

# HISTORY

---

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

## Key messages

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

## General comments

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

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

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

When analysing the sources many candidates confused themselves by picking out sections of text which ran counter to the overall message of the source. An example from this paper can be found in **Section C**, where many candidates wrote about Japan as supporters of the League, evidenced in the statement that they had been proud to be members, without realising that the source is an extract from the speech made by the Japanese delegate on their withdrawal from the League.

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

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

### Comments on specific questions

#### **Section A, the European Option**

##### **1 (a) Compare and contrast the views on the Papacy in Sources B and C**

Most candidates found a clear contrast between the sources, correctly identifying hostility to the political power of the Papacy in B through the declaration that 'the political control of the Pope is legally at an end for ever' and comparing this with C's support for the Papacy through the expansion of the Pope's political powers as leader of a federal government of a united Italy. Many were also able to identify similarities, the most obvious one being that the authors of both sources still saw a role for the Pope and Catholicism in a reformed Italy, with Source B emphasising the importance of the Pope's spiritual power and stating that there would be no attack on churches, and Source C focusing on the benefits of unity to the Catholic religion and stating it would 'bring utmost glory to the Papacy'. Weaker responses generally resulted from overlooking the requirement to focus on views about the Papacy and compared instead what the sources said about Italian unity or about the creation of a national assembly.

##### **1 (b) 'The early supporters of reform in Italy were republicans.' How far do sources A to D support this view?**

There were some excellent responses to this question, where candidates had a clear understanding of what constituted a republican government – these candidates were easily able to identify Source A as a support source, referring to the link between commerce and republicanism and stating that both were weak under Austria's dominant monarchy; and similarly that Source B shows support in their strong desire to remove papal government and replace it with a 'general assembly of the people'. C, with its focus on a federal government under the Pope was correctly identified by many candidates as a challenge as they wished to maintain papal authority. Source D could be used effectively to either show support for republicanism, quoting Young Italy 'raising the standard of republicanism', or to challenge given that the preferred choice of Young Italy was a monarchical government led by Charles Albert, with republicanism being very much a second choice when he refused the role. A significant number of weaker responses failed to understand the meaning of 'republicanism'. Some were still able to gain marks in Level 2 by picking out relevant quotes containing the word 'republic' from Sources A and D, but it was hard for these responses to score highly without an understanding of the nuances of the question. Some candidates focused on liberalism rather than republicanism. A minority equated 'republican' with 'reform' and therefore concluded that all sources supported the statement in the question. Few candidates attempted evaluation – most of these were generic comments on reliability with little attempt to link this to the question, though a few candidates did note that three of the four sources were written by people in exile for their political beliefs.

### **Section B, the American Option**

#### **2 (a) Compare and contrast the views given in Sources A and C about the US Supreme Court**

**Section B** was the most popular option on this question paper. Most candidates successfully identified at least one difference between the sources, noting A's criticism of the Supreme Court as 'a propagandist of human slavery' and C's support for the Court as 'an honest and intelligent judiciary'. Many candidates struggled to find a similarity, though some identified that both sources recognise the importance of the Supreme Court in dealing with cases of this nature, and some recognised that both sources show the Court as a focus of criticism, shown in A which describes the Court as giving in to the demands of slaveholders and in C which describes the Court as coming under attack from 'embittered partisans'. Some felt that both sources supported the judgment, failing to recognise the irony in Source A of the statement that slaveholders had accomplished 'a great success'. A significant proportion of responses missed the focus of the question, comparing what the sources said about the Dred Scott Case rather than the views expressed in the sources about the Supreme Court, and were therefore restricted to marks in Level 1.

#### **2 (b) How far do Sources A to D agree with the view that the Dred Scott judgment was accepted?**

Some candidates considered this question from the point of view of the authors of the sources, others considered the different views of the American people as reflected in the sources – both were acceptable responses. This enabled several sources to be interpreted as both support and challenge depending on the viewpoint of different people, and the best candidates explained this, using references from the sources to support both views. Source A was used by most candidates to challenge the statement, with its definition of the judgment as a 'conspiracy' and implying that the American people will reject it. Some candidates also recognised that for the '347,525 slaveholders in the republic' the judgment was 'a great success'. Similarly Source C was used by most candidates to support the statement, describing the judgment as 'an event of great political importance' which had been argued 'by the best lawyers', with some candidates also acknowledging that although the judgment gained 'general acceptance it did not 'escape attack' from some. Most candidates recognised that Source D challenges the statement, saying that politicians who believed it settled anything were 'afflicted with very severe short-sightedness'. Weaker responses found the reference to free labour hard to understand and misinterpreted the source to mean that slavery was expanding southwards. A minority of candidates were able to use Source B well, picking up on the opinion of the author in describing those who voted against the judgment as representing 'the universal sentiment of the North'; the majority saw this as a factual, neutral source and so discounted it. Just a few candidates attempted to consider the authorship of the sources and comment on their reliability, and this often fell short of the mark, either with the use of stock evaluation or comments on reliability not being used to address the question. A significant minority of candidates used only Sources A and D – although they could still access Level 3 by finding points of support and challenge from these two sources, their marks were inevitably restricted to the lower end of the Level.

### **Section C, the International Option**

#### **3 (a) Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources A and D about the League of Nations**

The majority of candidates were able to identify a difference in views expressed in these sources about the League, recognising the negative views in A where Italy describes the League as 'an instrument of its own repression' and the more positive views in D where the Japanese delegate expresses their pride in being part of 'one of the grandest purposes in which humanity could unite'. Some also identified that the authors of both sources were upset with the League, Italy because they felt 'suffocated' by them and Japan because of the implications of the Lytton Report and their 'different views on how to achieve peace in the Far East'. A significant number of candidates did not realise that Japan was leaving the League and this restricted their ability to interpret source D fully. There was scope for candidates to make good use of contextual knowledge to explain the similarities and differences in Italy's and Japan's views, with both being produced immediately after a key event for the League (the Corfu Incident in 1923 and the invasion of Manchuria followed by the Lytton Report in the early 1930s) but only a small minority took advantage of this to move into the higher levels.

**3 (b) How far do Sources A to D show that being a member of the League was beneficial?**

This question elicited some strong responses, partly because there were a number of opportunities to use a source effectively to either challenge or support the statement in the question – the strongest responses acknowledged this and explained both points of view. Source A was generally used to challenge, quoting Italy's feelings of being suffocated and restricted by the League. Some explained that membership could be beneficial for them, if only as a means of hastening the League's destruction. Most candidates saw B as a challenge, explaining that Russia saw the League as 'some kind of universal alliance against the Soviet Union'. C was the most challenging source, but many candidates were able to use it to show that Stresemann was arguing in favour of joining the League and explaining the benefits this would bring to Germany. The strongest responses used Source D to both challenge and support, identifying the benefits outlined by Japan of being able to contribute to the League's humanitarian aims, but also recognising that Japan had 'reached the limits of its efforts to cooperate with the League' and were now leaving. Some candidates made an attempt at evaluation, but this was largely limited to general comments on reliability rather than using contextual knowledge or provenance to assess the relative use of each source in answering the question. Candidates with good contextual knowledge about Germany in the mid-1920s and Japan's invasion of Manchuria found it easier to analyse sources C and D effectively.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 9389/12  
Document Question

## Key messages

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

## General comments

Most candidates know that the **(a)** question requires an identification of similarities **and** differences, and that answers to **(b)** questions require an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the prompt in the question. Stronger responses supported the points they made with precise quotations or direct paraphrases from the relevant sources. Weaker responses attempted to include long sections of quotation by starting a sentence and then using ellipses to join with a later section. This was rarely a successful way of showing support from the source and often led to confusion or lack of clarity. Support should take the form of brief, precise quotation, or paraphrase.

Weaker responses to **part (a)** were often rushed and in a significant minority of cases this was a result of the **part (a)** question being completed last. Although there is no required order for the question to be answered it should be noted that the **part (a)** question is designed to prepare candidates for the longer essay style question by concentrating on two sources and a particular issue. Candidates who completed **part (b)** first often found it difficult to refocus on **part (a)**. Candidates sometimes made inappropriate points of comparison. They claimed similarities for points which were not actually similar and differences for points which were not different. If the comparisons cannot be properly validated, they cannot be credited. The comparisons should also be focused on the question, e.g. in **Section A** comparisons should focus on 'Austria's future role in Italian affairs' rather than other similarities and differences between the sources.

The focus of the **(a)** question is to identify valid similarities and differences of the content of the sources. Weaker responses often included large sections of contextual knowledge or stock paragraphs of 'evaluation' rather than tackling the focus of the question. Although there are marks in the top level for commenting on

the usefulness of the sources, the focus of the question should be on making a developed comparison, i.e. identifying similarities and differences.

When analysing the sources many candidates confused themselves by picking out sections of text which ran counter to the overall message of the source. Some candidates were prone to just looking for similar words without thinking about their context. 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.

To achieve higher evaluation marks, it is necessary to explain why the nature, origin or purpose of the source makes it more or less useful when answering the question. One example of where this could be achieved was in **Section C, Source A**. Responses that dealt with this source successfully used their knowledge of the context to comment on the position of United States within ongoing discussions about the League and the fact they had not joined. As such, when using these ideas, it is important that candidates explain why this makes the source more or less useful for the question rather than just stating the date or type of source and saying it is unreliable.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### ***Section A: European Option***

##### **1 (a) Compare and contrast the views on Austria's future role in Italian affairs in Sources A and B.**

This question focused on the role of Austria in Italian affairs during the discussions around the involvement of Piedmont in the Crimean War. Most candidates were able to compare the sources with relevance to the question, but a significant minority were distracted by making other comparisons, e.g. about the relationship between Piedmont and France. It is important to remember that comparisons that are not relevant to the focus of the question cannot be credited. In stronger responses comparisons were accompanied by clear contextual knowledge that was used to clarify or further explain the areas of comparison and contrast. The strongest responses began to use the nature and purpose of both sources to explain why the sources differed.

##### **1 (b) 'Piedmont went to war against Russia in order to prevent revolution in Italy.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?**

This question required candidates to have some knowledge of the debates surrounding Italian unification in the 1850s and the entry of Piedmont into the Crimean war. Some weaker responses struggled to use the sources as they were unsure what other reasons (apart from preventing revolution) Piedmont may have had for joining the war against Russia. Close reading of the sources gave some ideas including decreasing the power of Austria, increasing their own standing within European politics and a burgeoning relationship with France. Many candidates were able to show both support and challenge from the sources with some useful contextual knowledge. There were a few responses which began to evaluate the sources to show how useful they were when answering the question but some attempts at this did not move beyond stock descriptions of provenance.

#### ***Section B: the American Option***

There were too few responses to write a report on this question.

#### ***Section C: International Option***

##### **3 (a) To what extent do Sources B and C agree about how the League should work?**

This question required responses to focus on how both extracts thought the League should work. In some cases, when looking at these two extracts, weaker responses got drawn into wider issues about the weaknesses and failures of the League. For example, some of these wrote at length about the treatment of Germany which is mentioned in Source B but is not really the focus of the question. Equally, other responses were confused about the different views on obligation under the Covenant. It is important for candidates to read what is in the sources rather than write about what they expect to be there. For example, some responses used Source C talking about securing delay to suggest the author thought delay was a negative thing for the thing. However, the view of the author was that securing delay was positive. This suggests that many candidates had been taught that delay was a 'bad thing' for the League and so didn't read the source closely enough. However, most responses

were able to recognise both similarities and differences in the sources as detailed in the mark scheme. Stronger responses were able to use their knowledge of the period to contextualise these sources and clarify or explain the positions taken in them.

**3 (b) How far do Sources A to D support the view that, from the beginning, the League was unlikely to succeed?**

Most responses engaged with the sources thoughtfully to offer support and challenge for the assertion stated in the question. There was plenty of scope to discuss what 'success' may have looked like for the League and the strongest responses began to use their contextual knowledge to do this. Many candidates were able to use all four sources to support and challenge the assertion in the question and there was some careful reading of the extracts. Most of these responses used evidence from the sources to clearly support their argument. The strongest responses used knowledge of the period to evaluate the sources and explain how this evaluation made them useful when answering the question. This was particularly relevant in some responses when they were able to use Sources A and C to discuss the complex relationship between the League and the United States, and France, respectively.

# HISTORY

---

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

## Key messages

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

## General comments

Most candidates know that the **(a)** question requires an identification of similarities **and** differences, and that answers to **(b)** questions require an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the prompt in the question. Stronger candidates appreciate that they need to support the points they make with precise quotations or direct paraphrases from the relevant sources. In some weaker responses, candidates attempted to include long sections of quotation by starting a sentence and then using ellipses to join with a later section. This often led to confusion or lack of clarity. Support should take the form of brief, precise quotation, or paraphrase.

