were also aware of the reasons why the admission of California and the settlement of the new territories acquire from Mexico, might cause conflict between slave and non-slave states. Some candidates however chose to concentrate on the Kansas Nebraska issue which did not arise directly from the Compromise and thus gained little reward.

(b) ‘By April 1861 both the North and the South wanted war.’ How far do you agree?

Many candidates did not engage with the idea that the two sides might have ‘wanted’ war and wrote an account of how the war broke out, highlighting key events like the election of Lincoln and the first secessions to the issue of Fort Sumter. Some stronger responses referred to Lincoln’s ‘House divided cannot stand’ speech to suggest that he saw no alternative to war while on the other side many southerners were increasingly prepared to fight to maintain their cultural difference so that for both sides war looked like the only reasonable option. Such responses often also recognised that the Fort Sumter incident was just a trigger for the release of pent-up tensions and the signal for the start of outright war. These responses sometimes also mentioned opposition to the war, especially in the North.

Question 5: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–77

(a) Explain why the 14th Amendment was passed.

Several candidates were aware of exactly which of the reconstruction amendments this was and so wrote in general terms about the changes brought about for former slaves as a result of the amendments. Such responses did not really engage with the importance of the 14th amendment in granting citizenship to all ex-slaves and establishing their equality before the law. A few weaker responses talked about the emancipation proclamation and its effect on the war which did not fulfil the requirements of the question. A few better responses did understand what was involved and wrote clearly about the implications of, and the effect in practice, of the 14th Amendment.

(b) To what extent was poor military leadership the reason the Civil War lasted for four years?



Understanding of military leadership varied, with some candidates able to name key leaders (McClellan, Grant, Lee Jackson etc.) and specific tactics and assess their role whilst weaker responses discussed in very general terms the military aspects of leadership. A clear introduction can be key to a successful essay and stronger responses provided these: *Poor military leadership was certainly one reason why the war lasted so long. The South had a strong commander in Lee who led the Confederacy to early success. Northern generals were more cautious and put their trust in longer term plans like the Anaconda Plan. But eventually Lincoln realised there were better general around and once he appointed Grant to lead the Union force thing changed. However, in the long run the Union had more people and better industries so was likely to win. But it took time to make full use of these.* Most responses were on firmer ground in considering other factors that played a part in the duration of the war like population size and, industrial development and availability of railways for transport of men and materials. However, many responses that grew out of this approach were lacking in balance.

Question 6: The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal policies, 1920–41

- (a) Explain why Roosevelt established the Alphabet Agencies.**

Insufficient responses for meaningful comment

- (b) ‘The Great Crash was caused by speculation on the stock market.’ How far do you agree?**

Insufficient responses for meaningful comment

Section C: International History 1870–1945

Question 7: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1920s

- (a) Explain why the USA did not join the League of Nations in 1920.**

Many candidates had a solid grasp of the circumstances in which the League of Nations was created. They were able to explain how Americans responded to the Paris negotiations and why Wilson was unable to persuade his countrymen to support the Treaty. Many candidates wrote clearly about the unwillingness of Americans to become involved in European affairs following the effects of the recent war, especially as many were descended for immigrant who had settled in the USA in order to escape European conflicts. Stronger responses provided good supporting detail including the effect of the return of a Republican majority to the Congress in the midterm elections of 1920.

- (b) To what extent did the Ruhr crisis lead to a change in relations between France and Germany?**

Stronger responses understood that in order to understand whether the Ruhr Crisis led to change it is necessary to explain the nature of relations before the crisis to be able to assess whether there was significant change in relations between the two countries or whether underlying problems remained. The majority of candidates were able to provide some account of improvements in relations between France and Germany by assessing the effects of various international arrangements like the Dawes Plan, the Locarno Treaties, the Kellogg Briand Pact and the Young Plan, and comparing this with the situation that had led to the occupation of the Ruhr in the first place. Some candidates found it more difficult to provide a counter argument however those who began from the response of many Germans to the Versailles settlement were able to build a convincing argument that underlying resentment and distrust remained and that only highly favourable circumstances in the mid 1920's made it appear that relations were much better. Weaker responses often did not go far beyond describing the events of 1923 and their immediate impact.

Question 8: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1930s

- (a) Explain why the League failed to stop Italian aggression against Abyssinia.**

There was generally a good understanding of the topic and many candidates provided at least one

reasoned argument about the failures of the League to answer the call for help from the Emperor Haile Selassie. Most responses focused on the role of France and Britain as effective leaders of the League, highlighting their unwillingness to act against Italy because of the growing threat of Germany. For example: *The League had the opportunity to act as soon as the invasion began by imposing sanctions and closing the Suez Canal to vital Italian supplies going through to Italian Somaliland to support their invasion. But Britain and France did not want to antagonise Italy as they had just formed the Stresa Front as an insurance against growing German aggression in Europe.* Strong responses were aware of the Hoare Laval Pact and its implications for action by the League. Some less focused responses just wrote about the general weaknesses of the League without really considering the specific circumstances of Italy's invasion of Abyssinia.

- (b) **'Ideology was the reason for the differing international responses to the Spanish Civil War.'**
How far do you agree?

Most candidates recognised that Communism vs Fascism was a consideration in the internal conflict in Spain and knew that the Nationalists led by Franco were supported by the right-wing governments of Germany and Italy, whilst the official government of Spain, the Republicans, received some aid from the communist government of the USSR. Many were able to balance the ideological interest of these three countries with more general considerations like Hitler's wish to test out new methods of warfare, Mussolini's ambitions to create a *Mare Nostrum*, or the reason why Stalin's support was limited. Most responses found difficulty in identifying and explaining the response of more democratically orientated countries like Britain France and the USA.

Question 9: China and Japan, 1912–45

- (a) **Explain why democratic government failed in Japan in the 1930s.**

Most candidates who did this question were able to offer at least one explained reason for the failure of democratic government usually linked to the position of the army in Japanese society. Stronger responses were able to suggest a number of reasons why democratic government failed and offered supporting detail to justify its analysis. Key factors that formed the basis of the best responses were the underlying weakness of democracy in Japan, the effects of the Wall Street Crash and the Great Depression, and the influence of the army and invasion of Manchuria.

