

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/11 Document question</p>
--

Key messages

- This assessment focusses 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.
- When reading sources candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source 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.
- 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. Comments about source evaluation should always be related to answering the question posed.
- Candidates need to make sure they leave enough time to complete answers to both questions.
- Candidates must read the sources very carefully, making sure that they understand both the details of the source and its overall argument.

General comments

Most responses demonstrated understanding that the **part (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. Most candidates used source content to support their answer by providing relevant quotations from the sources. The most perceptive responses understood the nuance offered in some of the sources and recognised where it was possible to use a source for both support and challenge. For example, in each of the **part (a)** questions candidates were required to make comparisons based on 'the power of the Tsar' in **Question 1(a)**, 'the position of the South at the outbreak of war' in **Question 2(a)** and 'accounts of the Long March' in **Question 3(a)**.

Weaker approaches to **part (a)** were often rushed and in some 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. Responses which completed **part (b)** first often found it difficult to refocus on **part (a)**.

Candidates should be careful to look at the whole source not dissected sections of it when making links to the questions and further judgements. Responses should also focus on placing the sources in context and applying historical knowledge. 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.

Many responses contain lengthy sections about bias or reliability, often based on stock evaluation. In **part (a)** candidates need to decide how the sources are similar and different and to consider why the similarities or differences exist. For instance, in **Question 1(a)** it was possible to use contextual knowledge about Rasputin's influence on the Tsar and Tsarina, or about the situation facing Russia in the First World War to explain the similarities between the sources. In **part (b)**, it is useful for candidates to ask themselves whether their knowledge of the topic supports the claims made in the sources. If so, that might increase the value of a source. Alternatively, if a source was written for a specific purpose or audience, they should consider how that affects its weight as evidence. For example, in **Question 3(b)** some used their knowledge of the Rectification campaigns to assess whether what was argued in Source D was a valid assessment of Mao's

leadership. The weight of the evidence could then be considered to decide if it weakened or strengthened the support or challenge element of the answer.

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. 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.

Where answers were weak this often resulted from overlooking specific phrases. Weaker responses often asserted similarities or differences for points which were not comparable. If it is not possible to support the comparison it cannot be creditworthy. In some responses, the similarity or difference was asserted with no support offered from either source. If the comparisons cannot be properly validated, they cannot be credited.

In some weaker responses there was the inclusion of long sections of quotation. 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 quotations, or paraphrases.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: European Option: The Russian Revolution, 1894–1921

Question 1

(a) Study Sources A and B. How far do Sources A and B agree about the power of the Tsar?

Most responses made at least one relevant comparison between the sources. The most frequently discussed similarity was that both sources showed that the Tsar's power was limited as Rasputin manipulated him. This was supported with effective use of source details. Source A showed Rasputin as a much larger presence, dominating the Tsar and Tsarina. Meanwhile, Source B showed the Tsarina pressing the Tsar to follow Rasputin's advice. A considerable proportion of responses did not link their comments on the similarity between the sources to the 'power of the Tsar' and instead made comparisons about the role or power of Rasputin. To be effective, an inference showing what this meant for the Tsar's power was needed. Identifying valid differences was addressed effectively by many candidates. Most realised that while the Tsar appeared powerless in Source A, many likening the way he was portrayed to a puppet, Source B showed he was 'the Lord and Master in Russia' which gave the impression of a strong ruler. Weaker responses frequently resulted from overlooking the requirement to focus on the question. There was some misreading Source A, seeing Rasputin as a protector and friend of the Tsar rather than understanding the sinister way in which he was portrayed. A considerable proportion of approaches included background knowledge, or a commentary on provenance or reliability, which did not explain either the similarities or differences between the sources.

(b) Read all of the sources. 'The Tsarina was responsible for the unpopularity of the Tsarist regime in Russia.' How far do these sources agree?