Weaker responses to **part (a)** were often rushed and in a significant minority of cases this was a result of the **part (a)** question being completed last. Although there is no required order for the question to be answered it should be noted that the **part (a)** question is designed to prepare candidates for the longer essay style question by concentrating on two sources and a particular issue. Candidates who completed **part (b)** first often found it difficult to refocus on **part (a)**. Candidates sometimes made inappropriate points of comparison. They claimed similarities for points which were not actually similar and differences for points which were not different. If the comparisons cannot be properly validated, they cannot be credited. The comparisons should also be focused on the question, e.g. in **Section A** comparisons should focus on 'attitudes to Papal authority' rather than other similarities and differences between the sources. The focus of the **(a)** question is to identify valid similarities and differences of the content of the sources. Weaker responses often included large sections of contextual knowledge or stock paragraphs of 'evaluation' rather than tackling the focus of the question. Although there are marks in the top level for commenting on the



usefulness of the sources, the focus of the question should be on making a developed comparison, i.e. identifying similarities and differences.

When analysing the sources weaker responses picked out sections of text which ran counter to the overall message of the source. Some of these were prone to just looking for similar words without thinking about their context. Stronger responses looked at the whole source rather than dissected sections of it when making links to the questions and further judgements. To achieve higher evaluation marks, it is necessary to explain why the nature, origin or purpose of the source makes it more or less useful when answering the question. One example of where this could be achieved was in **Section C, Source C**. Responses that dealt with this source successfully used their knowledge of the context to comment on the position of Cecil within ongoing discussions about the League and his support of it. As such, when using these ideas, it is important that candidates explain why this makes the source more or less useful for the question rather than just stating the date or type of source and saying it is unreliable.

### **Comments on specific questions**

#### ***Section A, the European Option***

##### **1 (a) Compare and contrast the attitudes towards papal authority shown in Sources C and D.**

This question focused on attitudes towards Papal authority during the struggle for Italian nationalism and asked candidates to identify similarities and differences between the two extracts. Most candidates were able to compare the sources with relevance to the question, but a significant minority were distracted by making other comparisons, e.g. about the location of the capital in Rome. It is important to remember that comparisons that are not relevant to the focus of the question cannot be credited. In stronger responses comparisons were accompanied by clear contextual knowledge that was used to clarify or further explain the areas of comparison and contrast. The strongest responses began to use the nature and purpose of both sources to explain why the sources differed.

##### **1 (b) 'Regionalism was the main problem facing those desiring Italian unity.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?**

Some responses showed limited awareness of the concept of 'regionalism' which was the focus of this question and so had difficulty in analysing the sources for support and challenge. Some assumed that Source A would be against Italian unification because it was from Sicily, but it gave a clear indication that it saw annexation as a good thing for the region. The opposite, more predictable view, was shown in Source B. Therefore, it is important that candidates read the extracts they are given closely rather than assuming that the content will support one side of the argument because of the attribution. Another issue with some responses was bringing the issue of 'papal authority' into this response whereas it was the focus of question (a). The discussion of regionalism required a look at different arguments surrounding Italian unification. However, there were many stronger responses which were able to show support and challenge for the statement by using the four sources and had some contextual knowledge of the period.

#### ***Section B, the American Option***

There were too few responses to write a report on this question.

#### ***Section C, the International Option***

##### **3 (a) To what extent do Sources B and D agree about the weaknesses of the League of Nations?**

This question required candidates to focus on how both extracts view the weaknesses of the League of Nations. Most candidates were able to recognise both similarities and differences in the sources as detailed in the mark scheme. Stronger responses were able to use their knowledge of the period to contextualise these sources and clarify or explain the positions taken in them. Some candidates got distracted from the content of the sources by their own knowledge of the events surrounding the failure of the League and this often led to extended sections of own knowledge which did not address the question asked. The strongest responses began to use their knowledge of the period to explain the differences between them using provenance which went beyond rote evaluation.

**3 (b) 'The League of Nations achieved little.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?**

Most responses engaged with the sources effectively to offer support and challenge for the assertion stated in the question. There was plenty of scope to discuss what 'achievement' may have looked like for the League and the strongest responses began to use contextual knowledge to do this. Many candidates were able to use all four sources to support and challenge the assertion in the question and there was some careful reading of the extracts. Most of these responses used evidence from the sources to clearly support their argument. The strongest responses used knowledge of the period to evaluate the sources and explain how this evaluation made them more or less useful when answering the question. Most responses attempted to use this method of evaluation rather than making stock phrases on the origin of sources. Weaker responses included long sections of contextual knowledge about the failure of the League. This was rarely credit worthy beyond Level 1 in the mark scheme.

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9389/21**  
**Outline Study**

## Key messages

- Candidates should read all the questions in the relevant section of the paper before selecting two questions to answer. There have been instances where a whole **part (a)** question has been written, only to be crossed out because of problems with answering the **part (b)** – a significant misuse of the limited time available.
- For **part (a)** questions the key element is explaining why something happened. Identifying and explaining several reasons is an important step but to reach higher levels of the mark scheme it is necessary to show how the factors interacted and to assess their relative significance.
- For **part (b)** questions candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported. A well-written but one-sided analysis will not allow the candidates to reach their full potential.
- Candidates with substantial topic knowledge need to ensure that they apply their knowledge to the specific focus of the question set.

## General comments

Most candidates attempted two complete questions from one section of the paper though there was a large number of 'no responses'. Generally, candidates deployed their time effectively, devoting an appropriate amount to each question while being able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge in their answers. However, less successful responses did not sustain consistent quality across all four question parts. It was common for candidates to produce satisfactory or better responses to one part of a question, yet weaker or no answers to the other part. There is a fundamental difference in focus between **part (a)** and **part (b)** questions and many candidates clearly appreciated this.

**Part (a)** questions were effectively answered by a majority of candidates. Stronger responses were clearly focused on the key issue of causation and contained a range of factors, demonstrating how they were interacted and developing judgements regarding their relative significance. Many candidates were able to identify some relevant causal factors and then add at least some basic explanation. The weakest responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy; they were over-reliant on vague and generalised assertions and demonstrated little engagement with the issue being examined.

**Part (b)** questions elicited a wider range of response quality. Stronger responses demonstrated an awareness that historical issues can be interpreted in many different and contradictory ways. The most successful answers were based on the development of consistent and balanced arguments, explicitly focused on the requirements of the specific question, leading to reasoned and fully supported conclusions. There is some evidence that candidates, faced with a familiar topic, were not able to adapt their knowledge to the specific question asked in this paper. Weaker responses fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question, or relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth.

**Comments on specific questions**

**SECTION A: EUROPEAN OPTION; Modern Europe, 1789 – 1917**

**Question 1 – France, 1789 – 1814**

**(a) Why was the Estates General divided in 1789?**

Strong responses were often able to explain the division within the Estates General over taxation issues and the unfair system of voting; occasionally the issues raised by the cahiers that required changes were discussed. Less successful responses would identify a relevant division without explanation. Weaker responses took too much time narrating events that led to the calling of the Estates General or describing the respective characteristics of each estate; some narrated about King Louis XVI locking out the Third Estate and the resulting Tennis Court Oath.

**(b) ‘The Directory governed France well.’ How far do you agree?**

The few successful responses discussed relevant arguments about the extent that the Directory governed France well, referring to the relative stability that existed compared to the Reign of Terror that had preceded it, managing the largely successful wars against Austria, for example, or dealing with the Babeuf Plot in 1796. Less effective responses described aspects of the Directory government system and the take-over of Napoleon in 1799. Weaker responses wrote in general terms or confused the Directory with Robespierre’s administration or the monarchy of Louis XVI. Some drifted into a narrative of Napoleon’s rule post-Brumaire.

**Question 2 – The Industrial Revolution c. 1800-c. 1890**

**(a) Why was there a growth in the influence of the middle class in this period?**

There were some effective responses to this question and these explained the growth of middle-class influence in terms of representation gained by the extension of the franchise through the 1832 Reform Act, or how influence grew from the industrialisation process creating a new class of entrepreneurs, factory owners, engineers and surveyors. Many weaker responses wrote in general terms and often confused ‘middle class’ with ‘working class’.

**(b) ‘Governments were the driving force for industrialisation.’ How far do you agree? Refer to any two countries from Britain, France or Germany in your answer.**

Some responses were successful in discussing government influence concerning transport improvements in railways and canals; detailed references were made to laissez-faire policies in trading such as the lack of restrictions in Germany once Zollverein ideas spread. Occasionally, effective counter arguments were made concerning the significance of industrial growth deriving from individual businessmen, engineers and inventors. However, less effective responses often struggled to provide relevant support material as examples. Most weaker responses only made general references to industrialisation in one country, usually Britain, or confused the industrial circumstances of Britain and Germany.

**Question 3 – The Origins of World War I, c. 1900 – 1914**

**(a) Why was Austria hostile towards Serbia in the years before 1914?**

There were many strong responses with explanations of Serbian nationalism as a threat to Austrian imperialism or supporting knowledge on Serbian terrorist groups such as the Black Hand. Also, some candidates explained Austrian hostility to Serbia due to the Russian support for the Serbs. Weaker responses often focused on events during 1914 which was beyond the timescale of the question. Narratives of the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand in June was a common failing.

**(b) ‘Its members had different reasons for joining.’ How far do you agree with this view of the Triple Entente?**

Successful responses were able to assess varying motives for joining the Triple Entente, such as the French seeking revenge for the humiliation after their defeat in the Franco-Prussian war or the

British seeing the Triple Entente as a solution to its problems with France in Africa, especially over Egypt. These responses could have been improved by recognising the varying motives for Russia joining the Triple Entente, such as wanting to maintain and develop French financial support and investment; particularly, to restore its international status after the humiliation of the war with Japan in 1904 – 5. Less effective responses often concentrated on similar motives among the Entente powers. For instance, the growing threat from German militarism and the rise in German commerce threatening British and French colonial empires; the Russians had worries over the German support for Austrian imperialism in the Balkans. Weaker responses were usually general in tone with limited specific knowledge and, occasionally, confusing membership of the Triple Alliance for the Triple Entente.

#### **Question 4 – The Russian Revolution c. 1894 – 1917**

**(a) Why did the Revolution of 1905 fail to overthrow the Tsar?**

Many candidates reached Level 3 with good supporting knowledge and explanation of relevant factors such as the lack of co-ordination between diverse opponents and critics of Tsar Nicholas' rule, or the loyalty of the Russian troops to the regime, another successful explanation concerned the Tsar's political concessions made through the October Manifesto in 1905. Less successful responses can improve by directing their knowledge to address the specific focus of the question. These weaker responses tended to narrate the events of 1905 with stress on Bloody Sunday or describe Russia's defeat in the war with Japan in 1904 – 5.

**(b) How far do you agree that popular discontent was the main reason for the Tsar's abdication?**

Strong responses demonstrated good, often detailed, knowledge of various factors that contributed to the Tsar's abdication. They achieved a balanced approach of differentiating social groups' reasons for discontent. For example, the army morale being destroyed by the incompetence of their officers and heavy defeats at Tannenburg and Masurian Lakes; the urban working class had been alienated by poor wages and working conditions in munitions factories; the aristocracy angered by poor Tsarist leadership and the actions of Rasputin and Alexandra once Nicholas left to command the Russian Army in 1915. These responses sometimes showed a range of material by discussing longer-term reasons such as the Tsar's inability to reform Russia following the 1905 Revolution or the backlash against Russification policies in the years before 1914. Weaker responses adopted a narrative approach with only general references to popular discontent or even unfocused references to Lenin's April Theses and to the Bolshevik Revolution of October 1917.

#### **SECTION B: AMERICAN OPTION; The History of the USA, 1840 – 1941**

#### **Question 5 – The Expansion of US Power from the 1840s to the 1930s**

**(a) Why did the Mexican American War lead to territorial gains for the United States?**

Strong responses were able to explain factors that enabled the USA to make territorial gains with detailed knowledge on the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo in 1848, the strength of the American forces when compared with those of Mexico and the justification for territorial expansion that stemmed from the Manifest Destiny idea. Weaker responses were able to identify a particular territory that was gained as a result of the War or refer to Manifest Destiny. The weakest responses had long narratives, particularly about the lead up to the war.

**(b) How far did the US acquisition of the Philippines signal a change in US policy towards Asia and the Pacific?**

Many candidates found this question difficult and did not focus on the question properly. More successful responses did discuss the war with Spain in 1898 and the annexation of the Philippines which then acted as a strategic and economic advantage for USA. They also made mention of the Open-Door Notes towards China in 1899 – 1900 to improve trading possibilities. Less effective answers had extensive narratives regarding the war with Spain and referred to improved trade. Weak responses wrote about unfocused details on the gaining of Cuba or discussing US policy of isolation regarding Europe with a complete disregard for Asia and the Pacific.

