

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- This assessment focuses on source analysis and evaluation. As such, this should be central to candidates' approach. Candidates should focus on how their historical knowledge of the period helps them to interpret the sources and use this knowledge to comment on the sources in relation to focus of the question.
- When reading sources, candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source and to understand the argument or point of view of the author. This means that the source should be viewed holistically rather than divided into individual sentences or part-sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to that of the whole source.
- It is important to use source content to support points made in both sections of the question paper. Quotations should be precisely selected rather than a section of the source being identified in general.
- 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 need to make sure they leave enough time to complete answers to both questions.

General comments

The entry for this paper, was extremely low and so a detailed report on specific questions is not appropriate. Some relevant general observations are however possible.

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 appreciated that they needed to support their points with precise quotations or direct paraphrases from the relevant sources. However, 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 a confused response with a lack of clarity. Evidence from the sources should be demonstrated with a brief, precise quotation, or paraphrase.

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. This often came about by focusing too narrowly on identifying similar words in each respective source. However, 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 Austrian attitudes to Prussia rather than more generalised similarities and differences between the sources which may be apparent. Although there are marks in the top level for commenting on the sources' usefulness, the candidates should prioritise a focus on making a developed comparison, i.e., identifying similarities and differences backed with precise details from the sources.

Responses should also focus on contextualising the sources and applying historical knowledge. In section **(a)**, some candidates added substantial paragraphs of additional contextual knowledge which were irrelevant to the focus of the question. Candidates should ensure they are only using contextual knowledge which links to the question posed and which explains similarities and differences. This paper requires more than just source comprehension. Candidates must be aware of and able to apply the historical context of the period as shown in the syllabus and be able to deploy this knowledge in an evaluative consideration of the source

material. 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. As such, when explaining these ideas, it is important that candidates explain why this makes the source more or less useful for the question with evidence from contextual knowledge rather than just stating the date or type of source and saying it is unreliable. For example, in **Section C**, using contextual detail about wider German foreign policy aims such as those outlined in the Hossbach Memorandum, could have been used to evaluate the sources and reasons for their differences.

HISTORY

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

General comments

The entry for this paper, was extremely low and so a detailed report on specific questions is not appropriate. Some relevant general observations are however possible.

Almost all candidates did questions from **Section A – Modern Europe 1750-1850**. The overall marks reflected a range of ability in the candidates sitting the paper. Though there were no outstanding responses there were competent responses to most questions from most candidates.

In answering part **(a)** questions most candidates were able to explain a least one relevant reason for events or action and better candidates often provided more factors. Some candidates were able to explain several factors but were unable to demonstrate any overarching link between them thus failing to maximise an opportunity to gain marks.

Part **(b)** questions often showed some understanding of the issues studied and an ability to recount relevant information. However, candidates did not always find it easy to match the information they knew to the specific questions that had been asked. This meant that many answers did not go much beyond relevant description. Some better candidates did manage some analysis with relevant support, but few were able to present an alternative perspective and support it with appropriate detail. This sort of response was most common amongst the candidates who showed some solid grasp of the topics they had studied.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/32 Interpretations Questions</p>

Key messages

- The question asks about the extract and what one can learn from it. The answer should therefore focus on what the extract says, and not on what happened in the Cold War.
- The task for candidates is to detect the historian's interpretation, and to use the extract to explain how the interpretation can be inferred from what it says. This means that candidates should explain how the historian indicates who or what is being blamed. Summarising what the extract says, without focus on explaining the interpretation, is not addressing the task.
- Length of answer is not a criterion used to judge quality. A concise but focused answer is always better than a lengthy response which fails to focus properly on the given extract and the interpretation it contains.

General comments

Many of the answers lacked a consistent focus on the interpretation. Most started by summarising what they saw as the historian's approach (intentionalist, post-revisionist etc.) and who/what was being blamed, but the quality and relevance of what followed this was variable. In the weakest responses, the rest of the answer consisted either of a recitation of events, with the extract used only as a source of references which were then contextually developed. Other responses summarised or paraphrased what the extract said, without reference to the historian and who/what was being blamed. These responses did not address the question. Some slightly stronger responses included valid material to make explicit points about blame and how this was indicated by what the historian wrote, though this constituted only a small amount of the total answer. Only a minority of answers had a consistent focus based on selecting appropriate material to support explicit points about the issue of blame. Most candidates could detect the approach the historian was adopting, which indicated that comprehension of the extract was not an issue, and that any weaknesses in the script were actually flaws in technique. There were additionally a few answers, which, although containing clear arguments for a particular interpretation, were undermined by misunderstanding, either of the historian's arguments, or of what characterises a particular historical approach

Comments on specific questions

There were too few candidates for meaningful comments on individual questions to be made.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/42 Depth Study</p>

Key messages

- The best responses demonstrated the ability to tailor their knowledge to the specific demands of the question. For example, see the comments on **Questions 2** and **3** below. It is important that candidates answer the question set.
- Providing a balanced response remains crucial for success. Candidates generally understand that alternative arguments need to be used, and this was seen in **Questions 9** and **12**, for example.
- Good chronological knowledge is vital when questions specify a particular time period. See comments on **Question 1** for further exemplification.
- Using the question to determine what criteria will be used to make judgements in good practice. This was seen in the best responses to **Question 2**.
- Command words such as assess, analyse evaluate are used in questions set on Paper 4 of 9489 and candidates should be able to respond effectively to gain marks for AO2 in particular.

General comments

Most responses answered questions from **Sections A** and **C**, with **Questions 1, 2, 3** and **9** being most popular. A smaller number responded to **Section B**.