Most approaches gave a two-sided response to the question and there was evidence of effective source use in many answers. Most responses identified Source D as a support source, focusing on the comment that '*No officer or private soldier has a good word to say for the Tsarina...all genuinely hate her.*' Sources A and B could be argued as support sources. Many noted that Source A suggested that the Tsarina was complicit in Rasputin having more power than the Tsar and as people hated Rasputin, they also hated the Tsarina. Contextual knowledge was used to good effect to explain and develop this argument in stronger responses. However, some argued that Source A was a challenge source and that it showed that Rasputin was really to blame for the unpopularity of the Tsarist regime. Either argument was acceptable if properly explained and linked to the question. Many considered Source B to be convincing evidence that the Tsarina was to blame as she was trying to influence the Tsar to follow Rasputin's wishes. A few responses demonstrated a weak understanding of the context by claiming that the source showed that the Duma were responsible for the unpopularity of the regime. Source C was a challenge source. It did not mention the Tsarina and instead blamed the government for the unpopularity of the regime. This was acceptable as the government could be argued as a separate factor. A few candidates mistakenly read the reference to the government as meaning the Tsarina and this sometimes resulted in a one-sided argument. A small number of responses mistakenly concluded that Source C was

irrelevant. None of the sources will be 'irrelevant', as sources are selected so that they can be used to support and challenge the statement in the question. Whilst contextual knowledge was sometimes used to good effect, for instance to help explain the message of Source A, it was rarely used to evaluate the sources. Many answers contained a paragraph on the provenance of the sources, but most attempts to evaluate were generic, often stating that a source was biased or unreliable because it was from a speech or letter without any links to the context or the question.

Section B: American Option: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861–77

Question 2

- (a) **Read Sources A and D. Compare and contrast the views about the position of the South at the outbreak of war.**

Many responses identified a similarity between the sources by explaining that both showed that the South was better prepared in terms of arms or military experience. In Source A it was argued that *'every village bristled with bayonets'*, Source D supported this by claiming that *'The Confederates had the great advantage in the familiarity of their people in the use of guns.'* A considerable proportion of responses also pointed out a difference between the sources in the level of support in the South for the upcoming war. Source A argued that there were *'fears about the wisdom of secession'* while Source D commented on the *'unanimous'* support of the Southern press for secession and war. There was some misreading of elements of the sources which meant that attempts to compare were less effective. For instance, the reference to the South being *'ill-prepared'* in Source A was taken out of context in many responses. Effective responses were able to make comparisons between the North and the South which were relevant. However, comparisons about Lincoln were made which were not related to the question. Stronger responses offered support from the sources to explain and develop their points. However, there were some who asserted that the sources were similar or different but did not provide relevant material from both sources to support their comparison. Less successful approaches wrote about each of the sources in turn without making a link between them. In addition, some responses added a paragraph of contextual knowledge, or a discussion of the provenance and reliability, which did not serve the needs of the question.

- (b) **Read all of the sources. 'Lincoln was an able war leader.' How far do the sources support this view?**

Many approaches made effective use of the sources and produced a balanced answer. Source B was used as a challenge source as it complained that Lincoln was likely *'too indecisive and too much of a coward'* to punish Frémont for disobedience. A number of successful responses explained that an able war leader would have to enforce discipline more effectively than this source implied. A small number of candidates argued that the source was not entirely negative as it recognised that if Lincoln's orders were followed, Jackson's rebel forces would have been destroyed. Source A could be used as a support or challenge source. On the challenge side, Lincoln's ability as a war leader was doubted as he *'had no plan of action and wasted opportunities'*. However, many answers successfully noted that the source also commented on Lincoln's political abilities and that these were necessary to be a good war leader. Source C was seen as a supporting source as the writer, whilst admitting that Lincoln faced challenges, praised his attitude in being determined to succeed. Source D could also be argued both ways. Although it explained that Lincoln had no military experience, it admitted that he *'had the determination and vision'* to succeed and was able to make the best of the advantages of the North. Stronger responses were able to use some of the sources on both sides of the argument. However, a number of less successful approaches were characterised by one-sided answers. Some approaches attempted to consider the authorship of the sources and comment on their reliability, but this was not always successful. Weaker answers tended to use stock evaluation. For example, Source C was argued as unreliable because it was from a Union officer who was bound to favour Lincoln. Alternatively, some concluded that Source C was not biased as the officer was writing to his wife and had no reason to lie. Neither of these comments carry weight as evaluation. The most effective answers used contextual knowledge to evaluate the sources and decide which side of the argument carried most weight.