#### **Question 6 – Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861 – 1877**

**(a) Why did Presidential Reconstruction prove to be controversial?**

Many strong responses could explain the key points of the controversy such as the differences between Lincoln's 10 per cent plan and Congress' Wade-Davis Bill requiring 50 per cent support from the Confederate; there was controversy because Johnson took a much softer line towards Confederates, many of whom were pardoned, and the Radical Republicans in Congress who demanded harsher measures. Weaker responses managed to identify factors such as these and often referred to the use of Black Codes in the Southern states to limit the civil rights of the ex-slaves. The weakest responses described 'Reconstruction' in general terms without identifying the causes of controversy, making references to sharecropping, KKK and the Jim Crow laws. To enhance these responses, they would need to focus more on the debate between Presidents Lincoln, Johnson and the Radical Republicans in Congress.

**(b) 'Poor military leadership was the main reason that the Civil War lasted for four years.' How far do you agree?**

Strong responses recognised the differences between the rewarding defensive strategies of Southern commanders such as Generals Lee and Jackson compared with the ineffective Northern commanders such as General McClellan. Many of these also explained how Northern leadership improved greatly with the appointments of Grant and Sherman during the last two years of war. A few notable responses pointed out that the chances of the war ever being short-lived were ill-placed as the South was a coherent and sizable entity with resources that time would take to break down. Stronger responses also demonstrated how the Anaconda Plan needed time to be an effective blockade, or how the Northern production of arms or training large numbers of recruits were not short-term measures. Weaker responses were descriptive about the events of the war without much linking to the focus of the question, while weakest became confused over the various military personnel and which side they were representing.

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

**(a) Why were there concerns about rapid urbanisation in the late nineteenth century?**

Most candidates were able to identify at least one concern of rapid urbanisation such as overcrowding in tenements, insanitary conditions that caused diseases such as cholera. Strong responses were able to explain these factors with good supporting knowledge; some developed explanations about how rapid urbanisation facilitated the rise of manipulative party bosses who in exchange for votes and promises of jobs conveniently forgot to address the issues of squalor and deprivation. Weaker responses confused 'urbanisation' with 'industrialisation' and described working conditions, low wages and child labour that were not relevant to the focus of the question.

**(b) 'Theodore Roosevelt was the most Progressive President.' How far do you agree?**

Strong responses were able to explain several progressive policies of Roosevelt such as railroad regulation, meat inspections, Food and Drug laws, conservation initiatives, the prosecution of trusts and intervention in the coal miners strike of 1902. Often, there was a balanced argument that compared Roosevelt with other 'progressive' Presidents such as Wilson, though Taft was ignored by many answers. Weaker responses identified some of Roosevelt's 'progressive' policies with only limited support material. The weakest responses confused the 'progressive' reforms of the differing Presidents and there was the inevitable confusion between Theodore Roosevelt and FDR.

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

**(a) Why was Roosevelt successful during his first '100 days'?**

Strong responses achieved a mid or good Level 3 by explaining the sheer scope, ambition and range of New Deal measures and the energy, sense of purpose and personal charisma of FDR. Supporting knowledge was detailed on the New Deal measures, especially actions related to improved regulation of the banks; 'fireside chats' were also explained in bringing about more trust and confidence among the American public. Weaker responses wrote narrative accounts of how Hoover failed to deal with the Depression and how this made FDR look successful in his first '100 days'. The weakest responses described New Deal measures with a lack of focus when the answer

went beyond into the Second New Deal. Once again, there was some confusion between FDR and Theodore Roosevelt.

- (b) **'The actions of President Roosevelt during the 1930s resulted in a positive change to the US economy.' How far do you agree?**

Some very strong responses were able to assess aspects of the New Deal that created positive changes to the economy with detailed supporting knowledge on the banking regulations, employment schemes and social security. These also produced strong counter arguments such as how the role of WW2 really brought USA out of the Depression. There were also effective balancing arguments about criticisms of FDR's reforms from both the left and right wings in American political life. Weaker responses narrated aspects of the New Deal with little regard to the focus of 'positive change to the American economy'. A few responses did confuse FDR with Theodore Roosevelt.

### **SECTION C: INTERNATIONAL OPTION: International Relations 1871 – 1945**

#### **Question 9 – International Relations, 1871 – 1918**

- (a) **Why was there conflict between European nations over Africa in the late nineteenth century?**

Strong responses were characterised by a detailed understanding of a wide range of factors such as resources for trade and potential markets in Africa, the rise of imperialism and the desire of European nations to build up an 'Empire'. Weaker responses identified relevant factors without explanation and weaker answers described the 'Scramble for Africa' and the Berlin Conference of 1885 or wrote about the Boer Wars.

- (b) **How far did the direction of US foreign policy change between 1890 and 1914?**

Some strong responses explained the major changes from isolationism in 1890 moving to imperialism by 1895 and then back to isolation at the outbreak of WW1 in 1914. These changes were supported by a range of relevant knowledge. The new aggressiveness was often explained in terms of personality and drive shown by Theodore Roosevelt as in the 'Big Stick' policy and the Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine. However, weaker responses fell into a narrative of the Spanish-American War or had limited discussion on how the US eventually declared war on Germany in 1917. Responses could have been enhanced by being clearly focused on the time frame of 1890 – 1914 and not stray beyond this.

#### **Question 10 – International Relations, 1919 – 1933**

- (a) **Why was Bolshevik Russia isolated internationally between 1918 and 1921?**

Stronger responses could explain the threat of communism and its aim to spread 'World Revolution', the impact of the Russian Civil War, or the significance of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk in alienating Russia's allies, the British and the French. Weaker responses identified factors such as the Treaty of Versailles excluding Russia or because Russia had become communist.

- (b) **'Efforts in the 1920s to solve the problems created by the Versailles Settlement were a failure.' How far do you agree?**

Stronger responses focused on German resentment over the reparations, French occupation of the Ruhr and the attempts to bring greater stability to the German problems as evidenced by the Genoa Conference, Dawes and Young Plans and the Locarno Treaty. Weaker responses concentrated on the word 'problems' and wrote about the work of the League of Nations between 1920 – 39 to solve problems and keep the peace worldwide, which was only partly relevant and strayed away from the time-frame of the 1920s. There were often irrelevant references to the World Disarmament Conference of 1932 – 33. The weakest responses wrote at length about the Treaty of Versailles terms rather than the efforts to solve its problems.

#### **Question 11 – International Relations, c. 1933 – 39**

- (a) **Why did Spain become a republic in 1931?**

This question was not answered well and there is some evidence that candidates only chose **Question 11** as they were attracted to the **part b** topic. Occasionally, a response would identify relevant material such as the effects of the Great Depression in Spain or the incompetence of King Alfonso XIII and the resignation of Primo de Rivera. Weaker responses were largely general assertions or irrelevant as candidates wrote about the causes of the Spanish Civil War or narrated events from that war.

**(b) How far does the strength of anti-war feeling amongst the British people explain why Chamberlain persisted with the policy of appeasement?**

Stronger responses were able to achieve a supported assessment by arguing the case for the assertion through evidence concerning the devastating impact of WW1 on the British public, the dread of bombing civilian targets and British economic weakness in the 1930s. Counter arguments such as Germany's unfair treatment at Versailles and the fear of Bolshevik Russia being thwarted by a strong Germany also featured in balancing the most effective responses. Weaker responses tended to produce descriptions about examples of appeasement towards Mussolini and Hitler. General reasons why the British public did not like war needed more support material.

**Question 12 – China and Japan, 1919 – 1945**

**(a) Why did Kuomintang attempts to destroy the Chinese Communist Party between 1927 and 1936 fail?**

Very few responses were seen by Examiners. Some candidates were able to identify the importance of the Long March and the ability of the Chinese Communist Party to win peasant approval. Weaker responses were characterised by general assertions or confusion about events.

**(b) To what extent was Yuan Shih-kai responsible for the collapse of the Chinese Republic established in 1912?**

Very few responses were seen by Examiners. These were characterised by general assertions about Yuan Shih-kai and confused about the events in China between 1912 and 1916.



# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9389/22**  
**Outline Study**

## Key messages

- Candidates should read all the questions in the relevant section of the paper before selecting two questions to answer. There have been instances where a whole **part (a)** question has been written, only to be crossed out because of problems with answering the **part (b)** – a significant misuse of the limited time available.
- For **part (a)** questions the key element is explaining why something happened. Identifying and explaining several reasons is an important step but to reach higher levels of the mark scheme it is necessary to show how the factors interacted and to assess their relative significance.
- For **part (b)** questions candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported. A well-written but one-sided analysis will not allow the candidates to reach their full potential.
- Candidates with substantial topic knowledge need to ensure that they apply their knowledge to the specific focus of the question set.

## General comments

**Part (a)** questions were generally well done by a large majority of candidates; the need for explanation seems to be well understood by most candidates and the level of answers suggests that they had been well prepared for the exam. Few candidates attempted the comparative judgements about relative importance of factors that could take their answers to the highest level of marks.

**Part (b)** questions were generally more challenging. Many responses showed a good grasp of basic knowledge but a varying degree of skill in its application to specific questions. Some responses simply described what happened without really focusing on the question or were very uneven accounts analysing one side of an argument but presenting very little as an alternative. Strong responses were confident about alternative interpretations of events with the best providing a reasoned consideration of the validity of different views.

## Comments on specific questions

### Section A

#### Question 1

- (a) **Why did French revolutionaries between 1789 and 1795 find it hard to agree on what kind of government they wanted?**

Most responses reached L3 because they understood that the basic dilemma of the revolution was over what sort of monarchy was possible or whether to retain monarchy at all. For many this took the form of a lengthy account of the differences between the Girondin and the Jacobin that amounted to one explained factor. Only a minority of responses considered the wider divisions created by regional differences or by the indecisiveness of the King himself as a catalyst for divisions. For example: *Louis' own indecisiveness, culminating in his Flight to Varennes, convinced many people of his lack of commitment to any sort of compromise and so increased division between moderate and extreme revolutionaries.* OR ... *in Paris the sans culottes supported the revolutionary ideas of the Jacobin but in the regions the people were much more conservative and there was still strong support for the Church and for monarchy.*

- (b) **'Napoleon's domestic policies brought great benefits to France.' How far do you agree?**

Most responses had a good understanding of the reforms that Napoleon made and could describe them, sometimes in very great detail, but then found it difficult to link them to the specific issue of whether they brought great benefit to France. Most were able to describe, with reasonably accurate detail, the domestic policies of Napoleon and stronger responses were able to suggest how they benefitted France. The strongest responses were also able to identify specific areas of policy that were not beneficial. Weaker responses often struggled with these, some restricting their comments to limitations of the freedom of women or the use of censorship. It was much easier to make a case for beneficial than for the alternative, but the stronger responses provided some measure of balance and a few even suggested that, overall, there was more positive than negative and that there were great benefits at a relatively small cost but these were few in number.

#### Question 2

- (a) **Why was industrial growth rapid in this period?**

Most candidates were able to identify and explain the effects of several of them. Some responses were extremely detailed descriptions of specific inventions and changes like the spinning and weaving machines or the development of steam pumps which made mining safer and locomotives which led to the development of railways, but stronger responses used less explicit detail whilst achieving a clearer argument, for example: *Technological innovation made industrial production more efficient. These machines alone reduced costs and increased productivity which allowed for expansion. Investors funded technological research which constantly improved machinery and made it more efficient. The resources needed for such machines like coal and iron were in abundant supply and the development of railways enabled them to reach the industrial centre quickly and efficiently which also helped speed up other industrialisation.* In a passage like this, lengthy details of specific inventions are not necessary, it is the general recognition of their role and of the implication behind these inventions that makes this part of a higher-level response. Some weaker responses wrote more about the Agricultural Revolution and, though there were significant changes, including mechanisation, there, most of them were not directly related to industry though there were valid points to be made about movement of workers and food supply to cities. Also, some responses suggested the railways allowed daily travel to work, but this only developed much later, it was not a factor in the initial growth of industrialisation.

- (b) **Evaluate the importance of international trade to the development of industrialisation in this period. Refer to any two countries from Britain, France or Germany in your answer.**

Responses often struggled with the issue of international trade and found it difficult to show how it related to industrialisation, with most focusing on other relevant factors. These provided detailed descriptions of the importance of developments in transport or of the invention of new and more efficient machines that created the factory system. However, there was often minimal reference to trade other than to say that it opened new markets. A few stronger responses linked this to colonial

expansion with a few even relating it to the effects of the slave trade but these were rare. Most responses stuck to general statements like '*...it helped the world stay connected allowing innovation and different industries to form*' but with little specific detail of how this was achieved. Most candidates overlooked the requirement for reference to at least two countries.