- (b) **How important was the Rectification Campaign in establishing Mao Zedong's control over the Chinese Communist Party?**

Effective responses understood that the campaign, which began in 1941, encouraged criticism of Mao's writing and ideas in order to identify opponents and subject them to 'rectification' or 're-education'. They were also able to assess how far Mao had already gone in securing his leadership of the CCP through the Long March, the creation of the Y'nan Soviet and the war against the Japanese. This enabled the better responses to reach a conclusion. For example: *Conclusively the Rectification Campaign is most important in establishing Mao's control. While the Long March was a vital propaganda tool in garnering support from the Chinese public, within the CCP it resulted in much turmoil over the position of power. The Rectification Campaign effectively allowed Mao to remove rivals and possible challenges which did consolidate his power in the long run.* Weaker responses were not fully aware of when and what the Rectification Campaign was. A few confused it the Chaing Kai-shek's encirclement campaign's or the early 1930's whilst others discussed how Mao went about establishing control in Y'nan at the end of the Long March in 1937.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/23 Outline Study 23</p>

Key messages

- In Part **(a)** questions, candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a range of factors to show how they are connected and reach a supported conclusion about why something happened.
- In Part **(b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.
- A good awareness of the chronology of key events will help candidates to link factors accurately and build an effective argument.

General comments

Part **(a)** questions are about causation. Effective answers were distinguished by detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. This is because causation can only be adequately explained by an appreciation of the combined effect of several factors, both long and short-term. The most effective responses focused clearly on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, demonstrating how they were connected and produced reasoned conclusions. The identification and explanation of some relevant causal factors was made by most candidates. Less successful answers tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. The weaker responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology; they were over-reliant on vague and generalised assertions lacking appropriate factual support. In Part **(b)** the awareness that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways was a characteristic of strong answers. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Responses which were less successful fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question; relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance (often by ignoring timeframes given in the question).

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Modern Europe 1750 – 1921

This was the most popular section of the paper.

Question 1: The Industrial Revolution in Britain, 1750–1850.

- (a)** Explain why there was opposition to the demands for social reform, caused by the Industrial Revolution.

There was generally a clear understanding of the need for social reform and some candidates went to considerable lengths to describe the poor living conditions in industrial towns and what caused them. Stronger responses focused more clearly on the question and considered a range of factors that might lead to opposition to social reform and of the groups who opposed change. These ranged from fear of a repeat of events of the French Revolution to concerns about falling profits because of the need to provide better wages or more support for the poor. Some weaker responses confused social reform with political reform and wrote about the Chartists.



- (b) **'The *laissez faire* approach to economic affairs caused the Industrial Revolution.' How far do you agree?**

Most responses showed a good understanding of a range of factors that helped to promote the Industrial Revolution and provided some sort of account of how each of these had an effect. In less effective responses this was often a simple narrative and many concentrated particularly on the effect of the Agricultural Revolution with limited reference to the role of invention and transport improvements etc. These responses often had little idea of what *laissez faire* meant in practical terms. Stronger responses showed some understanding of *laissez faire* and how this manifested itself and the best constructed complex analysis of the interconnection of a range of factors.

Question 2: Liberalism and nationalism in Germany, 1815–71

- (a) **Explain why Austria lost the war of 1866 against Prussia.**

Many responses had a good understanding of the main factors that contributed to this victory of Prussia and gave a reasonable account of these. In particular the role of Bismarck in 'setting up' the conflict was generally well reported as was the relative strength of the Prussian Army, though not all candidates were able to go beyond simple assertion and explain the role of army reforms in this transformation of Prussian strength. Stronger responses were also aware of the specific role played by Prussian generals and the best of these were able to demonstrate why this was the most important of the factors that they wrote about. For example: *Overall, all of the factors were linked, but it was probably Prussian brilliance in tactics that led to Austria's failure. Even though the Army Bill provided Prussia with superior forces to Austria's it still depended on the Generals to make brilliant decisions to achieve decisive victories. While Bismarck's diplomatic skills ensured Austria's isolation it still depended on Prussia's commanders, like von Moltke, to utilise the superior economy, forces and weapons to their full extent to win the war.* As the conclusion to a detailed examination of all the factors mentioned here this represents a top level response to this question.

- (b) **How far were the revolutions in Germany, 1848 – 49, caused by nationalism?**

Several responses wrote about what happened when the Frankfurt Parliament met in 1848 – 9 rather than looking at the causes of the revolutions. Some responses focused on the effect of the spread of revolutionary ideas to Germany during the Napoleonic era. Whilst there was some valid comment to be made on this the main focus needed to be on what was happening in Germany in the period between 1815 and 1848. Strong responses wrote about a range of topics including economic issues and the dominance of Austria and used these, in the best cases, to establish the relative importance of Nationalism.

Question 3: The Russian Revolution, 1894–1921

- (a) **Explain why there was opposition to the introduction of the New Economic Policy.**

There were some good responses to this question but a significant number who confused the NEP of Lenin with the economic reforms of Witte in the late 19th century. Effective responses based their suggestions on the concerns of many hardline Bolsheviks over the introduction of a degree of freedom in the marketplace. Many provided an account of the effect of war communism and the reasons for the NEP though these were, strictly speaking, not part of the reason for opposition though again there were concerns that war communism had helped the Bolsheviks win and abandoning it in favour of a new untested policy that allowed for the return of some capitalistic features was a move in the wrong direction.

- (b) **'Disunity amongst its critics kept the Tsarist regime secure in the period 1906 to 1914.' How far do you agree?**

In general term most candidates were able to write about factors that helped the Tsar to remain in control. These included the provisions of the October Manifesto, the ministry of Stolypin and the continuing loyalty of the army and support of the Church along with the innate conservatism of the peasantry who constituted 85 per cent of the population of Russia. Several responses were unclear about detail or only wrote about a few of these factors. What distinguished better responses is that they actually included the role of opposition groups, though some responses were still quite vague about who these 'groups' were. The best responses wrote confidently about the different reactions

to Tsarist rule of Bolsheviks and Mensheviks and other opposition groups, demonstrating a clear understanding of the different objectives of some of these groups in terms of whether they were seeking government reform or regime change. Strong responses usually managed to pull these conflicting ideas together in a final conclusion with reasoned judgement: *The opposition to the Tsar was divided and thus weakened but generally the stability of the regime in these years was due to Stolypin's reforms and his tactics for asserting control, such as the Stolypin necktie. Added to this the Romanov 300 celebrations and the enthusiastic support of the masses at the start of the war in 1914 suggest that underlying support for the regime was quite strong in 1914 and the divided opposition represented no real threat.*

Section B: The History of the USA 1820 – 1941

Question 4: The origins of the Civil War, 1820–61

(a) Explain why Texas joining the Union was controversial.