Section C: International Option: China and Japan, 1912–45

Question 3

- (a) **Read Sources B and C. Compare and contrast the accounts of the Long March given by Sources B and C.**

Many answers correctly identified the similarity that both sources argued that the Long March was good propaganda for the Communists. Most supported the similarity with reference to details in each of the sources. For instance, Source B described the Long March as a *'propaganda force'* while Source C referred to it as *'the biggest armed propaganda tour in history.'* A small number of responses misread *'exploit'* as a negative comment on the Long March. The most frequently used approach argued that the differences between Source B and Source C was that while Source B was entirely positive about the Long March, Source C contained some negative comments. Many responses included comments that Source C wrote about the Red Army *'making bitter enemies'* or seizing duck farms and eating duck until they were *'simply disgusted'* as a counter to the positive view in Source B. Some approaches attempted to draw comparisons about Mao, but these were not relevant to the question which was focused on *'accounts'* of the Long March. Weaker responses often mismatched details or made assertions about similarities or differences which were not supported by details from either source. A number of responses included contextual knowledge or comments on the reliability of the sources, these would have been more effective if they had been used to explain the reasons for the similarities or differences between the sources.

- (b) **Read all of the sources. How far do the sources support the view that Mao Zedong showed all the qualities needed to be a good leader of the Chinese people?**

Many responses made effective use of the sources to support and challenge the idea that Mao showed the necessary leadership qualities to be a good leader. Source A was used as a challenge source, quotations such as *'Mao Zedong is extremely devious'* and that he used *'political accusations to strike at comrades'* demonstrating that he was not a suitable leader. A small number of approaches attempted to argue that these characteristics made Mao a good leader, but this was not the argument of the source and was not credited. Source B was used as a support source, although, as some pointed out Mao wrote this himself, so it was bound to be positive. Many answers commented that he had led the Red Army to victory through *'untold difficulties'* and therefore clearly had good leadership abilities. Source C was seen as a support source with many responses highlighting the comments in the source that Mao was an *'accomplished scholar and military and political strategist of considerable genius'* to develop their argument. Some approaches focused on the idea that Mao was *'plain-living and plain speaking'* and tried to argue this as a challenge. However, in the context of the Long March these attributes would be positive in the eyes of the Chinese peasantry. Some approaches used Source D to argue both sides of the question. Evidence for good leadership skill was seen in the comments such as *'Mao was an inspiring leader'* who had brought about improvements in many areas such as education and agriculture. However, more effective responses also noted the negative implications in the source such as there being *'fixed elections, murder and immorality'*. Some effective answers used contextual knowledge to expand on these ideas, for instance by referring to the Rectification campaigns. However, this knowledge was not always used to consider the weight of Source D as evidence in response to the question. Weaker responses sometimes resulted from misreading elements of the sources or claiming that Source B was irrelevant to the question. Many answers contained a final paragraph which commented on the provenance, bias, or reliability of the sources, which was based on stock evaluation and the sources were not evaluated to assess which side of the argument was to be preferred.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/12 Document question</p>
--

Key messages

- This assessment focusses 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.
- When reading sources candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source 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.
- 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. Comments about source evaluation should always be related to answering the question posed.
- Candidates need to make sure they leave enough time to complete answers to both questions.
- Candidates must read the sources very carefully, making sure that they understand both the details of the source and its overall argument.

General comments

Most responses demonstrated understanding that the **part (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. Most candidates used source content to support their answer by providing relevant quotations from the sources. The most perceptive responses understood the nuance offered in some of the sources and recognised where it was possible to use a source for both support and challenge.

Weaker approaches to **part (a)** were often rushed and in some 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. Responses which completed **part (b)** first often found it difficult to refocus on **part (a)**.

Candidates should be careful to look at the whole source not dissected sections of it when making links to the questions and further judgements. Responses should also focus on placing the sources in context and applying historical knowledge. 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.