### Question 3

**(a) Why was there a growth in expenditure on armies and navies in this period?**

Most responses showed knowledge of some aspects of this question. For example, almost all responses provided some explanation of the Anglo-German Naval Race. In weaker responses this was often the bulk of the essay with little other than generalisations about other countries. Stronger responses often offered a wider range of factors before reaching some more general conclusion. For example: *The alliance system created tensions for many countries that led to growing military spending. Germany felt threatened by the Franco-Russian alliance and so built up its armies and planned for a two-front war. At the same time the French wanted revenge for the loss of Alsace and Lorraine and set about building a stronger army and the Russians wanted to make up for their loss in the Russo-Japanese war and set about modernising their army. Both these in turn made the Germans even more worried and they created the Schlieffen Plan to make sure they could win any war with France and Russia.* Most responses identified and explained several of these issues separately but did not establish the links implied in the above passage which could have taken them to the highest level of the mark scheme.

**(b) 'Members of the Triple Alliance joined in order to expand their empires.' How far do you agree with this view?**

Responses often demonstrated detailed knowledge of the ambitions of Germany and Austria-Hungary, though less so on Italy. However, most responses were poorly balanced because they either provided long explanations of the imperial ambitions of the allies in the global arena, or they provided a detailed account of the defensive nature of the alliance with respect to the threat within Europe. Few responses provided strong analyses of both sides. Nevertheless, most responses produced good explanations of the perspectives of the 3 alliance members. Some weaker responses confused the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente, and a few showed some misunderstanding about exactly who were the members of the Triple Alliance.

### Question 4

**(a) Why was Stolypin unpopular?**

Most responses showed knowledge of who Stolypin was and the key reforms he made, though weaker responses conflated reforms carried out over a period of years by Witte and Stolypin and attributed them all to the latter. The most common approach was simply to describe in detail the reforms that he carried out and assert that this was unpopular. Stronger responses considered more carefully the reaction of different groups to specific policies. For example, poorer peasants were not helped much by agricultural reforms and resented the creation of the kulak class and Liberals, initially pleased at the creation of the Duma were increasingly alienated by its lack of real powers. Almost all responses remembered Stolypin's necktie and were very clear on why that made him unpopular but only a few recognised that his reforms also made him unpopular with the higher levels of society, even with the Tsar himself, and so did not provide any sort of explanation for this.

**(b) 'The Provisional Government lost the support of the army.' How far does this explain its overthrow?**

Many responses struggled to isolate specific details of the role of the army in the fall of the Provisional Government but were able to give a general account of its fall, identifying a range of factors from the return of Lenin to the activation of Bolshevik supporters in order to defeat the advance of Kornilov. References to the army tended to focus on the Provisional Government's decision to continue the war and the effects of continuing losses on the army. A few responses mentioned Bolshevik success in winning support in the army (and the navy; e.g. the battleship Aurora) and a few stronger responses understood that the lack of support left only a limited number of troops to defend the Winter Palace when the Bolsheviks, who were essentially still a small

extremist group, staged their takeover. There was some sound analysis despite some lack of balance, but few strong responses.

### Section B

**Fewer than 10 candidates answered questions from this section, so it is not possible to make significant comments on performance on these topics.**

#### Question 5 (no responses to this question.)

- (a) **Why did American attitudes change towards China between 1911 and 1922?**
- (b) **'The policy of 'dollar diplomacy' was largely a failure.' How far do you agree?**

#### Question 6

- (a) **Why did the North fail to win the Civil War quickly?**

A strong response did point to difference in objectives suggesting that that the South did not have to win – it just had to avoid losing and so could concentrate solely on defence of their own states whereas to win the North had to invade and conquer the South which took longer to organise. Stronger responses covered the Anaconda Plan and indecisive northern Generals until the arrival of Grant.

- (b) **To what extent did the Compromise of 1877 prove that Reconstruction had been successful?**

Generally, responses showed a limited grasp of the Compromise or the circumstances in which it was agreed and understanding of Reconstruction was limited to the Reconstruction amendments with little detail on measures taken to try and carry out and enforce them. Few responses mentioned the presidency of Grant.

#### Question 7

- (a) **Why did large corporations form in the United States in the late nineteenth century?**

There were few responses to this question and most described the growth of some of the key corporations but failed to explain why they became so significant. Others wrote in general terms about developments like immigration and railways.

- (b) **'Prohibition was the most important aim of the Progressive movement.' How far do you agree?**

Responses tended to describe prohibition and write about the 1920s without much reference to context. There was little indication of knowledge of other progressive reforms, though a few stronger responses showed some understanding of such major innovations as senatorial elections, federal taxes and votes for women. There was little attempt to define 'the progressive movement' and knowledge of the 'progressive presidents' seemed limited (Roosevelt was mentioned but not Taft or Wilson).

#### Question 8

- (a) **Why did the New Deal receive criticism from both Left and Right?**

Most responses were about key opponents like Huey Long and Father Coughlin with little about right wing opposition. Responses were generally limited to what opponents wanted rather than why they opposed the New Deals.

- (b) **'The political impact of the Great Crash was as important as the economic impact.' How far do you agree?**

Most candidates were aware of the economic impact of the Wall Street Crash and were able to write about them in some detail but there was little evidence of understanding of the political impact and so responses tended to be one-sided and limited in their scope.

### Section C

#### Question 9

**(a) Why was France isolated in Europe between 1871 and 1894?**

Most responses showed awareness of the effects of the outcome of the Franco-Prussian War and of the policies Bismarck adopted to ensure the isolation of France following this defeat. Strong responses were able to offer explanations of other factors like colonial disputes which isolated them for Great Britain. Some weaker responses gave a detailed description of Bismarck's alliance system which was not necessary to understand his basic intentions. Many of these also concentrated only on the European aspect of isolation and neglected the effects of imperial rivalry on relations with Britain for example. There was little attempt to attach any significance to the end date of the question.

**(b) To what extent did the wars in southern Africa in the late nineteenth century reveal the limitations of British power?**

There were few strong responses to this question. Knowledge of the wars in South Africa was quite limited though it could be used to good effect where there was clear underlying knowledge and could lead to a reasoned judgement, for example: *Whilst victory in the Second Boer war should have given the impression of Britain as a strong and successful empire it had a generally negative effect. Loss of the First Boer war plus initial defeats against the Zulus created the impression that Britain was weak militarily. Though they won the Second Boer War eventually, their tactics against the Boers, including scorched earth and concentration camps, created a bad impression of Britain as a weak and bullying country and left them isolated and vulnerable internationally.*

However, most responses restricted themselves to the Second Boer War and there was often confusion about chronology. The Kruger Telegram, for example, was often described as congratulating the Boers on victory in the First Boer War with the Jameson Raid, if mentioned at all, seen as a later event. Some stronger responses were aware of the reasons for, and the role of, this raid in the beginning of the Second Boer War and were able to comment effectively on the intentions and actions of key figures like Cecil Rhodes and Kaiser Wilhelm. However, there were few successful conclusions that presented a balanced view of British strength and limitations at the end of the Boer Wars – there was little consideration for example of the global presence and overall strength of the British military.

#### Question 10

**(a) Why did the failure of the United States to approve the Versailles Settlement cause problems in Europe between 1919 and 1925?**

Strong responses recognised that the key to this question was consideration of what was expected of the USA at the end of World War One and the effects of failure to live up to these expectations. The fact that Wilson had been a driving force behind some of the key decisions over the treatment of Germany, the use of the principle of self-determination and the establishment of the League of Nations led to an expectation that the US would back these decisions with action if appropriate. When the US Congress refused to ratify the treaty, and thus the creation of the League, then difficulties were likely. Strong responses then identified specific areas of failure that could be attributed to the absence of the US, like the French actions over reparations, or the difficulties of the League in arbitrating border conflicts in Eastern Europe to demonstrate why the US absence was a key to a number of problems. Good responses were able to demonstrate that all of them could be linked back to the issue of US failure to ratify the Peace Treaties.

**(b) How far did the Wall Street Crash bring about deterioration in international relations?**

The strongest responses approached the issue from the point of view of the nature of international relations before the Wall Street Crash and then considered the consequences in light of this assessment. This allowed for the analysis of change and continuity between the 1920s and 1930s with German dissatisfaction being one of the key points. Weaker responses took a very narrative

approach to what happened after the event had taken place and focused on withdrawal of US support, return of French distrust of Germany, and the rise of extremism and the effects of economic collapse on key countries like Germany, Italy and Spain. This narrative approach rarely produced the sort of comparative response needed to access the higher levels of the mark scheme.

### Question 11

**(a) Why did Mussolini form the Rome–Berlin Axis with Hitler in 1936?**

There were some strong responses that recognised and provided clear explanation of the change in direction in Mussolini's foreign policy. The strongest responses often began from the knowledge that Mussolini initially referred to Hitler as a 'mad little clown' and proceeded from this to account for his change in attitude, reaching a conclusion based on a range of factors, for example: *In 1935 Mussolini was losing support at home because of the effects of the depression and launched his attack on Abyssinia to revive his plan to 'make Italy great again'. However, he found this move opposed by Britain and France so began to look for other sources of support. Impressed by Hitler's defiance of the western allies in withdrawing from the League and in re-militarising the Rhineland he decided to reach an agreement with Hitler, and they signed the Berlin Axis in 1936.* Weaker responses just wrote in more general terms about Mussolini's policies and the invasion of Abyssinia without really focusing of the question.

**(b) How far does military weakness explain Britain's adoption of the policy of appeasement?**

Strong responses demonstrated knowledge of a range of factors that contributed to the adoption of appeasement and were able to deploy them in a reasoned explanation of British policy. These responses were aware of the limitations placed on rearmament by the economic crisis of the early 1930s and/or contrasted British weakness with the strong re-armament measures undertaken by Hitler from 1934 onwards. Other factors commonly identified in strong responses included acceptance of the need to modify the Versailles settlement as it was increasingly seen as having been unfair, opposition to war and a significant peace movement amongst public opinion and a fear of communism, with Germany seen as a potential buffer against communist expansionism, even though Stalin had shelved the idea of 'worldwide revolution'. Weaker responses simply wrote about appeasement with little real reference to the importance of military preparation.

### Question 12

*There were very few responses to this question so detailed comment is not possible.*

**(a) Why did Mao emerge as leader of the Chinese Communist Party during the Long March?**

This question was generally not answered effectively, and responses tended to be simple descriptions of the Long March or some general comments on Chinese History in the 1920s with little reference to the question.

**(b) To what extent did the warlords control China between 1916 and 1928?**

There were only short responses showing limited understanding of the warlord era. There was some description of the activities of the KMT but not related directly to the question.

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9389/23**  
**Outline Study**

## Key messages

- Candidates should read all the questions in the relevant section of the paper before selecting two questions to answer. There have been instances where a whole **part (a)** question has been written, only to be crossed out because of problems with answering the **part (b)** – a significant misuse of the limited time available.
- For **part (a)** questions the key element is explaining why something happened. Identifying and explaining several reasons is an important step but to reach higher levels of the mark scheme it is necessary to show how the factors interacted and to assess their relative significance.
- For **part (b)** questions candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported. A well-written but one-sided analysis will not allow the candidates to reach their full potential.
- Candidates with substantial topic knowledge need to ensure that they apply their knowledge to the specific focus of the question set.

## General comments

**Part (a)** questions produced effective responses from most candidates; the need for explanation was well understood and the level of answers suggested that they had been well prepared for the exam. However, few candidates attempted the comparative judgements about relative importance of factors that could take their responses to the highest level of marks.

**Part (b)** questions were generally more challenging. Many candidates showed good knowledge but a varying degree of skill in its application to specific questions. Some responses described what happened without really focusing on the question or were uneven accounts analysing one side of an argument but presenting very little as an alternative. Strong responses were confident about alternative interpretations of events with the strongest providing a reasoned consideration of the validity of different views.

## Comments on specific questions

### *Section A*

#### Question 1

**(a) Why did the execution of the King fail to end political instability in France?**

Most responses provided an explanation of the basic instability caused by the Reign of Terror that divided the French people and ended only with the overthrow of Robespierre and the formation of the Directory. Stronger responses were able to identify further destabilising factors including the Revolutionary Wars that broke out in 1792, the continuing social and economic issues, the divisions between moderates and extremists (generally identified as Girondin and Jacobin), the outbreak of regional revolts against Robespierre's regime and the existence/effect of significant émigrés groups supporting a return to monarchy. A few weaker responses wrote in general terms about the execution of the king without direct reference to the question.