There were some very good responses to this question which understood the issues, most of which revolved around the growing conflict over slavery. Many responses were effective because they were able to set a clear outline for the essay. For example: *The issue of Texas joining the Union was controversial because Texas was a slave owning state and wished to continue with this. This would upset the balance between slave and free states which had existed since the Missouri Compromise. Also, Texas had been part of Mexico and accepting it as a state might lead to conflict.* A simple introduction sets a clear outline for developing a detailed answer explaining how if, Texas were to be admitted as a slave state, this would upset the delicate balance of power in Congress. In addition, there was some discussion of dividing Texas, because it was so large in comparison to other state, into 3 states which would exacerbate the slave issue. Also, the admission would breach the Compromise of 1820 as Texas stretched significantly farther north than the Mason-Dixon Line. A few strong responses also recognised that it increased the tension with Mexico that eventually led to the US Mexican war. Weaker responses tended to conflate these two events and wrote about the admission of Texas (1845) as a part of the settlement of the US Mexico War (1848-9) so that much of their argument was not valid.

(b) To what extent was Lincoln's victory in the 1860 election caused by divisions in the Democratic Party?

Most candidates were able to offer at least one explanation for Lincoln's victory in 1860. In weaker responses this often had little to do with divisions in the Democratic Party which were not well understood by this group. Most candidates wrote about the issue of slavery and the relative size of the electorate in the northern and southern states, and many wrote about the Lincoln Douglas debates as a critical factor in Lincoln's candidacy and ultimate success. However only the stronger responses recognised the link between Douglas' support, in these debates, for the Freeport Doctrine, which divided the party and led to a split in the Democratic Convention and the selection of two Democrat candidates that thus split the vote.

Question 5: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–77

(a) Explain why ex-slaves found it difficult to improve their lives during the Reconstruction period.

Many candidates were able to provide an account of at least some aspects of the life of ex-slaves in the Reconstruction period. Many focused-on opposition to the Reconstruction amendments and especially on the role of white supremacist groups like the Ku Klux Klan in repressing freed slaves. Better responses took into consideration southern states legislation like the Black Codes that sought the restrict access to the electoral process, and the development of share cropping as a means for Plantation owners to maintain a hold over their former slaves. Some even took into account the role of President Johnson which encouraged the resistance of southern states, including the closing of the Freedman's Bureau which had been set up specifically to help ex-slaves develop an independent life.

(b) How important was foreign influence in determining the outcome of the Civil War?

Some candidates struggled with the central issue of this question. They were aware of general factors that helped to assure the North of victory. These included superior numbers, better

developed industries and good rail communications, but the issue of foreign influence tended to be restricted to the South's reliance on cotton sales to European partners. This approach produced responses that were not well balanced. A significant number of responses fell into this category; only a limited number of candidates fully understood the pressures that European countries like Britain and France imposed on both sides, including factors like the Trent incident in their accounts. These responses generally scored well by producing balanced arguments often with a reasoned overall judgement. Stronger responses offered an effective comparison of factors within their analysis, for example: *The international community's continuing neutrality in the war did contribute to the outcome. The chief goal of the Confederacy, diplomatically, was to gain international recognition. Fear that this might happen, and swing the balance in favour of the Confederacy led Lincoln to sign the Emancipation Proclamation and this turned the war into a war against slavery, which European countries had already abolished.* Having established the basic position these were able to go on to a more detailed consideration of the relationship between the two sides and the international community.

Question 6: The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal policies, 1920–41

- (a) **Explain why there was a 'Roosevelt Recession' in 1937 – 38.**

There were too few responses to this question for meaningful comment.

- (b) **How far do you agree that the Depression was caused by Hoover's reaction to the Great Crash?**

There were too few responses to this question for meaningful comment.

Section C: International History 1870 – 1945

Question 7: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1920s

- (a) **Explain why the Kellogg–Briand Pact of 1928 was seen as a major development in international relations.**

Most responses showed good understanding of the provisions the Kellogg Briand Pact and were able to provide at least one explanation of why it was considered to be important. These included the fact that it was an agreement not to resort to war as means of settling international disputes and thus was a development of the commitment made in the Versailles settlement. Furthermore, effective responses were aware of the number of candidates signing it and, in theory, were committed to avoiding war as an acceptable way of resolving international disputes. The best responses set these in the international context of the late 1920's where economic stability seemed to have been restored and old rivalries like those between France and Germany seemed to have been eased due to the positive relations between Briand and Stresemann. Some also recognised it as an important re-engagement of the US in international relations.

- (b) **'The League of Nations was successful in dealing with international conflict in the 1920s.' How far do you agree?**

Most responses provided at least some examples of successes and of failures in the 1920's. The stronger responses were those which offered a clear view from the start, for example: *During the 1920's the League did have many successes in dealing with international conflicts through peaceful plebiscites (Upper Silesia) and negotiations between countries (Aaland Islands). However, this success is overridden by its failure to react to international disputes (the Ruhr) or lack of will to act against a major member (Corfu) due to national interest and lack of enforcement power.* Weaker responses tended to describe the identified examples of cases dealt with and usually offered an assertion about success or failure. Successes identified include the Aaland Island dispute, the Silesian coalfields and the Graeco-Bulgarian border dispute among others. Failures were noted in the case of the Polish seizure of Vilnius and the Italian invasion of Corfu as part of their demands for compensation from Greece. Weaker responses often stuck to a description of events with a summative conclusion while stronger responses provided an assessment of the relative importance of different factors in determining the outcome. For example, the Poles had a strong relationship with the French who were one of the major powers in the League whilst Italy was itself one of the leading powers in the organisation.

Question 8: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1930s

(a) Explain why Britain was slow to begin re-armament in the 1930s.

Many responses showed good awareness of a general resistance to any policies that threatened to lead to war, reflecting the popular perspective of the horrors of the fighting in the First World War. However, the most effective responses covered other issues like the effects of the Great Depression on public spending and the fear of communism.

(b) 'The Nazi–Soviet Pact was brought about by Stalin's mistrust of Britain and France.' How far do you agree?

There were some good responses to this question from candidates who understood that the West's reluctance to engage in talks with the Soviet Union made Stalin suspicious of their intentions, whilst recognising that there were some advantages for Stalin in signing the pact with Germany at this stage in their industrial and military development. The most effective responses often provided detailed explanation of the failure of the West's negotiations with the USSR as well as recognising that Stalin himself saw the Pact as only a temporary measure. Weaker responses often wrote predominantly about the Nazi Soviet Pact, including describing Hitler reasons for signing it, which were not relevant to the question.

Question 9: China and Japan, 1912–45

(a) Explain why the Japanese army occupied Manchuria in 1931.