Many responses contain lengthy sections about bias or reliability, often based on stock evaluation. In **part (a)** candidates need to decide how the sources are similar and different and to consider why the similarities or differences exist. In **part (b)**, it is useful for candidates to ask themselves whether their knowledge of the topic supports the claims made in the sources. If so, that might increase the value of a source. Alternatively, if a source was written for a specific purpose or audience, they should consider how that affects its weight as evidence. The weight of the evidence could then be considered to decide if it weakened or strengthened the support or challenge element of the answer.

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 D. Here successful responses used the context of the Washington Naval

Conference to comment on the purpose of the Japanese speaker and explain this in relation to the question of aggression. 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.

Where answers were weak this often resulted from overlooking specific phrases. Weaker responses often asserted similarities or differences for points which were not comparable. If it is not possible to support the comparison it cannot be creditworthy. In some responses, the similarity or difference was asserted with no support offered from either source. If the comparisons cannot be properly validated, they cannot be credited.

In some weaker responses there was the inclusion of long sections of quotation. 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 quotations, or paraphrases.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: European Option: The Russian Revolution, 1894–1921

Question 1

(a) How far do Sources C and D agree about the events of the February Revolution?

This question focused on the events of the February Revolution and asked candidates to identify similarities and differences in the two sources. The best responses to this question used their historical knowledge of the February Revolution to interpret ideas from the sources. As such they were able to recognise similarities and differences in the reactions of the police and military units as well as other ideas about the spontaneity of the event. Weaker responses often lacked clear points of comparison because of lack of knowledge about the events of the February Revolution. This meant that there was sometimes confusion about how the actions of the police or military were described in the sources.

(b) ‘The demand for revolutionary change in Russia was brought about by the First World War.’ How far do these sources support this view?

This question was generally well attempted, and responses showed an ability to use the sources to support and challenge the assertion given in the question. Many effective responses also recognised the complexity in some of the sources which meant they could both support and challenge the statement. For example, in **Source C** where elements of anti-war feeling were displayed alongside economic challenges. The best responses were able to use their historical knowledge of the period to explain why this was the case in 1917 in Russia. Most candidates were able to recognise both support and challenge in the sources and good responses used clear quotations or paraphrases to support their points. This was done most effectively when specific sections of the sources were chosen and then explained or analysed further. There were also a few responses which started to use the provenance of the sources to weigh up the evidence they gave. This meant that answers began to evaluate sources for use in the question. However, there were a number of weaker answers which struggled to contextualise the sources because of a lack of knowledge about the arguments surrounding the First World War and revolutionary feeling in Russia. The most effective responses were characterised by a close understanding of the syllabus and the period before attempting to answer these source questions.

Section B, the American Option: Civil War and Reconstruction

Question 2

(a) Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about Lincoln’s views on slavery.

Effective responses could clearly draw similarities and differences between the two sources. Candidates should be encouraged to read the sources they are given carefully rather than assuming that they know what the content will be from the attributions or making presumptions about Lincoln’s views. The use of contextual knowledge, and using the dates of the sources, was vital here. For example, Lincoln’s views appear to have changed in the sources but looking more closely it is possible to explain why this has happened and how the opinions given in Source A are from a particular context. Responses with the best historical understanding of the period were able to analyse the sources most successfully. Answers which avoided writing long descriptions, which

were not strictly related to the question, were the most effective, as these descriptions rarely added to the quality of the response.

(b) 'There was strong support in the North for emancipation.' How far do the sources support this view?

This question required effective responses to understand what the phrase 'strong support' might mean in the context of emancipation and discussions surrounding it during the Civil War. This was often well attempted and there were many responses which were able to show how the sources both supported and challenged the assertion in the question. The most effective answers also showed a clear grasp of relevant contextual knowledge which helped the analysis and expansion of the sources. This was most often done by using Sources B and/or Source C to comment on the views of emancipation from different groups. This meant that they were beginning to read the sources beyond face value. However, there were still a number of responses which misunderstood the meaning of the sources because of a lack of accurate contextual knowledge. For example, some answers struggled to interpret the cabinet discussions in Source B because they did not have the required knowledge of the differing views in Lincoln's cabinet. Although many responses described the provenance of the sources using stock evaluation, few used this to test how useful the sources were when answering the question. Responses should concentrate on making clear comments about how the nature, origin, or purpose impacts on the utility of the source.