**(b) 'A popular dictator.' Assess this view of Napoleon.**

Some weaker responses struggled with the two separate issues of 'popular' and 'dictator'. Responses that fell into this category tended to just provide a description of some of the reforms

that Napoleon introduced with little direct link to the question. Stronger versions of this provided some details of reforms and commentary on whether they were popular or not. For example, ‘... *the Civil Code was introduced to create a single system of laws for the whole of France. Before this there had been separate system for the North and South of France. This code also included some of the changes made during the early revolution like the ending of the feudal system. It was therefore popular as Napoleon was seen as completing the changes of the Revolution.... However, the Code removed some of the rights won by women and made them the responsibility of their husbands without any independence – this was not so popular.*’ Only a minority of candidates went beyond this sort of response to consider Napoleon’s methods and whether they showed he was, despite his popularity, a dictator who imposed censorship, appointed Prefects to control all the regions of France and created a new social hierarchy with himself at the top as Emperor. Responses which successfully did this achieved the higher marks.

### Question 2

**(a) Why was there increased social mobility in this period?**

There were few good responses to this question. Some candidates appeared not to understand the term ‘social mobility’ and wrote about improvements in transport allowing workers to move to towns in search of work, or about the agricultural revolution making people unemployed in the countryside and having to move to cities. A few stronger responses did explain the effects of industrialisation for improving job opportunities for managers, lawyers etc. and the effects of improved agricultural incomes on investment in further growth and entrepreneurship.

**(b) To what extent did the lives of the working class improve in this period? Refer to any two countries from Britain, France or Germany in your answer.**

Many candidates wrote effective explanations of the effects of industrialisation on the deterioration of both the working and living conditions of the working classes. For example: ‘*The growth of factories led to poor living conditions because factory workers had to live in the crowded streets around their factories with poor sanitation and water supplies. Often several families had to share one house so diseases like Cholera and Typhoid spread quickly and there were serious outbreaks in 1842 and 1848 (and etc.) .... The factories themselves were dangerous and workers were often hurt reaching over machines or .... children crawling under them were killed or injured. So many workers had short and unhappy lives.*’ For some candidates, however, this represented the bulk of their answer. Stronger responses moved on from this argument to suggest that things like increasing agricultural production and the growth of railways led to better food reaching workers in industrial centres and a few mentioned specific Acts of Parliament in Britain that led to a steady improvement of the lives of the working class from the 1840s onwards. Such responses provided a balanced analysis and often scored quite highly but they were a small minority. Generally, responses did not identify anything relevant about France or Germany and many overlooked this aspect of the question altogether.

### Question 3

**(a) Why did the two Moroccan crises increase tension between the European powers?**

Knowledge of the two crises was good and most candidates were able to describe key events, with many able to link these to increasing tensions between Germany on the one hand and France and Britain on the other. Strong responses were able to highlight the different intentions and actions of the Powers that led to the confrontation and explain several ways in which the crises led to rising tensions between Britain and France on one hand and Germany on the other. Key to these responses was explanation of Anglo-German naval rivalry, German overseas ambitions (Weltpolitik – ‘a place in the sun’) and German fears of French intentions regarding Alsace Lorraine. Weaker responses tended to conflate the events of the two crises and confuse the chronology of the actions of Germany in particular.

**(b) ‘Germany was not to blame for the outbreak of the war.’ How far do you agree?**

Strong responses showed awareness of the reasons for suggesting that Germany was responsible for the war and then set out a range of suggestions for other causes of the war including the Kaiser’s aggressive Weltpolitik and the ‘blank cheque’ support for Austria during the July Crisis. Some strong responses then produced a suggestion of resolution along the following lines,



*'Though German actions in 1914 might have encouraged Austria to take action against Serbia thus making Germany at least partially responsible for the war, it was long-term tensions that led to the outbreak of war as a result of the assassination of the Archduke...'* However, these were rarely explained in enough detail to take marks to the highest level. Weaker responses just quoted the Treaty of Versailles and the 'war guilt' clause to support assertions.

#### Question 4

**(a) Why did World War One damage the Russian economy?**

There were a few strong responses to this question that provided information about a range of factors. These included the inefficiency of the distribution of food and goods because of weaknesses in the railway system, the effects of conscription in reducing the number of peasants available to work the land thus leading to food shortages and the loss of factory workers. Some responses focused on circumstances before the war began but this did not generally work as it was not linked to any effects during the war which was the focus of the question. A few candidates wrote at length about why the war was bad for Russia including the Tsar's decision to take command of the army and leaving the Tsarina and Rasputin in charge, but these did not have any significant links to the question. A minority of strong responses linked the relevant factors to reach the top level of the mark scheme, for example, *'shortage of labour in factories and farms created a shortage of food and goods in both the towns and for the army and led to severe inflation and economic hardship and but this was made worse by the fact that goods often stood abandoned on station platforms because of the inefficiencies of the railway system. So, it was a combination of all these factors that undermined the Russian economy.'*

**(b) 'The government's reforms of 1905 to 1914 largely achieved their aims.' How far do you agree?**

There were some very good responses to this question, balancing a positive interpretation of government actions against an analysis of continuing sources of discontent amongst some sections of the Russian population. Candidates who did this were familiar with the reforms of the October Manifesto and the work of Stolypin to build support for the Tsar and sometimes used the term 'carrot and stick approach' to describe this, with a proper appreciation of what this meant. They were also able to appreciate that the 'stick' part of the equation could have an adverse effect with 'Stolypin's necktie' being given as one of the indicators of limited success. Strong responses had a clear idea of what the Tsarist government's aims were and how far these aims were achieved. Weaker responses often struggled with the focus of the question and specific detail, writing about Witte's industrial reforms from before 1905 or crediting these reforms to Stolypin. A few responses discussed the loss of support for the Tsar after the start of World War One, even though this was clearly outside the scope of the question and did not score well.

#### Section B

***There were insufficient responses to questions from this section of the paper to make meaningful observations about candidate performance on these topics.***

#### Question 5

- (a) Why was there disagreement in the United States about joining the League of Nations?**
- (b) 'The Open-Door policy towards China was successful for the United States in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.' How far do you agree?**

#### Question 6

- (a) Why, in 1868, was the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution passed?**
- (b) How important was the Emancipation Proclamation to the outcome of the Civil War?**

#### Question 7

- (a) Why were there concerns about the power of party bosses at the end of the nineteenth century?**

- (b) To what extent was the impact of new immigration in the late nineteenth century positive?

#### Question 8

- (a) Why did Hoover lose the 1932 presidential election?
- (b) To what extent were the reforms of the Second New Deal more radical than those of the First?

#### Section C

#### Question 9

- (a) Why was Japan in a strong position internationally by 1918?

There were only a few responses to this question, all of which were able to offer some explanation of the rise of Japanese power but only one that went beyond this to provide a judgement on prioritisation. Having explained the emergence of Japan as an industrial and military power after the Meiji restoration the response moved on to analyse its expansion in the Pacific sphere and benefits of participating in WW1 before the following conclusion, *Among them all I would suggest the Meiji Restoration is the most significant. Without the realisation of the need to modernise its society Japan would neither experience its following victories around the Pacific nor be treated equally by western powers in the international arena. Therefore, its strong position by 1918 was mainly due to the Meiji Restoration.* By effectively linking the different elements of the explanation the response offered a reasoned evaluation of the relative importance of those elements, achieving the highest level.

- (b) 'The Kaiser did not expect Britain to join the conflict.' To what extent does this explain the actions taken by Germany in the July Crisis of 1914?

Many responses to this question lacked depth of argument. Instead of focusing on the expectations and intentions of the Kaiser they tended to simply present an account of events leading up to the war with some general inferences about who might be considered responsible. Few responses also seemed to recognise that the question required them to focus on reasons for the actions taken by Germany in the July Crisis.

#### Question 10

- (a) Why was Stresemann important in the improvement of international relations during the 1920s?

Most candidates had a good grasp of Stresemann's importance to the improvement of international relations in Europe and provided detailed explanation of this. For example, *He was important because of his central role in the signing of the Locarno Treaties. As German foreign minister he was responsible for negotiations with Britain and France that stabilised Germany's western border and created the Locarno Spirit that marked a significant improvement in international relations... He also formed a good relationship with French foreign minister Aristide Briand that helped him to complete negotiations successfully and build a new trust between the two countries.* Most candidates also understood his role in solving the Ruhr Crisis and in the re-launch of the German currency following the disastrous hyperinflation of 1922 – 3. Responses to this question were generally clear and well-constructed.

- (b) 'After 1919 the United States returned to a policy of isolationism.' How accurate is this judgement of United States Foreign Policy in the 1920's?

Similar to **part (a)** responses, these were generally clear and well balanced along the lines of, *On one hand, in support of the judgement, is the example of the absence of the US from the League despite Woodrow Wilson being seen by many as the founding father of that organisation... on the other hand they did not return completely to a policy of isolation as seen in the Washington Naval Conference, the Dawes Plan (and etc...).* Stronger responses were able to explain how these, and other examples, could be used to support alternative interpretations of US policy, using examples of failure to attend the conferences in Genoa and Locarno on the one hand and the involvement in

brokering solutions to the issue of reparations and active involvement in moves to promote disarmament (the Kellogg– Briand Pact) on the other. There were some suggestions of self-interest as a determining factor in US involvement, but this was not often sufficiently developed to represent a resolution of the conflicting views. Weaker responses produced more descriptive accounts but still provided good examples of significant detail.

### Question 11

**(a) Why did Britain not oppose Hitler's re-militarisation of the Rhineland in 1936?**

The issues here were generally clearly understood and used to good effect in stronger responses to explain Britain's reluctance to make a more active response. The argument that it was simply re-occupying 'its own back yard' was frequently identified, as was the general anti-war sentiment of the British public, the bigger problem of the Italian invasion of Abyssinia and the underlying fear of Soviet intentions that produced a feeling that, as one response noted, '*...though Germany's actions were somewhat alarming, a stronger Germany was potentially helpful to Britain as a strong anti-communist nation between Britain and the Soviet Union.*' Some weaker candidates tended to just list these different factors, but most responses demonstrated sound understanding and an ability to offer at least some explanation of the role of some of these different factors in Britain's decisions.

**(b) To what extent was Republican Spain destroyed by outside forces?**

Many candidates made a good effort at providing a well-constructed analysis for this question. All responses showed at least some awareness, and most provided some detailed explanation of the role of Hitler and Mussolini in supporting the forces of General Franco. Strong responses were also able to comment on the shortcomings of the support provided by the USSR to the Republicans and some were even aware that the weak response of the western allies deprived the Republic of much needed support. These responses often provided a counterargument based on the relative strengths of the internal forces of the two sides, showing that even without outside support the forces backing Franco had a significantly stronger position than those of the Republicans. Some responses even began to form significant judgements but usually failed to provide enough support for their conclusions. For example, '*Overall it was obvious that outside forces were not the only reason for the destruction of Republican Spain. However, the question remains whether the Republicans would have been defeated without the effect of outside forces on either side. While this is difficult to answer it is possible to draw the conclusion that the significant difference in terms of help from outside was what turned the war clearly in favour of the Nationalists and led to the destruction of Republican Spain.*

### Question 12

*Only a few candidates did this question*

**(a) Why did the Kuomintang abandon co-operation with the Chinese Communist Party?**

Most candidates understood that the First United Front had served its purpose in taking the Northern Expedition to a successful conclusion, but few recognised the wider intentions that underpinned this point. These included the personal ambitions of Chiang Kai-shek and his growing concern about the increasing support that communists were gaining amongst the peasantry. He also wanted to establish his own leadership and end the KMT reliance on Russian support.

**(b) 'The military was the main cause of political instability in Japan in the 1930s.' How far do you agree?**

Most candidates were able to identify some relevant 'other factors' such as the rise of extreme nationalist groups and Japan's limited experience of democracy to develop a balanced response about the influence of the military on the country's political instability. Stronger responses were able to explain the effects of specific factors, while weaker responses tended to write one-sided account based on the military actions in Manchuria.

# HISTORY

---

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

## Key messages

- Deal with the extract as a whole, rather than as a series of unrelated sections. The interpretation will be discernible in the extract as a whole, not necessarily just in bits of it.
- Read the extract carefully before beginning to write. Any statement made in a response must be justifiable in relation to the content of the extract, so being sure about what the extract says is very important.
- Keep responses focused on the extract and what it says about the historian. The length of an answer is not an indicator of its quality, so do not be tempted to write more for the sake of it, such as writing about other historians' views, or describing events.
- Some parts of the extract will be more significant in revealing the interpretation than others. The ability to recognise these and select material from them is an important way of demonstrating understanding.