Responses to this question were often very good. Factors ranged from the conflict between democratic government to the rising tide of militarism in Japan. Most responses were clear on the extent to which this was fuelled by the effects of the Great Depression which caused significant problems in Japan and led many to blame the democratic government for these. Additionally, the attraction of land and resources offered by seizing control Manchuria, gave impetus to the ambitions of the Kwantung Army who in the end acted without reference to the domestic government. Most provided effective conclusions which do not need to be long if the response is carefully constructed: *In the end, although militaristic ambitions and war resource security were factors it was ultimately the Great Depression that caused the occupation of Manchuria. The army turned to this as a method to calm internal chaotic conflict and solve the state of social unrest that the democratic government could not solve.*

(b) To what extent was the increasing support for the Chinese Communist Party in the 1930s a result of the policies of Chiang Kai-shek?

Strong responses each produced a well-balanced analysis of the factors leading to growing support for the CCP. These often covered clearly the developing relationship between Chiang and the CCP from the breach over the Shanghai massacres of 1927 to the war against the Japanese in the latter part of the 1930's. The most effective of these responses were able to produce a balanced account comparing the negative effects of Chiang's policies with the positive achievements of the Communists in winning admiration and support from the Chinese population in general. *In assessment, although Chiang's policies had caused heavy loss of support, it was ultimately because of the CCP's ability to utilise these weaknesses that won the hopes of the people towards the CCP. Furthermore, in comparison to Chiang's policies, the CCP had policies that were targeted to a greater majority of the population, the peasants in the countryside. So, it was only to a lesser extent that Chiang's policies, that targeter a minority of landlords and businessmen, were responsible for the CCP winning support.*

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/31 Interpretations Question 31</p>
--

Key messages

- The question asks what you can learn from the extract about the historian's interpretation. Candidates should first identify the interpretation, and then explain how the content of the extract can be used to show how the interpretation can be inferred from it.
- The interpretation will always relate to the central, key question which underpins the study of the topic; that is, *Who or what is the historian blaming?* Candidates should read through the whole extract to find where it allocates blame and to whom or to what.
- Candidates should also consider how the extract suggests blame: how can you tell from what the historian has written that someone/something is being blamed? These are the parts of the extract that candidates should use when constructing answers. Although all of the extract will be consistent with the interpretation, this does not mean that all of it will be helpful in explaining it. Candidates should select those parts that reveal the blame and use those parts to build responses.
- Candidates should focus directly on the interpretation and avoid working through the extract paragraph by paragraph and just summarising what it says, commenting on points as they arise. Responses that adopted the latter approach struggled to view the extract as a whole and were drawn into giving too much significance to incidental points that had little bearing on the historian's main messages.

General comments

Most answers understood that the extract contains an interpretation, and, using the extract, attempted to explain what this was. Several responses were able to reach sound, supported, conclusions however many were not quite as successful for several reasons. Firstly, part of the Interpretations study is acquiring an understanding of the major historiographical approaches that are relevant to the topic. Candidates commonly used historiographical 'labels' such as intentionalism, revisionism and functionalism in their answers but without fully appreciating what these meant. This had a knock-on effect on candidates' responses, since the task of inferring the historian's interpretation is informed by understanding of the different approaches' historians have taken to their study of the topic. A different but related issue was that many answers attempted to compare the interpretation in the extract with what other historians had written. This can be an effective move when it works, but often the comparison was ill-founded which undermined the response. Answers also often strayed from the extract into writing about the context which often resulted in description of the extract rather than discussion of the argument. There can only be one reason for writing about the context, and that is to help with answering the question; that is, with explaining the historian's interpretation. Lastly, some candidates took to using truncated quotations. This should be avoided on the basis that what comes between the first and the last words may be capable of being interpreted in different ways, or parts of it may be relevant and others not. The interests of clarity are best served by putting on the page the exact material needed to support the point made.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: The origins of the First World War

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he blames domestic factors because (i) in pre-war Europe social change and fear of revolution were destabilising domestic politics, and (ii) this served to intensify international tensions. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Many candidates knew that the interpretation was linking domestic with international developments, but found it hard to explain this link, though they often made the point that this was not an interpretation that blamed individual people or countries. Others looked for a variety of other factors to blame, some mentioned in the extract – such as

reckless foreign policymakers and the arms race – and some not – such as the alliance system. Overall, amongst weaker responses there was a fair amount of writing about the origins of the war without much focus on the extract, perhaps a reflection of the unfamiliarity of the historian's approach to them. This also produced answers that simply paraphrased points in the extract.

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he blames (i) Hitler for his genocidal intent, and (ii) wartime developments for the change from disorganised/improvised killing to genocide. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. The historian's approach was clearly a synthesis which, whilst accepting that even in late 1941 there was no clear plan for genocide, nonetheless saw Hitler as central in both seeking and deciding on the murder of all European Jews. Many candidates could explain one aspect of the interpretation, but not both. The aspect more easily explained was Hitler's culpability. The war was less effectively handled. Here, limited understanding of functionalism was apparent. For many candidates, perceiving that the interpretation had something to do with wartime developments was enough to determine a functionalist approach, whereas, though necessary, this was insufficient to explain how and why. The clues were the reference to a '*messy situation*' caused by deportations to the East, with no consistent policy for the treatment of Jews, and to Hitler's decision for genocide being contingent on the entry of the USA into the war. The other historiographical 'label' to cause problems was structuralism, which many candidates claimed to detect in what the extract had to say about Heydrich, though in reality there was no evidence in the extract for the idea that the Holocaust was caused by competing individuals or agencies within the Nazi state. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

Section C: The origins and development of the Cold War

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he blames the United States for (i) mistakes made in 1945 – 6 that pushed the USSR into hardline policies, and (ii) for missing the chance for greater cooperation that existed at that time. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. This extract provided a good example of how basing an answer on working through it paragraph by paragraph can cause problems, since the historian's interpretation only becomes fully apparent in the final paragraph. The first two paragraphs serve to establish the idea that the USSR is *not* being blamed, which is important but not the main point. Candidates who had not selected their material in advance had often concluded by this stage that the focus on the Soviets must actually somehow be showing them to blame. At best, they were likely to miss what all this meant in the main interpretation, which was to signal that the USA, for a short period, had a real chance of working cooperatively with the USSR, but failed to take it. The blame became explicit in the last paragraph, which outlined crucial errors made by US policymakers. Weaker answers placed too much weight on individual words or phrases: searching for suggestions that the Soviets were blamed, they might seize upon '*known Soviet paranoid tendencies*' or '*Russia's shift to a tough line*'. But this mistook detail for understanding of the interpretation as whole. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.



HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/32 Interpretations Question 32</p>
--

Key messages

- The question asks what you can learn from the extract about the historian's interpretation. Candidates should first identify the interpretation, and then explain how the content of the extract can be used to show how the interpretation can be inferred from it.
- The interpretation will always relate to the central, key question which underpins the study of the topic; that is, *Who or what is the historian blaming?* Candidates should read through the whole extract to find where it allocates blame and to whom or to what.
- Candidates should also consider how the extract suggests blame: how can you tell from what the historian has written that someone/something is being blamed? These are the parts of the extract that candidates should use when constructing answers. Although all of the extract will be consistent with the interpretation, this does not mean that all of it will be helpful in explaining it. Candidates should select those parts that reveal the blame and use those parts to build responses.
- Candidates should focus directly on the interpretation and avoid working through the extract paragraph by paragraph and just summarising what it says, commenting on points as they arise. Responses that adopted the latter approach struggled to view the extract as a whole and were drawn into giving too much significance to incidental points that had little bearing on the historian's main messages.

General comments

Most answers understood that the extract contains an interpretation, and, using the extract, attempted to explain what this was. Several responses were able to reach sound, supported, conclusions however many were not quite as successful for several reasons. Firstly, part of the Interpretations study is acquiring an understanding of the major historiographical approaches that are relevant to the topic. Candidates commonly used historiographical 'labels' such as intentionalism, revisionism and functionalism in their answers but without fully appreciating what these meant. This had a knock-on effect on candidates' responses, since the task of inferring the historian's interpretation is informed by understanding of the different approaches' historians have taken to their study of the topic. A different but related issue was that many answers attempted to compare the interpretation in the extract with what other historians had written. This can be an effective move when it works, but often the comparison was ill-founded which undermined the response. Answers also often strayed from the extract into writing about the context which often resulted in description of the extract rather than discussion of the argument. There can only be one reason for writing about the context, and that is to help with answering the question; that is, with explaining the historian's interpretation. Lastly, some candidates took to using truncated quotations. This should be avoided on the basis that what comes between the first and the last words may be capable of being interpreted in different ways, or parts of it may be relevant and others not. The interests of clarity are best served by putting on the page the exact material needed to support the point made.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: The origins of the First World War.

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

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he blames Hitler (i) for his long-held desire to destroy the Jews, and (ii) for his close involvement in driving Jewish policy. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Most

answers understood that Hitler was being blamed, so the issue became how effectively this understanding could be demonstrated using the extract, and whether this understanding was undermined by seeing things in the extract that really were not there. In this latter group could be found those who saw mention of Nazi leaders other than Hitler, and agencies such as those of the SS, and thereby assumed that the historian's approach was structuralist. There were also misreadings, taking the views of others as the historian's own, such as *'Examples like these allow historians to deny any link between Hitler's declarations and the evolution of Nazi policy'* being seen as evidence that the interpretation could not be intentionalist – the opposite of the historian's actual opinion. In the main, though, candidates understood the idea that Hitler's intent remained constant, even if policies had to be adapted to circumstances. This was a question that produced a lot of writing about the context, and although this generally did not get in the way of valid work on the extract, it was unnecessary. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

Section C: The origins and development of the Cold War

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he blames Stalin (i.e. as distinct from the Soviet Union) for exacerbating Cold War tensions (i) because of his personality, and (ii) for his obstructionism being unnecessary/unwise/harmful. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. It was important for answers to understand that the focus of the interpretation was Stalin, rather than the Soviet Union, and candidates who missed this would often assume that this was a traditional extract, blaming an aggressive, expansionist USSR. Most, though, concluded, that the approach was post-post-revisionist in placing blame on Stalin personally, and seeing him as paranoid and ideologically-driven. There were relatively few answers that searched the extract for hints of blame being placed on the USA, though some mistook Stalin's views for those of the historian (*'the peaceful, socialist and progressive'* contrasting with *'the capitalist, oppressive and imperialistic'*), or assumed that the historian was trying to exonerate Stalin (making *'apparently reasonable Soviet initiatives'*), to claim that the historian's approach was post-revisionist. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.



HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/33 Interpretations Question 33</p>
--

Key messages

- The question asks what you can learn from the extract about the historian's interpretation. Candidates should first identify the interpretation, and then explain how the content of the extract can be used to show how the interpretation can be inferred from it.
- The interpretation will always relate to the central, key question which underpins the study of the topic; that is, *Who or what is the historian blaming?* Candidates should read through the whole extract to find where it allocates blame and to whom or to what.
- Candidates should also consider how the extract suggests blame: how can you tell from what the historian has written that someone/something is being blamed? These are the parts of the extract that candidates should use when constructing answers. Although all of the extract will be consistent with the interpretation, this does not mean that all of it will be helpful in explaining it. Candidates should select those parts that reveal the blame and use those parts to build responses.
- Candidates should focus directly on the interpretation and avoid working through the extract paragraph by paragraph and just summarising what it says, commenting on points as they arise. Responses that adopted the latter approach struggled to view the extract as a whole and were drawn into giving too much significance to incidental points that had little bearing on the historian's main messages.

General comments

Most answers understood that the extract contains an interpretation, and, using the extract, attempted to explain what this was. Several responses were able to reach sound, supported, conclusions however many were not quite as successful for several reasons. Firstly, part of the Interpretations study is acquiring an understanding of the major historiographical approaches that are relevant to the topic. Candidates commonly used historiographical 'labels' such as intentionalism, revisionism and functionalism in their answers but without fully appreciating what these meant. This had a knock-on effect on candidates' responses, since the task of inferring the historian's interpretation is informed by understanding of the different approaches' historians have taken to their study of the topic. A different but related issue was that many answers attempted to compare the interpretation in the extract with what other historians had written. This can be an effective move when it works, but often the comparison was ill-founded which undermined the response. Answers also often strayed from the extract into writing about the context which often resulted in description of the extract rather than discussion of the argument. There can only be one reason for writing about the context, and that is to help with answering the question; that is, with explaining the historian's interpretation. Lastly, some candidates took to using truncated quotations. This should be avoided on the basis that what comes between the first and the last words may be capable of being interpreted in different ways, or parts of it may be relevant and others not. The interests of clarity are best served by putting on the page the exact material needed to support the point made.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: The origins of the First World War

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

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he blames the emergence of the Holocaust on (i) the failure of plans to resettle the Jews, and (ii) the failure of Operation Barbarossa. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the



extract. The historian's approach is clearly functionalist, with the extract making it explicit that there was no decision for genocide, and that it emerged from the failure of all other plans. Most answers successfully explained the first aspect of the interpretation, and although they also noted that the failure of Barbarossa was important, this was very rarely explained. The point was straightforward; it was the failure to defeat the Soviet Union that meant finally there was nowhere else to send the Jews. The most common weakness in the answers was the assumption that mention of the SS and other Nazi agencies, or the actions of individual Nazis such as Frank, signified a structuralist approach. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