Section C, International Option: China and Japan, 1912–1945

Question 3

(a) Compare, and contrast Japan's views of the Paris Peace Conference expressed in Sources B and C.

This question required a focus on Japan's views of the Paris Peace Conference. However, some approaches confused this with trying to look at wider issues surrounding Japanese aggression and opinions of them – this was not credit worthy. It should be remembered that **part (a)** questions have a specific focus which should be followed by candidates. Most approaches showed recognition of both similarities and differences in the sources as detailed in the mark scheme. Effective responses were able to use knowledge of the period to contextualise these sources and clarify or explain the positions taken in them. The best responses began to use their knowledge of the period to explain the differences between them using provenance which went beyond rote evaluation.

(b) How far do the sources support the view that, by the end of the First World War, Japan was becoming aggressive in asserting its international status?

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 different views of Japanese aggression in the period, and the best responses began to use their contextual knowledge to do this. Many answers were able to use all four sources to support and challenge the assertion in the question and used evidence from the sources to clearly support their arguments. The best answers used their knowledge of the period to evaluate the sources and explain how this evaluation made them more or less useful when answering the question. These answers went beyond making stock phrases on the origin of sources.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/13 Document question</p>
--

Key messages

- This assessment focusses 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.
- When reading sources candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source 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.
- 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. Comments about source evaluation should always be related to answering the question posed.
- Candidates need to make sure they leave enough time to complete answers to both questions.
- Candidates must read the sources very carefully, making sure that they understand both the details of the source and its overall argument.

General comments

Most responses demonstrated understanding that the **part (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. Most candidates used source content to support their answer by providing relevant quotations from the sources. The most perceptive responses understood the nuance offered in some of the sources and recognised where it was possible to use a source for both support and challenge.

Weaker approaches to **part (a)** were often rushed and in some 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. Responses which completed **part (b)** first often found it difficult to refocus on **part (a)**.

Candidates should be careful to look at the whole source not dissected sections of it when making links to the questions and further judgements. Responses should also focus on placing the sources in context and applying historical knowledge. 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.

Many responses contain lengthy sections about bias or reliability, often based on stock evaluation. In **part (a)** candidates need to decide how the sources are similar and different and to consider why the similarities or differences exist. In **part (b)**, it is useful for candidates to ask themselves whether their knowledge of the topic supports the claims made in the sources. If so, that might increase the value of a source. Alternatively, if a source was written for a specific purpose or audience, they should consider how that affects its weight as evidence. The weight of the evidence could then be considered to decide if it weakened or strengthened the support or challenge element of the answer.

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. Here successful responses used the context of Mao's essay on the May 4th movement to discuss his opinions and the utility of the source and apply relevant historical knowledge. 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.

Where answers were weak this often resulted from overlooking specific phrases. Weaker responses often asserted similarities or differences for points which were not comparable. If it is not possible to support the comparison it cannot be creditworthy. In some responses, the similarity or difference was asserted with no support offered from either source. If the comparisons cannot be properly validated, they cannot be credited.

In some weaker responses there was the inclusion of long sections of quotation. 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 quotations, or paraphrases.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: European Option: The Russian Revolution, 1894–1921

Question 1

- (a) **How far do these sources agree about Nicholas II's decision to take command of the Russian forces?**

The best responses to this question used historical knowledge of the actions of Tsar Nicholas during the First World War to interpret ideas from the sources. They were able to recognise similarities and differences in the opinions of the sources. Weaker responses struggled to make such clear points of comparison because of lack of knowledge about the period and did not apply the knowledge to sources, especially visual ones. In addition, some answers misunderstood the cartoon, and did not recognise many of the visual cues about Tsardom and Russia which were being portrayed. The most effective responses were prepared to use historical knowledge to interpret a range of sources. Strong answers were able to account for the differences between the sources by using their historical knowledge to contextualise. For example, the best answers were able to discuss the purpose of the cartoon in Source D and the importance of its British origin.