## General comments

Most responses recognised that the extract contains a historian's interpretation, attempted to identify that interpretation, and explained, using the extract, how the interpretation could be detected in what the historian had written. The effectiveness with which responses achieved this varied and the difference between a strong response and weaker one was generally dependant on two factors. The first of these was the way the answer was structured. Many used the first paragraph to state what they saw as the historian's approach, and to summarise the interpretation. They then worked through the extract paragraph by paragraph. Stronger responses using this approach did this by focusing on the interpretation and commenting on how what was written related to it. Weaker responses summarised what the extract said, illustrating the interpretation rather than explaining it. Some responses focussed unnecessarily on specific details in the paragraph, losing sight of the extract as a whole, and produced assertions about the approach which appeared true if applied to a single phrase or sentence within the paragraph, but which were contradicted elsewhere. These responses frequently reached their conclusion without having provided any direct evidence to support their claims about the interpretation. The strongest responses were structured differently from the paragraph by paragraph approach. These responses decided what the main features of the interpretation were, and then selected evidence from throughout the extract to illustrate and explain these features in turn.

The second factor is knowing what it is that has to be explained and illustrated. The question asks about the interpretation and approach of the historian. However, to a greater or lesser extent, almost all responses spend time on explaining details from the extract – what it says and what it refers to. Many responses identified a single reference – for example, the Yalta Conference – and then wrote a paragraph about what happened at the conference. Using the extract and one's own knowledge only has relevance if applied to the task of explaining what you can learn about the historian's view. Stronger responses were able to do this, but weaker ones did not and were consequently not addressing the question directly.

There were also instances of candidates attempting to illustrate points using truncated, incomplete quotes from the extract – e.g. *I can tell the historian is a post-post-revisionist because the extract says '(Stalin's) post-war goals... ..and his ideology'*. This should be avoided, and responses should give in full the material they are offering as support for a point, not least because the omitted material may lend itself to alternative meanings or be capable of explaining different points. The other characteristic of weaker responses was to take the views of the historical figures in the extract as being those of the historian. This almost always produced misinterpretation which could be avoided by a careful reading of the extract.

### **Comments on specific questions**

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

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

#### ***Section B: The Holocaust***

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is about the impact of war. It is that war changed the attitudes of ordinary Germans towards the Jews and gave the Nazi leadership the opportunity to radicalise actions against the Jews. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and explained how and why these things occurred using material from the extract. The key was to understand which parts of the extract were capable of supporting the explanation. Many responses assumed, for example, that the change of ordinary Germans into 'willing executioners' was brought about by the 'obligation to do one's duty and support one's country in time of war'. But whilst this might be made part of an explanation it is insufficient in itself. The necessary element was provided by what the extract said about the 'corrupting process of racial imperialism' involved in the conquest of Poland. Many responses wanted to classify the extract as intentionalist or functionalist, and there were points about the Nazi leadership or the war that could be made to support either, or indeed both. Weaker responses assumed that there was a causal link between the two aspects of the interpretation; that is, that it was Nazi policy and propaganda that changed the attitudes of ordinary Germans, even though this was not apparent in the extract. The weakest responses simply paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that Stalin's policy was expansionist, but that the circumstances of the immediate post-war period limited his ability to achieve this. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. The historian held the USSR responsible for Cold War tensions and being able to reconcile this with the reasons given in the second half of the extract for Stalin's restraint was key to demonstrating full understanding. The best way to view the historian's approach was as post-post-revisionist, but traditional was also acceptable in its insistence on Soviet expansionism. Weaker responses saw the second part of the extract as exonerating Stalin, or even putting some element of blame onto the West, and thereby reached flawed conclusions that the extract must be post-revisionist, or revisionist, in nature. Some responses also provided examples of the kind of misreading mentioned above in the General Comments. It was common to read that the historian believed that 'Stalin wanted to conquer the world' – a quote from the first sentence. Yet what the historian actually says about this idea is that it is 'simplistic'. Similarly, the sentence 'Should not Stalin's leadership expect special treatment from Western powers after such a sacrifice?' was taken as the historian's approval for such an idea – yet the true sense of the quote was as something which Stalin would have believed. The weakest responses simply paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

# HISTORY

---

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

## Key messages

- Deal with the extract as a whole, rather than as a series of unrelated sections. The interpretation will be discernible in the extract as a whole, not necessarily just in bits of it.
- Read the extract carefully before beginning to write. Any statement made in a response must be justifiable in relation to the content of the extract, so being sure about what the extract says is very important.
- Keep responses focused on the extract and what it says about the historian. The length of an answer is not an indicator of its quality, so do not be tempted to write more for the sake of it, such as writing about other historians' views, or describing events.
- Some parts of the extract will be more significant in revealing the interpretation than others. The ability to recognise these and select material from them is an important way of demonstrating understanding.

## General comments

Most responses recognised that the extract contains a historian's interpretation, attempted to identify that interpretation, and explained, using the extract, how the interpretation could be detected in what the historian had written. The effectiveness with which responses achieved this varied and the difference between a strong response and weaker one was generally dependant on two factors. The first of these was the way the answer was structured. Many used the first paragraph to state what they saw as the historian's approach, and to summarise the interpretation. They then worked through the extract paragraph by paragraph. Stronger responses using this approach did this by focusing on the interpretation and commenting on how what was written related to it. Weaker responses summarised what the extract said, illustrating the interpretation rather than explaining it. Some responses focussed unnecessarily on specific details in the paragraph, losing sight of the extract as a whole, and produced assertions about the approach which appeared true if applied to a single phrase or sentence within the paragraph, but which were contradicted elsewhere. These responses frequently reached their conclusion without having provided any direct evidence to support their claims about the interpretation. The strongest responses were structured differently from the paragraph by paragraph approach. These responses decided what the main features of the interpretation were, and then selected evidence from throughout the extract to illustrate and explain these features in turn.

The second factor is knowing what it is that has to be explained and illustrated. The question asks about the interpretation and approach of the historian. However, to a greater or lesser extent, almost all responses spend time on explaining details from the extract – what it says and what it refers to. Many responses identified a single reference – for example, the Yalta Conference – and then wrote a paragraph about what happened at the conference. Using the extract and one's own knowledge only has relevance if applied to the task of explaining what you can learn about the historian's view. Stronger responses were able to do this, but weaker ones did not and were consequently not addressing the question directly.

There were also instances of candidates attempting to illustrate points using truncated, incomplete quotes from the extract – e.g. *I can tell the historian is a revisionist because the extract says, 'The World War... ..US economy to benefit'*. This should be avoided, and responses should give in full the material they are offering as support for a point, not least because the omitted material may lend itself to alternative meanings or be capable of explaining different points. The other characteristic of weaker responses was to take the views of the historical figures in the extract as being those of the historian. This almost always produced misinterpretation which could be avoided by a careful reading of the extract.

### **Comments on specific questions**

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that the impact of the British Empire was not all bad, and that the standard depictions of the Empire are inadequate. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. The essential point was to recognise that the writer is an apologist of empire, and most responses were based on this idea. Weaker responses missed the historian's point of view, and focused instead on details in the extract, such as the way in which the British established bases when first entering a particular area. The weakest responses simply paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Empire with no reference to the extract.

#### ***Section B: The Holocaust***

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that before 1941 Hitler had no plan to exterminate the Jews, yet despite this he was still at the centre of decision-making about the Final Solution. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Fundamental to providing a plausible analysis of the extract was understanding that what was said in the first paragraph about the Madagascar Plan indicated that at that stage Hitler had not decided to exterminate the Jews. This meant that any suggestion in a response that Hitler did have prior intent, or a plan had to be taken as evidence of misunderstanding. The most satisfactory way of 'labelling' the historian's approach was to see it as functionalist. The extract was clear that the Final Solution emerged in the circumstances of war, with some indication of an 'ad hoc' evolution of policy. Many candidates, however, argued that the approach was intentionalist, and as long as this focused on the central importance of Hitler, rather than prior intent, valid support from the extract was possible. Similarly, a conclusion that the extract was 'synthesis' in nature could be acceptable. Some responses felt the interpretation was structuralist because of the reference to 'scheming functionaries' though these explanations often revealed a confusion about the meanings of structuralism and functionalism. Weaker responses struggled to integrate the various elements of the extract into a coherent explanation. For example, many of these responses viewed the reference to the Madagascar Plan as signalling that Hitler had no prior plan for genocide, only then to insist that he did have such a plan because of 'all the anti-Jewish measures taken over the years', mentioned later in the extract. The weakest responses simply paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that the policy of containment was not caused by a real Soviet threat, and that the USA chose hostility towards the USSR to serve its own purposes. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. The historian's approach was revisionist in the blame it placed on the USA for causing Cold War tensions and using any other 'label' for all or part of the extract was evidence of misunderstanding. A fundamental building block of strong responses was the first sentence of the second paragraph, stating the historian's view that containment 'did not accurately reflect the realities of the time'. If candidates missed the importance of this, they almost always concluded that the historian was attributing at least some of the blame to the Soviet Union. Indeed, many read the entire extract as exonerating the USA, on the basis that the Soviet threat was real. Some responses saw the historian's criticism of containment yet were puzzled by the list of reasons for pursuing the containment policy given in the second paragraph. Some of these reasons appeared understandable – why, for example, should a country not wish to avoid repeating the mistake that had been made with appeasement? Yet the fact that some of the reasons might have been justifiable, does not mean that they all were, and the conclusion that the USA opted for the Cold War to meet the needs and wishes of its economy and military was still damning. Weaker responses also provided examples of the kind of misreading mentioned above in the General Comments. Much of the first paragraph was often seen as a statement of the historian's views, rather than those of Kennan and those who shared his opinions. Therefore, one would read that the historian believed that 'the very existence of the Soviet Union threatened the United States' or that 'the United States should make containment of the Soviet threat its primary aim'. The weakest responses simply paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

# HISTORY

---

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

## Key messages

- Deal with the extract as a whole, rather than as a series of unrelated sections. The interpretation will be discernible in the extract as a whole, not necessarily just in bits of it.
- Read the extract carefully before beginning to write. Any statement made in a response must be justifiable in relation to the content of the extract, so being sure about what the extract says is very important.
- Keep responses focused on the extract and what it says about the historian. The length of an answer is not an indicator of its quality, so do not be tempted to write more for the sake of it, such as writing about other historians' views, or describing events.
- Some parts of the extract will be more significant in revealing the interpretation than others. The ability to recognise these and select material from them is an important way of demonstrating understanding.

## General comments

Most responses recognised that the extract contains a historian's interpretation, attempted to identify that interpretation, and explained, using the extract, how the interpretation could be detected in what the historian had written. The effectiveness with which responses achieved this varied and the difference between a strong response and weaker one was generally dependant on two factors. The first of these was the way the answer was structured. Many used the first paragraph to state what they saw as the historian's approach, and to summarise the interpretation. They then worked through the extract paragraph by paragraph. Stronger responses using this approach did this by focusing on the interpretation and commenting on how what was written related to it. Weaker responses summarised what the extract said, illustrating the interpretation rather than explaining it. Some responses focussed unnecessarily on specific details in the paragraph, losing sight of the extract as a whole, and produced assertions about the approach which appeared true if applied to a single phrase or sentence within the paragraph, but which were contradicted elsewhere. These responses frequently reached their conclusion without having provided any direct evidence to support their claims about the interpretation. The strongest responses were structured differently from the paragraph by paragraph approach. These responses decided what the main features of the interpretation were, and then selected evidence from throughout the extract to illustrate and explain these features in turn.

The second factor is knowing what it is that has to be explained and illustrated. The question asks about the interpretation and approach of the historian. However, to a greater or lesser extent, almost all responses spend time on explaining details from the extract – what it says and what it refers to. Many responses identified a single reference – for example, the Yalta Conference – and then wrote a paragraph about what happened at the conference. Using the extract and one's own knowledge only has relevance if applied to the task of explaining what you can learn about the historian's view. Stronger responses were able to do this, but weaker ones did not and were consequently not addressing the question directly.

There were also instances of candidates attempting to illustrate points using truncated, incomplete quotes from the extract – e.g. *I can tell the historian is a post-post-revisionist because the extract says, 'Stalin believed... .....get a lot'*. This should be avoided, and responses should give in full the material they are offering as support for a point, not least because the omitted material may lend itself to alternative meanings or be capable of explaining different points. The other characteristic of weaker responses was to take the views of the historical figures in the extract as being those of the historian. This almost always produced misinterpretation which could be avoided by a careful reading of the extract.