Section C: The origins and development of the Cold War

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he blames Stalin for escalating Cold War tensions because of **(i)** the hostility of his actions, and **(ii)** his ideologically-driven worldview. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. The historian accepts that some form of postwar confrontation between the two powers was likely, but this is not the point s/he seeks to make. The focus of the interpretation is Stalin, and the impact he had on international relations. He gave the West no choice but to resist. Candidates who did not select the material on which to base their answer and adopted a paragraph-by-paragraph approach, often concluded by its end that the historian was a post-revisionist. This was, though, one of those occasions where the historian sets a scene which s/he then goes on to challenge. The historian's purpose is not to argue that the USA shares blame. As the rest of the extract makes clear, Stalin is held to be most to blame. By taking the extract as a whole, the focus on Stalin, and the blame placed on him, marks the historian out as a post-post revisionist. A good number of candidates understood this and produced well-supported answers. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.



HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/41 Depth Study 41</p>

Key messages

- A sustained focus on the specific nature of the question posed is necessary to enable candidates to access the higher levels of the mark scheme.
- Strongest answers are typically consistently analytical and address all elements of the question.
- Analysis must be supported by relevant and accurate information, which should be wide-ranging, at the highest levels.
- Candidates must have a good chronological understanding and should only use material which is relevant to the period identified in the question.
- Stronger answers provide a fully balanced argument, which considers any factors stated in the question alongside alternative explanations of causes or consequences of events.
- Candidates should read the questions carefully and determine what is required before starting to write their answers. Planning answers before writing should be encouraged.
- Command words such as assess and evaluate will be frequently used in questions set on Paper 4 of 9489 and candidates should be able to respond effectively to gain marks for AO2.

General comments

The best responses were consistently analytical in their approach and contained a coherent and clearly defined argument, effectively supported with detailed and relevant subject knowledge allowing for a logical final judgement, which was based on a consistent line of reasoning, evident throughout the essay. A good example of this was **Question 3**, where the strongest answers discussed the role of terror in securing Nazi control of Germany, before introducing alternative explanations, such as propaganda and making clear judgements about which factors were the most significant.

A lack of subject knowledge sometimes limits responses, and this was illustrated in **Question 12**, where many candidates had little clear understanding of Golda Meir's role in the Arab Israeli conflict. Some responses to **Question 9** evidenced limited knowledge of the key events of the 1950s and relied on a discussion of the Cuban Missile Crisis to evaluate the impact of the policy of peaceful coexistence.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: European history in the interwar years, 1919 – 41

Question 1

Assess the extent to which Mussolini's regime received popular support.

There were several valid approaches and examples which could be used to develop a balanced argument. The best analysis seen made the conclusion that the regime was tolerated rather than loved, but there was little outright opposition. Perceptive analysis also referenced the speed at which support disappeared and how quickly fascism fell out of favour in Italy. It was argued by many that Mussolini gained support through his policies towards the Catholic Church, with the better responses also acknowledging the limitations of this relationship, especially after antisemitism became official policy. Some also pointed to the support that Mussolini received from the élite groups in society to agree that there was acceptance of his regime. Propaganda and terror were commonly referenced, although not always successfully. Some argued that there was support because there was oppression, rather than the more logical point that the existence of a police state suggests less than total support. Those candidates who used economic and foreign policies as

evidence did not always draw the correct conclusions but were able at times to use these examples to explain their point effectively.

Question 2

‘It was the failings of Stalin’s rivals that best explain his rise to power by 1929.’ Discuss this view.

Responses to this question were mostly able to employ at least sound levels of detail to support their arguments, although analysis was not always as strong as the detail. The best examples were able to draw upon a range of rivals, most notably Kamenev and Zinoviev, rather than simply relying on Trotsky. Their response to Lenin’s Testament, Trotsky failure to attend the funeral and his personal flaws were all used regularly to address the stated factor. It was also common to read that they failed by underestimating Stalin. Some candidates also made valid comments about the various policy platforms that were adopted to argue that these stances were failings. Balance was achieved through considering Stalin’s political cunning and his use of positions in the party, usually General Secretary although sometimes going beyond one example, and also blaming Lenin for leaving a leadership vacuum. Although candidates are familiar with the various examples employed, work can still be done on properly analysing the relative significance of them.

Question 3

‘Terror was the most important factor in maintaining Nazi control of Germany in the period 1933 – 39.’ Discuss.

Most responses were able to produce a balanced and focused response, although sometimes the examples used might have been better chosen to reflect the question’s focus on maintaining control. The stated factor was usually dealt with well, with common references to the Gestapo, concentration camps, SS, SA and, less regularly, SD. However, few responses invoked the use of the police and justice system as examples of terror. The Night of the Long Knives was routinely referenced. Those that went on to discuss persecution of minority groups and examples such as Kristallnacht were less tightly focused on the question. Balance was achieved through alternatives, with propaganda and economic policies valid examples. Some of the most perceptive thinking was seen through arguments about the apparent legitimacy of the regime and the divided nature of the opposition. Less well focused examples such as youth policies were not as convincing as they were more concerned with developing the next generation of Nazis than on maintaining control of Germany in the short-term. Responses which focused on how Hitler initially came to power and failed to go beyond 1933 were not able to score highly as they had not fully met the demands of the question.

Question 4

Evaluate the extent to which social welfare policies improved the lives of the British people in the years

There were insufficient responses to this question for any comment on performance.

Section B: The USA, 1944 – 92

There were insufficient responses to questions 5 to 8 for any comment on performance.

Section C: International history, 1945 – 92

Question 9

‘Khrushchev’s policy of peaceful coexistence had little effect on US-Soviet relations.’ Evaluate this view.

Chronological understanding was key to answering this question successfully. There was some uncertainty about how far the policy of peaceful coexistence lasted and whether it was valid to discuss détente. Some responses suggested that the two were identical. The best responses were rooted firmly in the 1950s, when the policy was born and were able to offer examples of improving relationships, such as summits, and continued tension, such as over Hungary or Berlin. The best responses covered all of Khrushchev’s time in office, showed balance whilst reaching a definite conclusion, but many failed to do so and consequently fell short of the higher levels.

Question 10



Assess the impact of the Vietnam War on Sino-US relations during the Cold War.

Some candidates were able to develop a balanced argument by firstly concentrating on the support that China provided for North Vietnam and concluding that being on opposite sides during the conflict obviously meant that Sino-US relations deteriorated, before going on to explore the changing nature of relations in the 1970s. The best responses understood that Nixon and Kissinger's search for peace with honour led to improvements as the USA hoped to use China to pressurize North Vietnam into accepting peace terms. Weaker responses were less precise about exactly what China did during the Vietnam War and how much influence the Chinese had on the North Vietnamese leadership.