- (b) **'It was likely that Russia would be defeated in the First World War.' How far do these sources support this view?**

This question was generally well answered, and responses showed an ability to use the sources to support and challenge the assertion given in the question. The best responses were able to use their historical knowledge of the period to explain why the sources held particular views and how useful they were in answering the question. Most answers were able to recognise both support and challenge in the sources and strong responses used clear quotations or paraphrases to support their points. This was done most effectively when specific sections of the sources were chosen and then explained or analysed further. There were also a few responses which started to use the provenance of the sources to weigh up the evidence they gave. This meant that answers began to evaluate sources for use in the question. However, there a number of weaker responses which struggled to contextualise the sources because they did not know enough about the arguments surrounding the First World War and revolutionary feeling in Russia.

Section B: The American Option: Civil War and Reconstruction

Question 2

- (a) **To what extent do these two sources agree about the leadership of President Davis?**

Effective responses dealt with this question well and could clearly draw similarities and differences between the two sources. Candidates should be encouraged to read the sources they are given carefully rather than assuming that they know what the content will be from the attributions or making presumptions. The use of contextual knowledge, and the dates of the sources, was vital here. For example, the later source was clearly written in a different context to the one in the middle of the Civil War and the best responses recognised and discussed this. The most successful answers had the best historical understanding of the period and were able to analyse the sources most successfully. Answers which avoided writing long descriptions, which were not strictly related to the question, were the most effective, as these kinds of descriptions rarely added to the quality of the response.

- (b) **'The Confederate Army had little chance of victory.'** How far do the sources support this view?

This question required understanding of what the phrase 'little chance' might mean in the context of the Civil War. This was often well attempted and there were many responses which were able to show how the sources both supported and challenged the assertion in the question. Effective answers also showed a clear grasp of relevant contextual knowledge which helped them expand on and analyse the sources. This was most often done by using Sources A and/or Source D to comment on the views of Southern chances from different perspectives and times. This showed some understanding of the need to read the sources beyond face value. However, there were still a number of responses which misunderstood the meaning of the sources because they did not have an accurate grasp of the period. Although a number of responses described the provenance of the sources using stock evaluation, very few used this to test how useful the sources were when answering the question. Responses should concentrate on making clear comments about how the nature, origin, or purpose impacts on the utility of the source for answering the question.

Section C: International Option: China and Japan, 1912–1945

Question 3

- (a) **Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence of the impact of the May the Fourth demonstrations.**

This question required answers to focus on the impact of the May the Fourth demonstrations in both source extracts. Some responses confused this with trying to look at the causes of the movement – this was not credit worthy. It should be remembered that **part (a)** questions have a specific focus which should be followed by candidates. Most approaches were able to recognise both similarities and differences in the sources as detailed in the mark scheme. Effective responses were able to use their knowledge of the period to contextualise these sources and clarify or explain the positions taken in them. The best responses began to use their knowledge of the period to explain the differences between them using provenance which went beyond rote evaluation. Overall, this question was well attempted.

- (b) **How far do the sources support the view that Chinese nationalism was the main cause of the May the Fourth demonstrations?**

Most responses effectively engaged with the sources to offer support and challenge for the assertion stated in the question. There was plenty of scope to discuss different views of Chinese nationalism in the period, and the best answers began to use their contextual knowledge to do this. However, there were also a significant number of responses that struggled with the term nationalism. This led some to confuse what the sources were saying especially Source C where the mention of 'national betrayal' by Mao was used to claim nationalism. It was also clear that some responses had not heard of Dr Sun in this context and could not use the content of the source effectively. Many approaches used all four sources to support and challenge the assertion in the question. Most of these used evidence from the sources to clearly support their argument. The best answers used their knowledge of the period to evaluate the sources and explain how this evaluation made them more or less useful when answering the question. These answers went beyond making stock phrases on the origin of sources.