### **Comments on specific questions**

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

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

#### ***Section B: The Holocaust***

This extract was about how the Holocaust is defined. The central argument of the historian is that it comprised more than just the Jews, and that for all groups affected there was a common decision-making process directed by Hitler. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. To demonstrate complete understanding, responses had to show awareness that this definition of the Holocaust is not shared by all historians, many of whom would limit it to the genocide of the Jews. Most responses focused more on the role of Hitler than on the definition aspect. It was possible to argue for an intentionalist approach, not merely on the many references to Hitler, but also in the arguments about euthanasia providing a model for the Final Solution, and the early moves towards killing operations. As long as this analysis also showed awareness of the common process affecting all three excluded groups, this could be seen as a sound explanation of the interpretation. References to bureaucrats and functionaries led some responses to assert the approach as being structuralist, though it was noteworthy how limited the understanding of structuralism was. Mention of the ‘cover of war’ also led some responses to suggest that the approach was functionalist, but this was not the main focus of the extract. Weaker responses lost sight in the overall interpretation and focused instead on details in the extract, such as whether Hitler signed a killing order. The weakest responses paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that to ensure his security Stalin sought to make the USSR dominant, but was mistaken in thinking this could be achieved without resistance. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Almost all responses saw the historian’s approach as post-post-revisionist, specifically in its focus on the personal aims and motives of Stalin, but how they explained the issue of expansionism did much to determine the overall quality of the answer. The strongest responses saw that security was the central issue, with expansionism being just a means to that end. They were also able to explain how Stalin’s ideological delusions about the West were what prevented him achieving his aim. There were many good responses on the first of these aspects, but the second proved more difficult, with a lot of answers simply concluding that Stalin’s ideology was what caused tensions with the West to rise. Weaker responses saw the interpretation almost in traditional terms, portraying Stalin as a greedy, ideologically-driven, aggressive expansionist, and almost overlooking those parts of the extract that insisted that, in the short term at least, Stalin really did want to cooperate with the West. Some responses showed a misreading of the extract in the ways mentioned above in the General Comments. For example, many stated that the historian approved of the idea that the Soviet Union was ‘entitled to disproportionate gains’ – missing out that this was preceded by the qualification that it was ‘disproportionate losses during the war’ that created this entitlement, and, more importantly, that this seemed, in any case, to be stating Stalin’s view, rather than the historian’s. The weakest responses paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 9389/41  
Depth Study

## Key messages

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

## General comments

Strong responses were clearly analytical in approach and had a well-argued case that was supported with good levels of relevant subject knowledge and then reached a logical final judgement. Good examples of this were **Question 1** and **3**, where the strongest responses dealt with the 'how far' element of the question, supporting ideas with a range of examples from their knowledge of the topic, rather than simply identifying and explaining valid factors, without attempting a serious analysis of relative significance. **Question 7** also saw many candidates discussing a number of factors, without providing any analysis as to their hierarchy of importance.

Material which is provided must be relevant to the timeframe of the question or it will not be credited. In **Question 5**, there was a good deal of material, which belonged to the 1960s rather than the 1950s. Similarly, some responses tried to use events in the 1950s or 1960s to answer **Question 8**. It is crucial that candidates have a good chronological understanding. **Question 2** specifically referred to after 1922, and although material before that date could be relevant if handled competently, there must have been a serious attempt to address that time period to perform well.

## Comments on specific questions

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

#### 1 'The Bolsheviks won the Civil War due to their opponents' lack of support'. How far do you agree?

There were very few responses to this question. Stronger responses often grasped that the Bolsheviks' opponents might get support from not only 'locals' but also from the other nationalities that made up Russia as well as foreign powers. There were a range of other factors to consider, including the strengths of Trotsky and the Red Army set against the weaknesses and lack of unity of the Whites.

#### 2 Assess the reasons why democracy came to an end in Italy after 1922.

There were very few responses to this question. The focus of the question was two-fold: the end of democracy and the time period after 1922. Candidates who understood the demands of the question produced strong responses, including coverage of the Aventine Secession, Acerbo Law, in addition to discussing the reasons that many groups were content with the dismantling of democratic processes.

Weaker responses tended to focus on the problems facing Italy after World War I without making clear how and why they related to the loss of support and trust in democracy.

**3 'The purges were the most important reason why Stalin retained power'. How far do you agree?**

There were not many responses to this question. Candidates who answered the question tended to have sound knowledge of the stated factor and alternative explanations, most obviously propaganda, genuine support and lack of democratic tradition in Russia. The strongest responses were produced by candidates who were prepared to engage with the debate while weaker responses presented factors without comment on their relative significance. The importance of using analysis alongside good knowledge remains crucial in scoring highly.

**4 'His opponents were leaderless and divided'. How far does this explain the lack of effective opposition to Hitler after 1933?**

The questions required a focus on after, rather than before, Hitler came to power. Strong responses confidently focused on a range of opponents, real and potential, and explained why they posed little threat, compared with other factors, such as terror, propaganda, economic success etc. The last of these factors was less confidently handled than the first two. Responses that were less secure on the nature of opposition to Hitler were less likely to reach the higher levels.

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

**5 'The position of women in society saw little change in the period 1945 – 60'. How far do you agree?**

This was a very popular question, with the large majority of candidates answering it. It was common for responses to recognise that, unlike during World War II, women's roles were largely domestic. Some were able to support these comments with reference to media reinforcement of gender and family roles, inequality in education and work and to link them to developments in US society such as suburbanisation. There was rarely sufficient depth of supporting material and analysis to reach the higher levels, however. Weaker responses were hampered by a lack of chronological accuracy and often included references to the 1960s feminist movement. Although Friedan's work was relevant in terms of supporting the argument that women were unfulfilled by their domestic roles, it was often used to argue that it inspired change in this period. Responses generally found it more difficult to challenge the statement, although there were some valid references to increased levels of college education and to women in the workplace, albeit usually confined to 'women's jobs.'

**6 Evaluate the reasons why Nixon chose to end the gold-dollar standard in 1971.**

There was often a sound understanding of the nature of the Bretton Woods agreement and of the reasons that the USA withdrew from the gold-dollar standard. Strong responses understood the problems afflicting the US economy and the reasons for them and sometimes proved able to explain how Nixon's policy aimed to solve them. Candidates were often well-versed in the issue of stagflation. There was, however, some confusion over what would happen to the value of the dollar, with many responses asserting that it would rise, rather than fall. The evaluation of most significant factor was usually not tackled directly and there were many responses, relatively strong in other respects, that failed to grasp the political motivations, given the presidential election which was due in 1972 and could have been seen as one of the most significant reasons.

**7 Analyse the reasons for Reagan's victory in the Presidential election of 1984.**

It was common for candidates to be able to offer some valid reasons, with varying degrees of supporting material, although the analysis of their relative importance was often implicit. Stronger responses made it clear that they knew that this was Reagan's second election victory and were able to tailor these responses accordingly, including relevant information on his achievements during his first term of office. References to the success of 'Reaganomics' and the popularity of his stance on foreign policy were employed relatively successfully. Another factor widely cited was his personality and charisma, although this could have linked to victory in 1980, as could the support of America's conservative groups. References to Mondale's campaign were confined to the better responses, with comments about Ferraro and Jackson sometimes included, although there was little about Mondale himself. Weaker

responses did not make clear that they were referring to 1984, with comments about Carter's failings appearing with regularity. Some candidates talked of Reaganomics in terms of what he promised, rather than achieve, and there were chronological errors in references to Gorbachev and to speeches made by Reagan after 1984. There was little or no reference to the quality of the advisors and ministers chosen by Reagan to implement his policy initiatives.

**8 Assess the effectiveness of US foreign policy in Asia in the late 1940s.**

Most responses showed familiarity with the policy of Containment and brought in Kennan's Long Telegram. Weaker responses did not show enough knowledge of this topic to make a confident assessment. In some cases, there was recognition that the US failed to stop the Communists' victory in China, although there was little confident discussion of what support the US put in place for the Nationalists or why it failed. Where Japan was considered, it was more likely to be in relation to the events of 1945, than to US support for the creation of a democratic, capitalist nation. Much of the content that was included in weaker responses lacked relevance as it strayed beyond the time period stipulated in the question and there was often a good deal of material on the wars in Korea and Vietnam which could not be credited.

**Depth Study 3: International History, 1945–1991**

**9 How effectively did the United States uphold the Truman Doctrine in the period 1950 to 1963?**

There was a very small number of responses to this question, which required a balanced assessment of the success of US policy towards containment. Crucial to reaching higher levels was the ability to make a clear judgement on this issue. Strong responses were well focused, made clear what they understood the Truman Doctrine to relate to and used a range of examples of both success and failure. Weaker responses included detailed passages of narrative about the events of the Korean War or Cuban Missile Crisis. The analysis needed to be about the outcomes of each event.

**10 Assess the reasons why Gorbachev undertook reform in the Soviet Union after 1985.**

There were very few responses to this question.

**11 Assess how far communes were responsible for China's agricultural policies during Mao Zedong's rule.**

There were very few responses to this question.

**12 How far was the Palestinian refugee issue responsible for the destabilisation of Lebanon during the civil war 1975 – 1990?**

No candidates answered this question.

# HISTORY

---

Paper 9389/42  
Depth Study

## Key messages

- A sustained focus on the specific nature of the question asked is the key to accessing the higher levels of the mark scheme. Where there is a stated factor, this should be addressed as part of the answer.
- Stronger responses are analytical throughout and attempt to address all aspects of the question.
- Analysis should be supported by relevant and accurate factual information, and this knowledge should be in-depth.
- Candidates must take note of the chronological timeframe of the question as assessment of events outside of the question remit cannot be credited.
- Stronger responses provide a balanced argument and evaluation.
- Candidates are advised to read the questions carefully and analyse what is required before starting to write their answers.

## General comments

Strong responses were clearly analytical in approach and had a well-argued case that was supported with good levels of relevant subject knowledge and then reached a logical final judgement. Good examples of this were **Question 4**, where stronger responses dealt adeptly with fear of communism as a factor, alongside a range of alternatives. Weaker responses did not consider fear of communism at all, and this resulted in a lack of balance in the response.

Linking material used clearly to the question set is another crucial element of successful responses. This was particularly apparent in **Question 3**, where candidates who were confident about what was meant by social change prospered far more than those who wrote about economic and political developments without making a secure link to everyday life. **Question 10** also saw significant numbers of candidates with knowledge of Gorbachev's policies who were uncertain as to the precise link between them, their outcomes and the end of the Cold War and did little more than assert that they were responsible.

Questions which contain command words such as assess or evaluate require candidates to produce clear judgements. The best responses show evidence of what criteria the candidate has used to reach their judgement.

## Comments on specific questions

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

#### **1 'It made only limited progress towards creating a communist state.' Assess this view of the Bolshevik regime between 1918 and 1924.**

A common approach among stronger responses was to define what constituted a communist state, while others had a clear idea of the criteria required. Another characteristic of these responses was to consider Lenin's policies from the perspective of social, economic and political factors. Balance was achieved, through, for example, using War Communism as an example of socialism in practice and New Economic Policy as a counterargument. These were the most common examples, but candidates also discussed political control, terror and, less often, social changes such as gender equality. Weaker responses lacked a range of examples to provide a wide-ranging discussion. They could also typically lack a clear sense of what communism was or be imprecise as to the consequences of different policies in relation to its achievement. Weaker responses also tended to adopt a narrative approach to the Civil War, attempting to explain why it meant that the Bolsheviks failed. There was also some confusion about the relevance of

the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk, with some candidates suggesting that the peace terms were a betrayal of communist ideology.

**2 Was Mussolini's popularity with the Italian people the reason for his control of Italy between 1925 and 1941?**

Strong responses were clear on why Mussolini might have been considered to have been popular in Italy in these years, with successful policies and propaganda being used. Alternatives sometimes pondered the extent of popularity and of the use of terror and the lack of viable alternatives, given the unpopularity of liberal democracy among many. Weaker responses tended to lack focus on the precise demands of the question, leading to descriptions of policies such as the battles, without a consistent line of argument being employed. There were also some candidates whose focus was more on support than control and so ended up answering a different question than that which was posed. A minority tried to explain why Mussolini came to power.

**3 'The years 1929 to 1941 saw limited social change in Russia.' How far do you agree?**

Strong responses showed a clear understanding of what was meant by social change. There was good knowledge of Stalin's policies regarding women and the family, education, religion and social classes, for instance. Where candidates were familiar with this material, they were comfortable with an analysis of change, comparing Stalin's attitude towards abortion and divorce with Lenin's for example. Stronger candidates were also adept at linking economic and political developments with social factors, for instance the impact of industrialisation on living and working conditions. Weaker responses struggled to come to terms with the issue of social change and provide, often detailed, accounts of the purges or of collectivisation and industrialisation without being able to clearly link the material to the question. Many candidates asserted that these changes must have led to a great deal of social change, without giving clear examples. The requirement for a balanced response also caused some problems, with some responses failing to examine both sides of the argument.