Question 11

Evaluate the nature and extent of UN peacekeeping in Africa.

There were insufficient responses to this question for any comment on performance.

Question 12

'Golda Meir mismanaged the Arab Israeli conflict.' Discuss this view.

Many responses did not evidence much knowledge of Golda Meir's period in office and therefore were unable to develop effective arguments. Several of these were a general history of the conflict without being clear about which parts Meir was directly involved in. Those that were confident and accurate about her place in the chronology of the Arab Israeli conflict were generally in agreement with the statement.



HISTORY

Paper 9489/42
Depth Study 42

Key messages

- A sustained focus on the specific nature of the question posed is necessary to enable candidates to access the higher levels of the mark scheme.
- Strongest answers are typically consistently analytical and address all elements of the question.
- Analysis must be supported by relevant and accurate information, which should be wide-ranging, at the highest levels.
- Candidates must have a good chronological understanding and should only use material which is relevant to the period identified in the question.
- Stronger answers provide a fully balanced argument, which considers any factors stated in the question alongside alternative explanations of causes or consequences of events.
- Candidates should read the questions carefully and determine what is required before starting to write their answers. Planning answers before writing should be encouraged.
- Command words such as assess and evaluate will be frequently used in questions set on Paper 4 of 9489 and candidates should be able to respond effectively to gain marks for AO2.

General comments

The best responses were analytical in approach and contained a clearly defined argument, well supported with detailed and relevant material in order to reach a logical final judgement, which was based on a consistent line of reasoning, present throughout the essay. This was demonstrated in the best responses to **Question 1**, where Mussolini's political skill was clearly understood and exemplified, before candidates went to explore the challenges facing Italy in the aftermath of World War I. There different explanations were fully explained, compared and links between them made apparent. For example, the fear of socialist revolution and the *Bienno Rosso* were combined with Mussolini's forceful action against these groups and the subsequent approval of various élite groups.

Most responses were well-balanced, and this was seen to good effect in many responses to **Question 9**, where Afghanistan was compared to Gorbachev's policies and other examples such as the USA's role. Again, the best analysis showed how these factors linked together, with the interplay between Soviet economic problems being exacerbated by the conflict in Afghanistan and Reagan's expansion of the arms race, leading to Gorbachev's reforms, being set out. **Question 10** also featured many balanced and analytical responses.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: European history in the interwar years, 1919 – 41

Question 1

Assess the view that Mussolini's political skill was the most important reason for his rise to power by 1922.

The best responses had a clear understanding of, and focus on, Mussolini's 'political skill.' Successful approaches often considered his ability to tailor his message to different groups, his ideological flexibility – for example his changing attitudes towards the Catholic Church and his ability to appeal to the élite groups in Italian society. Strong analysis saw these examples being compared to the impact of World War I, economic problems and the threat of socialism. It was possible to show how Mussolini's popularity increased as a result of his promises to solve these issues and also to compare his appeal to the failures of liberalism and



widespread disillusionment with the Italian political system. Weaker responses were less certain about Mussolini's political skill and had less grasp of the detail of the various challenges facing Italy, but it was common to see some attempt at balance in their analysis.

Question 2

'Stalin's fear of being overthrown was the main reason for the purges.' Assess this view.

Some candidates wrote in detail about what the purges were, without being able to make much of an assessment of the reasons for them. Not all responses were clear on what might be meant by the purges and there was some unnecessary discussion of Stalin's rise to power. Others agreed with the statement, considered Stalin's paranoia and attempted to provide alternatives, which were sometimes variations of the stated factor. Valid counter arguments sometimes considered the impact of industrialisation and the need to ensure obedience despite its negative consequences. There was also useful discussion of the role of external threats and the threat of war as a motivation for Stalin's actions. It was rare for candidates to explore the arguments relating to the terror 'from below' and the possibility that not all of the blame could be apportioned to the central authorities.

Question 3

Assess the impact of Nazi policies towards the German workers in the period 1933-39.

The focus had to be on German 'workers' and on policies which directly related to them and not all groups in society. Many responses did not acknowledge this and included material which did not fully address the question as a result. Stronger answers considered policies which created employment and used this to argue that there were positive benefits, although this did not apply to all sections of society, with women and Jews losing out. There was also discussion of the extent to job creation schemes delivered positive outcomes, with the shortcomings of the limitations of the Labour Force being addressed in some responses. Other valid approaches were to consider the loss of trade unions rights, increased working hours and the impact of policies such as Strength through Joy and Beauty of Labour. However, responses which sought to explore the persecution of minority groups, or to incorporate education policies in their responses were generally outside the expected scope of the question.

Question 4

Evaluate the reasons for the limited impact of political extremism in Britain during the 1930s.

There were insufficient responses to this question for any comment on performance.

Section B: The USA, 1944 – 92

There were insufficient responses to questions 5 to 8 for any comment on performance.

Section C: International history, 1945 – 92

Question 9

'The USSR's involvement in Afghanistan was the main reason for the collapse of the Soviet system.' Assess this view.

There was some divergence among candidates about what was meant by the 'Soviet system' and this led to various approaches. The best responses either focused on the collapse of the Soviet Union itself, or on its control of eastern Europe. Strategies towards the stated factor also varied, with some responses going into unnecessary levels of detail about the invasion of Afghanistan and its causes, whilst others largely ignored it. The best dealt with its impact on public opinion, the international response and, occasionally, the financial implications, before exploring alternative explanations. Most responses wrote about Gorbachev's policies particularly Glasnost and Perestroika and, depending upon the focus of the answer, the Sinatra Doctrine. There was also attention paid to the financial pressures forcing Gorbachev into action and the impact of Reagan's policies. The strongest responses were able to compare the impact of different factors, whilst building an argument which provided a clear judgment about comparative significance and was based on clear line of reasoning.

Question 10



‘The People’s Republic of China entered the Korean War primarily to save communism in North Korea.’ Discuss this view.

Stronger responses identified a range of possible factors ranging from geographical nearness and perceived threat of American invasion as their forces neared the Yalu River, through to pressure from Stalin to ideological togetherness and basic hatred of the West/USA. The very best of these really imposed themselves on the question and tended to set out several valid points, though several did not make it clear which ones were the most significant and why. Weaker responses described the war, without addressing the focus of the question directly.

Question 11

Analyse the effects of dependence on ex-colonial trading partners on newly independent African nations.

There were insufficient responses to this question for any comment on performance.