HISTORY

Paper 9489/21
Outline study

Key messages

- Candidates should always read the question carefully to make sure they have fully understood the requirements. Candidates must also be fully aware of the meaning of time-related phrases and dates used in the questions. For example, if an end date is given, for example, 'by 1850', references to events/figures after this date are not relevant to the question posed.
- In **part (a)** questions, it is important to recognise the difference between describing actions, events or intentions that affected something and explaining exactly why these things happened or what effect they had on the outcome. Candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a range of factors to show how they are connected and reach a supported conclusion.
- In **Part (b)** questions, candidates should address the specific question rather than writing about the topic in general terms, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported. The strongest responses reach a supported judgement about the extent to which the sources support the statement and weighs the evidence in order to do this.

General comments

Many candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of the topics that had been studied and produced well-constructed and analytical essays. Weaker responses often included a lot of factual detail but struggled to fit that detail into an answer to the specific question that had been set.

Part (a) questions are about causation. Effective answers were distinguished by detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. They focused clearly on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, both long and short-term, demonstrating how they were connected and produced reasoned conclusions. Most candidates made the identification and explanation of some relevant causal factors. Less successful answers tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. The weaker responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology; they were over-reliant on vague and generalised assertions lacking appropriate factual support.

For **part (b)** questions most candidates were able to offer some explanation of events. Most recognised the need to consider different possibilities and made some effort at providing details to support different interpretations of events. Good responses included detailed knowledge of the topics and were characterised by carefully considered and well-supported analysis of alternative perspectives. The best responses were able to compare the relative strengths of different arguments and draw reasoned conclusions in answer to the specific questions that had been set. Other responses provided arguments which considered only one interpretation of the issue. Responses which were less successful fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question, or relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance (often by ignoring a timeframe given in the question).

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Modern Europe, 1750–1921

Question 1: France, 1774–1814

(a) Explain why Louis XVI issued the edict of 24 January 1789, summoning the Estates General.

Strong responses included several reasons for the calling of the Estates General (e.g. financial problems facing France; the failure of the Parlements and the Assembly of Notables to provide solutions; growing social unrest occasioned by poor harvests; and rising living costs). These responses could have been improved by showing the connection between the factors. Less successful responses described the composition of the Estates General and/or the events of the summer of 1789 rather than addressing causation.

(b) To what extent was the Directory a failure?

The most successful responses provided a balanced account of the Directory's actions and reached a reasoned judgement about the extent of its failure. Other responses focused on the issue of failure and the relative ease with which the Directory was overthrown by Napoleon in 1799. Less successful answers made generalised points about economic weakness, high taxation and/or confused events from earlier governments with those of the Directory.

Question 2: The Industrial Revolution in Britain, 1750–1850

(a) Explain why there was rapid urbanisation in the period 1750–1850.

There were good responses to this question which explained several factors behind the rapid urbanisation. These include factors such as the developments in agriculture which provided the food to feed a labour force attracted to factories, which had been created because of mechanisation; whilst advances in transport, allowed this food to be transported cheaply and efficiently to the growing urban centres. Weaker responses showed confusion by looking at general industrialisation and so lost the question's focus.

(b) 'The availability of energy sources was the most important reason Britain experienced an Industrial Revolution.' How far do you agree?

Good responses were characterised by high-quality analysis based on the deployment of appropriate factual evidence which aided the development of fully focused and balanced arguments. This meant energy sources were assessed against the roles of agricultural, mechanical, and financial developments in enabling Britain to experience the Industrial Revolution. Other, less successful, responses focused on a single energy source, coal, ignoring the role of waterpower as a vital energy source in providing a motive force for factories. At times, the phrase 'energy sources' was misunderstood, with reference being made to iron ore as an energy source. Confusion was seen, also, in the reference to trains allowing workers to commute to the factories.

Question 3: Liberalism and nationalism in Germany, 1815–71

(a) Explain why the Franco–Prussian War broke out in 1870.

Good knowledge was displayed by many candidates in providing a number of reasons behind the outbreak of the war in 1870. These responses, however, could have been strengthened by showing the connection between the factors that had been explained. Weaker responses demonstrated more limited topic knowledge and identified reasons without developing an explanation.

(b) How strong was German nationalism by 1850?