**4 'Fear of communism was the main reason for Hitler being appointed chancellor in January 1933.' How far do you agree?**

Strong responses dealt confidently with the stated factor, identifying the scale and nature of the threat from communism at this time, which groups in particular felt much at risk and how this related to Hitler's appointment. Weaker responses failed to include one or more of these elements. Some responses did not engage at all with the stated factor, even where very strong analysis of other factors was included. Weaker responses did not engage directly with the specific demands of the question, nor did they offer any balance of argument. A small number of responses included material which went beyond January 1933 and lacked relevance.

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

**5 Assess the view that economic prosperity in the period 1945 – 60 was driven by a new consumer economy.**

Strong responses considered aspects of the new consumer economy – from credit cards to cars and had a sound picture of its overall impact. This was then contrasted with other factors, such as the huge military spending, a baby boom and other federal spending on things such as highways. In spite of Eisenhower's dislike of them, there were still plenty of federal programmes left over from the New Deal which pumped money into the economy as well as highly successful exports. Differentials in the quality of responses were seen in the range and accuracy of supporting detail and the ability to assess the validity of the statement.

**6 'The social revolution of the 1960s changed the lives of Americans.' Evaluate this view.**

Responses were able to provide some description of the 1960s counter-culture, feminist and gay rights movements, although the degree to which they were able to evaluate their impact on society was variable. Weaker responses were prone to discussion of the civil rights movement, with limited relevance. There was an attempt at balance in some cases, with a discussion on the 'Silent Majority', although other responses were limited in this aspect.

**7 To what extent did Supreme Court judgements further the cause of ethnic minority rights during the 1980s?**

There were very few responses to this question. Strong responses understood the nature of Reagan's appointments to the Supreme Court and were able to call upon precise examples to support both sides of the argument. Weaker responses were lacking in detail and knew few specific case studies.

**8 How far did his multiple meetings with Gorbachev in the period 1985 – 88 change Reagan's foreign policy?**

There were very few responses to this question.

**Depth Study 3: International History, 1945–1991**

**9 'The United States wanted détente in the 1970s more than the Soviet Union did.' How far do you agree?**

Strong responses were properly balanced, with a range of factors for both the USA and USSR covered. Reference to the impact of the Vietnam War was common, often from the economic and public opinion perspectives, although less commonly relating to the USA's loss of confidence on the world stage. Some candidates asserted that détente was a way of securing the USA's withdrawal from the war, without considering that the search for better relations continued beyond 1973. The USSR's economic problems was the most widely cited motivation, and there was use of the Sino-Soviet Split in many answers. Weaker responses tended to write a description of détente itself, rather than focusing squarely on the motivations for it.

**10 How far was Gorbachev responsible for the end of the Cold War?**

Strong responses made a clear case for a most important factor, whether that agreed with the question or not, and produced a consistent line of argument throughout. There was often detailed material on Gorbachev's policies, with glasnost and perestroika commonly discussed, as was democratisation and the Sinatra Doctrine. Strong responses demonstrated a clear understanding of the ways in which these policies not only led to the break-up of the Soviet Union, but to the end of the Cold War. Weaker responses were somewhat uncertain about the consequences of these policies and used the collapse of the USSR and the ending of the Cold War inter-changeably. The need for alternative arguments was usually understood and Reagan, but rarely Bush, also got credit, often more for the aggressive re-armament policies than for his more conciliatory approach towards Gorbachev. The strongest responses showed a shrewd understanding of how these factors over-lap, rather than dealing with them as distinct entities.

**11 The Hundred Flowers Campaign did not achieve its aims. Assess this view.**

Sound examples demonstrated that well-prepared candidates knew that the apparent initial aims and those which were later propounded following the resultant criticism were different. Candidates differentiated between Mao's desire for debate and his later claims to have been setting a trap for 'rightists.' The strongest responses indicated an understanding that Mao was prepared for criticism of the growing bureaucratism of the party and the context of Khrushchev's 'Secret Speech.' Weaker responses tended to understand the main arguments and relay them with some attempt at analysis but were noticeably lighter on detail to support their assertions.

**12 'Egypt was responsible for the outbreak of the Six-Day War in 1967. Assess this view.'**

There were some strong responses, which showed very good knowledge of the events leading up to the war in 1967. There was consideration given to the actions of Egypt and other Arab nations, as well as Israel, alongside their Cold War sponsors. Well-informed candidates discussed Nasser's actions during 1967, including closing the Straits of Tiran to Israel and moving troops to the border, having requested the removal of UN forces. Some responses considered the pressure put on Nasser by allies such as Jordan and that his policies constituted brinkmanship. Reference to Palestinian refugees and the activity of the PLO was less common. Israel's role was also considered, with chief consideration being given to the actual attack, rather than activity on the border with Jordan. It was less common that responses considered the roles of the USA and USSR. There was some validity in considering the events of 1956, but candidates who went further back to explain the history of conflict in the Middle East were losing focus

on the question and should have spent more time on the immediate causes of the war to be more convincing.



# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9389/43**  
**Depth Study**

## Key messages

- A sustained focus on the specific nature of the question asked is the key to accessing the higher levels of the mark scheme. Where there is a stated factor, this should be addressed as part of the answer.
- Stronger responses are analytical throughout and attempt to address all aspects of the question.
- Analysis should be supported by relevant and accurate factual information, and this knowledge should be in-depth.
- Candidates must take note of the chronological timeframe of the question as assessment of events outside of the question remit cannot be credited.
- Stronger responses provide a balanced argument and evaluation.
- Candidates are advised to read the questions carefully and analyse what is required before starting to write their answers.

## General comments

Strong responses were clearly analytical in approach and had a well-argued case that was supported with good levels of relevant subject knowledge and then reached a logical final judgement. Many examples of strong knowledge married to a consistently analytical approach were seen in **Question 1**, where candidates were often confident about events and how they could be used in analysis of fundamental change. Making a very clear initial judgement about the line of reasoning to be taken is a characteristic of many of the more thoughtful responses. Responses to questions such as 10 were often detailed and knowledgeable about the general issues but lacked a clear engagement with the question, failing to make a clear and supported judgement to answer it directly.

Questions which contain specific dates require a careful consideration of the full period in question. Better examples of responses to **Questions 2** and **4** were aware of the requirement to go beyond 1922 and 1933, respectively. Responses which did not do so were limited in range and were not as effective in dealing with the issues.

Questions which contain command words such as assess or evaluate require candidates to produce clear judgements and centres are encouraged to stress that the best responses show evidence of what criteria the candidate has used to reach their judgement.

## Comments on specific questions

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

#### **1 ‘Russia experienced fundamental change between 1918 and 1924’. How far do you agree?**

The question allowed for a range of successful arguments. Some suggested that what change there was, was in theory rather than practice. Others argued convincingly that Lenin’s pragmatism meant that he could only lay the basis for future fundamental change. There was also balance provided by the view that policies such as the use of terror, authoritarian regime and NEP meant that there was a good deal of continuity with the Tsarist regime. Strong responses produced a sustained line of argument by setting out their case early on and then went on to develop it in depth. The case for/case against approach often kept some responses with really good knowledge and understanding out of the top level as the final analysis just did not quite fit into the preceding narrative. Sustained analysis is required at Level 5.

**2 'Communism was feared more than fascism'. How far does this explain Mussolini's rise to power by 1925?**

Strong responses met the statement directly with clear analysis of the nature and extent of the communist threat, which groups in Italian society felt most threatened and how this translated into support for the fascists. These responses also considered the extent of a fascist threat. Some candidates thoughtfully compared this aspect with others, such as the failures of liberal government and its leadership. Weaker responses which set out the arguments around Mussolini's appointment in 1922, without going onto consider events such as the Acerbo Law and Aventine Secession, were limited in scope. Some candidates made brief reference to 1922 – 25, but the best fully incorporated this period into their argument. Answering the question set, including the full chronological span, is very important to reaching the higher levels.

**3 To what extent was Stalin's rule based on popular support?**

Strong responses were clear that the statement referred to widespread support among the population of the Soviet Union and were able to explain why this might be the case. There was some perceptive comment about how Stalin's policies might be popular, at least for some of the time, among some of the people. Weaker responses spent time explaining why Stalin's policies were not popular. There was also a view that the success of Stalin's propaganda campaign was a reason for popularity, although some felt that it would not have been necessary with true public support. Terror was commonly used as a counter argument, often in some depth which could be to the detriment of the line of reasoning being put forward. Weaker responses also did not provide much evidence to support the statement, relying instead on detailed narrative accounts of the purges, or to spend time detailing Stalin's rise to power. The latter approach tended to result in irrelevant material being presented.

**4 Evaluate the reasons why democracy came to an end in Germany in 1934.**

Strong responses were focused on the issue of democracy, rather than being a standard response to why Hitler came to power. There were valid arguments about the nature and inherent weakness of Weimar democracy, the failures of its leaders to cope with the economic crisis after 1929 and the mistakes of Hindenburg and von Papen in 1933. The appeal of the Nazis in highlighting these issues, offering scapegoats and solutions was also part of many responses. However, those that ended in January 1933 were not engaging fully with the question, and Hitler's actions from then onwards formed part of the stronger responses. A minority only dealt with this period and failed to offer any explanation of how Hitler came to be in the position to establish his dictatorship.

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

**5 Assess the impact of the Warren Court on the lives of African Americans in the 1950s.**

Relatively few candidates answered questions on the American section of this paper. The commonly used example was the Brown vs Board of Education ruling, which many candidates were aware brought de jure segregation in schools to an end. Stronger responses were aware of the Brown II ruling and that no official timetable for implementation was set down, meaning that integration was often slow. The events in Little Rock in 1957 were often used to show southern opposition to the ruling.

**6 'The US economy was transformed in the 1970s by developments in the Cold War.' How far do you agree?**

Relatively few candidates answered questions on the American section of this paper. Strong responses were able to discuss Vietnam, the arms race and the Oil Crisis to support the statement and understood that the American economy was facing numerous challenges such as inflation in this period. Alternatives such as the revival of economies in Germany and Japan were also offered. Weaker responses failed to address the stated factor at all and were characterised by descriptions of the economic situation without much analysis of why this situation had come about.

**7 'Affirmative action policies in the 1980s improved the lives of minorities.' How far do you agree?**

Few candidates answered questions on the American section of this paper. There were some strong responses which showed knowledge and understanding of examples of Supreme Court decisions, but others displayed a lack of grasp of what was meant by affirmative action policies and were therefore limited in depth and analysis of the issue.

**8 Assess the impact of US policies on Latin America in the period 1950 to 1963.**

Relatively few candidates answered questions on the American section of this paper. There was a general tendency to focus on Cuba, with often great detail on the Cuban Missile Crisis being produced, at the expense of material on Guatemala, which stronger responses showed some knowledge of, and Nicaragua, which was entirely absent from the responses seen.

**Depth Study 3: International History, 1945–1991**

**9 How effective was arms control in the 1960s and 1970s?**

Many candidates were able to produce detailed and analytical responses and knew a great deal about the relevant treaties and agreements, along with their limitations. There was usually a balanced attempt to analyse the effectiveness of each, although some responses neglected this aspect and there must be analysis alongside knowledge at the highest levels. Some responses used examples of continued tension to argue that arms control was ineffective, although using the Cuban Missile Crisis to do so was often a less successful approach.

**10 How far was the USA's ideological determination to defeat the USSR the main cause of the Second Cold War?**

Many candidates were comfortable with the role of neo-conservatism and with the reasons for changing attitudes within the USA. There was often good knowledge of events in the Third World, particularly Africa, and of Afghanistan, which was usually given a central role in the arguments. Although many responses were detailed and provided a range of factors, some fell short in making a clear judgement of how far the stated factor was the best explanation and this hampered their ability to reach the highest levels. Analysis must be given sufficient attention and a specific answer to the question set is required. There were a small number of responses which showed little understanding of the Second Cold War and which spent a good deal of time detailing events from the 1940s and 1950s, in an attempt to explain the initial outbreak of the Cold War.

**11 Assess the reasons for the communist victory in China.**

This question was generally well answered, with candidates weighing up Communist successes, often related to Mao's treatment of peasants and the morale and discipline of his troops in comparison to the corrupt nature of the Nationalist regime and its poorly trained and motivated army. Often, analysis was not as strong as the knowledge employed. To reach the highest levels in questions of this nature, supported judgements about which reasons carried more weight and on what basis that decision has been reached are required.

**12 'Britain's withdrawal from Palestine caused the Arab-Israeli War in 1948.' Assess this view.**

This question was often well answered, with a clear explanation of the reasons for, and impact of British withdrawal, balanced against other factors, such as the role of the combatants in bringing about conflict. There was sometimes a lack of certainty about how far back to go to explain events and detailed discussion of the Balfour Declaration and events of the 1920s was sometimes a hindrance to a clear analysis of the more short-term factors. The strongest responses made valid and perceptive assessments of the role of both the UN and the USA in events.