All candidates understood the rubric and answered two questions from the same section. There was a clear understanding that responses should be structured into paragraphs, employing introductions and conclusions and that they should aim for balanced analysis. Better responses considered the relative significance of different factors throughout their essays and aimed to develop a clear line of reasoning. Others left their analysis to the conclusion. The extent of supporting material is important for AO1 marks, although the more successful responses carefully select which information is relevant to the specific enquiry and thereby ensure that their answer directly addresses the wording of the question. In **Question 3**, not all candidates were clear about the extent of 'control' that the Nazi regime achieved over the Christian churches and instead discussed the degree to which policies were successful. Similarly, references to consistency were important in answering **Question 2**.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Assess the reasons why Mussolini was able to consolidate his power in Italy in the years 1922 to 1925.

A relatively popular question within **Section A**. The better responses stuck firmly to the question and the stipulated time period, avoiding the temptation to discuss how Mussolini came to power in 1922. The concept of consolidation of power was generally understood and there was good knowledge of the political devices, such as the Grand Council of Fascism and the Acerbo Law, used by Mussolini. References to the murder of Matteotti were more convincing when linked to the subsequent Aventine Secession. Other explanations included Mussolini's courting of the Catholic Church, although chronological inaccuracy in some responses led to the inclusion of the Concordat. Valid discussion of propaganda, terror and the popularity of Mussolini's foreign policy actions such as in Corfu also gained credit.

Question 2

Discuss the view that Stalin had no consistent foreign policy between 1928 and 1941.

Relatively few responses were seen to this question, but those that tackled it did so with confidence and grasped its demands. Starting with an assessment of Stalin's aims in foreign policy was a successful approach and allowed candidates to explore whether those aims remained consistent and whether it was simply the methods employed which changed. Examples given included the use of the League of Nations, Cominform, involvement in the Spanish Civil War and the Nazi-Soviet Pact. There was also some valid discussion of Stalin's approach towards the Chinese Communist Party.

Question 3

'The Nazi regime was largely successful in controlling the Christian churches in Germany.' Evaluate this view.

This was the most popular question in **Section A** and was generally answered with a fair degree of competence. A good starting point here was to differentiate between the Christian churches and Nazi policy towards them. The best analysis related to Nazi control of the churches, indicating that candidates had carefully noted the precise wording of the question. Strong responses tended to incorporate the Concordat with the Catholic church as an example of control, before going on to examine examples of opposition such as von Galen's campaign against euthanasia and Pius XI's 1937 encyclical *With Burning Anxiety*. In relation to Protestantism in Germany, the formation of the Reich Church under Müller was employed to agree with the proposition of success, balanced by discussion of the Confessing Church and the roles of Niemöller and Bonhoeffer. Useful arguments were produced by some candidates which related to the continued significance of Christianity in many sections of German society. It was rare to read material on the German Faith Movement and some candidates lost focus on the demands of the question by straying into material on antisemitism in Nazi Germany.

Question 4

Evaluate the reasons for the failure of the General Strike in Britain in 1926.

Too few responses to this question were seen to make comments appropriate.

Section B

Question 5

Evaluate how successful the Civil Rights Movement was in the 1950s.

Too few responses to this question were seen to make comments appropriate.

Question 6

'Economic issues were the most serious domestic challenge faced by the Ford administration.' Assess this view.

Too few responses to this question were seen to make comments appropriate.

Question 7

'The New Right in the 1980s was mainly motivated by a desire to reverse social change since the 1960s.' Discuss this view.

Too few responses to this question were seen to make comments appropriate.

Question 8

Analyse the reasons why US governments supported the Bretton Woods system from 1944.

Too few responses to this question were seen to make comments appropriate.

Section C

Question 9

Assess how far the nuclear arms race prevented conflict between the superpowers during the Cold War in the period 1950 to 1991.

This question was the most popular and was answered by every candidate who attempted Section C. There was a general understanding of the contribution that the nuclear arms race played in preventing conflict, with Mutually Assured Destruction commonly used by candidates as an example. Good answers also considered examples where conflict might have broken out, but did not, such as Hungary and Cuba, although there was some discussion of how the presence of nuclear weapons brought about tension in the latter case. Candidates sought to achieve balance in two ways and either was credited. They could explore examples of how conflict did occur, through proxy wars, such as Korea or Vietnam. Alternatively, some candidates sought to explore other reasons for the absence of direct conflict between the superpowers in this period, for instance bringing in attempts at arms reduction or the attitudes of individual leaders.

Question 10

Assess how far the growth of nationalist movements helped Indochina to gain independence from France by 1954.

This was a relatively popular question within **Section C**. Although some responses acknowledged that French Indochina covered Laos and Cambodia, in addition to parts of Vietnam, candidates tended to rely solely on material which related to nationalist movements in the latter. Consequently, the range of material employed was narrower than it might have been. Explanations generally erroneously referred to the Viet Cong rather than the Viet Minh and lacked depth of knowledge of this period. Candidates also found it difficult to offer convincing alternative explanations, describing US support for France and the Battle of Dien Bien Phu, without linking them effectively to the question.

Question 11

Evaluate the role of superpower involvement in the civil war in Mozambique in the years 1977 to 1992.

Too few responses to this question were seen to make comments appropriate.

Question 12

Analyse how far the UN decision to partition Palestine in 1947 caused the Palestine conflict of 1947–48.

This was a relatively popular question within **Section C**. Candidates were generally able to explain the background to the UN decision and to offer reasons for it and its consequences, with some showing strong levels of knowledge to explain its significance. Alternatives, in the form of exploration of the roles of Britain and the US, allowed for balanced analysis. Other valid explanations incorporated consideration of the activities of Jewish groups such as Irgun and Haganah and their contribution also received credit.