Question 12

Assess how far Yasser Arafat’s tactics for achieving a Palestinian state changed in the period up to 1979.

Several responses understood the point about Arafat as a statesmen and politician versus Arafat the terrorist leader and the extent to which the balance between the two shifted over time. The best answers also paid attention to the phrase ‘achieving a Palestinian state’ when building their argument, to ensure a tight focus. Weaker responses did not do this and often wrote a narrative of events.

HISTORY

Paper 9489/43
Depth Study 43

Key messages

- A sustained focus on the specific nature of the question posed is necessary to enable candidates to access the higher levels of the mark scheme.
- Strongest answers are typically consistently analytical and address all elements of the question.
- Analysis must be supported by relevant and accurate information, which should be wide-ranging, at the highest levels.
- Candidates must have a good chronological understanding and should only use material which is relevant to the period identified in the question.
- Stronger answers provide a fully balanced argument, which considers any factors stated in the question alongside alternative explanations of causes or consequences of events.
- Candidates should read the questions carefully and determine what is required before starting to write their answers. Planning answers before writing should be encouraged.
- Command words such as assess and evaluate will be frequently used in questions set on Paper 4 of 9489 and candidates should be able to respond effectively to gain marks for AO2.

General comments

The best responses were consistently analytical and contained a clearly defined argument, which was well supported with detailed and relevant knowledge allowing for a logical final judgement, based on a consistent line of reasoning, which was present throughout the essay. Analysis of comparative importance should be made throughout the essay. A good example of this was **Question 9** where successful answers examined the role played by fear of nuclear war, before going on to offer alternatives based on factors affected either or both the US and USSR. Wide-ranging levels of knowledge and understanding were apparent in many responses. This led to the development of a balanced judgement, based on precise and relevant examples. Strong subject knowledge was also apparent in many answers to **Question 3** where candidates often were familiar with precise details of Nazi economic policy and were able to supply objectives as criteria by which to measure its success by.

Responses to some questions was limited by a failure to tailor material to the specific demands of the question. **Questions 1** and **2** provide exemplification of this point. Some responses to **Question 1** were more concerned with exploring how Mussolini attained his position in 1922 than the steps towards dictatorship subsequently. **Question 2** specifically referred to industrialisation and there were a number of candidates who chose to focus instead on collectivisation.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: European history in the interwar years, 1919 – 41

Question 1

‘The Acerbo Law was the most important tactic used by Mussolini to establish a dictatorship by 1925.’ Discuss.

The best responses understood that the question was based on Mussolini’s consolidation of power, rather than his initial rise to power, although some explanations could be used for both and were valid if made specific to actual question. Those who were able to comment knowledgeably on the stated factor and compare it alternatives, taking care to explain which was the most important factor, tended to reach the highest levels of both AO1 and AO2. Some candidates seemed uncertain as to what the Acerbo Law was,



and this limited their ability to answer the question effectively. Other explanations offered included the support of the élite groups in society, such as the king, church, landowners and industrialists, and the use of terror and propaganda. Again, it was important that examples were specific to the period in question. There was valid discussion of the Matteotti Crisis, although few responses considered the Aventine Secession. Some candidates made good use of examples of Mussolini's foreign policy in this period, for instance Fiume and Corfu, although responses which paid a great deal of attention to the battles were less convincing.

Question 2

Evaluate the impact of industrialisation on the Russian people.

Many candidates wrote extensively about the consequences of collectivisation and, although it was possible to link this to the demands of industrialisation, that was not where the focus of the question lay. Stronger responses also tended to focus on the impact on the Russian people rather than Russia itself – and so evaluations of the success of the Five Year Plans were not necessarily answering the question. Those that did well discussed a range of impacts, ensuring that there was a balanced discussion by choosing both positive and negative consequences, with the latter usually predominating. There needed to be a clear evaluation of the extent to which the drive for rapid industrialisation benefited those directly affected. Valid areas of discussion included the impact of the move from rural to industrial areas, living and working conditions, the focus on heavy industry rather than consumer goods and the impact on women. It was rare to read about the extent to which better opportunities for training, education and advancement in the workplace were available to some members of the proletariat.

Question 3

Assess the extent to which Nazi economic policies had achieved their objectives by 1941.

A common characteristic of successful approaches to this question was the identification of objectives from the outset, with some thoughtful consideration of the differences between long and short-term aims, before going on to explain how they were tackled and with what degree of success. Attention was often paid to the need to deal with problems caused by the Great Depression, principally unemployment, and to the readiness for war, through the achievement of autarky. Some less effective responses tended to become rather descriptive, providing details about policies, without making sufficient assessment of the extent of achievement. Responses often took Nazi success in eradicating unemployment at face value, with relatively few responses considering invisible unemployment or the limitations of the RAD.

Question 4

Analyse the reasons why the policy of appeasement received support in Britain during the 1930s.

There were insufficient responses to this question for any comment on performance.

Section B: The USA, 1944 – 92

There were insufficient responses to questions 5 to 8 for any comment on performance.

Section C: International history, 1945 – 92

Question 9

Assess how far the policy of détente (1963 – 79) resulted from the superpowers' fear of nuclear war.

There were many successful responses which tackled the question directly and were able to compare the stated factor, with specific examples, which were often based on the events in Cuba, and the arms race, with alternatives. A range of other explanations were offered, with the economic issues facing both sides commonly put forward. Candidates tended to be more confident on the problems facing the Soviets in this regard, and, although there was some attention paid to the impact of the Vietnam War on the US, few candidates considered the consequences of the Oil Crisis. There was also valid discussion of the impact of the Sino-Soviet Split and events in Europe, including the role of Brandt, in well-informed candidates' responses. A less successful approach taken by a minority was to describe the various treaties and agreements relating to détente, without paying sufficient attention to causes.

Question 10



Assess the extent to which the policy of containment was the reason for the United States' growing involvement in Vietnam.

Most responses to this question were able to focus on the stated factor and to make some comment on how containment led to American involvement, initially under Eisenhower. Stronger responses acknowledged the word 'growing' in the question and therefore were able to explain the motivations behind the escalation of US intervention from 1963 to 1970. The ability to explore the changing context and its implication for US policy was crucial in producing a balanced response and going beyond containment as an explanation. This was not common, however, and there was also a tendency among a minority to describe the war and reasons for US failure.

Question 11

Analyse the significance of Senghor's role in gaining independence for Senegal.

There were insufficient responses to this question for any comment on performance.

Question 12

'The consequences of the Arab Israeli War of 1948 – 49 were more significant for Israel than the Arab world.' Discuss.

There were insufficient responses to this question for any comment on performance.