Responses which were successful achieved this in one of two ways. A balanced assessment of the strength of German nationalism covering the period from 1815–50 or focusing the assessment on the period from 1848–50. The most successful responses displayed a depth of knowledge of the period in the context of fully focused and balanced arguments. Less successful responses ignored the end date set out in the question, 1850, and wrote at length about the role of Bismarck who achieved prominence after this date.

SECTION B: The History of the USA, 1820–1941

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

(a) Explain why the Compromise of 1850 was agreed.

Strong responses showed clear knowledge of the reasons for the 1850 Compromise and were able to identify causes or the terms of the Compromise. However, weaker responses confused 1850 with the Missouri Compromise of 1820 and/or the Kansas-Nebraska Act, 1854.

(b) To what extent was the growing strength of abolitionism the reason for Lincoln’s victory in the 1860 presidential election?

Successful answers provided a balanced assessment supported by a clear knowledge and understanding of the topic. Other, less successful, answers focused on the growing strength of abolitionism and ignored other influences (e. g. the split in the Democratic Party/Lincoln’s abilities/the publicity occasioned by the Lincoln-Douglas debates). Weaker answers also tended to describe the rise of abolitionism and/or made generalised points about Lincoln’s attitude towards slavery.

Question 5: The Gilded Age and Progressive Era, 1870s to 1920

(a) Explain why temperance was a popular idea amongst Progressives.

Good answers explained the link between temperance and the Progressives (concerns with society’s moral fabric and how alcohol impacted families/seeking to cut the link between the controlling influence of the distillers and corrupt politicians at city, state, and national levels). Weaker answers showed confusion over what temperance meant.

(b) ‘New technology was the main cause of industrial growth in the late nineteenth century.’ How far do you agree?

Successful responses were able to provide accurate examples of new technology, along with their inventors, and link them to industrial growth. This was balanced with an examination of other influences such as immigration, patents and access to capital investment. Less successful, responses focused on new technology or other factors, resulting in an imbalanced assessment. Weaker answers often showed confusion over chronology in giving generalised descriptions of railways from earlier in the nineteenth century and/or the development of the assembly line from later in the twentieth century.

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

(a) Explain why the 1920s saw a growth in consumerism.

A number of good responses were seen which identified and explained the causes of consumerism in this period. For example, buying on credit and the growth of advertising. These responses could have been strengthened by showing the connection between the factors explained. Some weaker responses confused stock market speculation, 'buying on the margin', with consumerism and lost the question's focus with descriptions of The Great Crash and subsequent developments in the Great Depression.

- (b) **'The need for a Second New Deal showed that the First had been a failure.' How far do you agree?**

Candidates could have approached the question in a number of ways. Successful answers were able to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the First New Deal; or argue that it was a relative success that was built upon by the Second New Deal. Some responses focused on either the First or Second New Deal, which led to an imbalanced assessment. Weaker answers also tended to describe the Deal/s and/or were confused over which agencies were part of which Deal.

SECTION C: International History, 1870–1945

Question 7: Empire and the emergence of world powers, 1870–1919

- (a) **Explain why Japan's military strength developed rapidly in the later nineteenth century.**

Successful responses explained the roles played by a number of factors (Meiji Restoration/fear of being exploited, like China, by European powers/seeking information about western technology, particularly relating to weaponry) in bringing about the development of Japanese military strength. Weaker responses were able to identify some factors but did not have the depth of knowledge to develop them into explanations. In addition, less focused responses ignored the question's end date, 'later nineteenth century', and wrote about the Anglo–Japanese Alliance and/or the Russo–Japanese War.

- (b) **'Imperial expansion created more cooperation than conflict between the Great Powers before 1914.' How far do you agree?**

Good answers were able to assess imperial expansion of the Great Powers in relation to co-operation and conflict, citing relevant examples of each such as the Berlin Conference in 1884, growing tension between Britain and Germany following the Kruger Telegram and Second Boer War, and the Morocco crises of 1905 and 1911. These responses could have been strengthened by showing the connection between the factors explained. Other answers focused on examples of conflict, producing an imbalanced assessment. Weaker answers tended to describe imperial expansion in a generalised form and/or went beyond the end date of 1914.

Question 8: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1920s

- (a) **Explain why the League of Nations had limited success in the 1920s.**

Successful responses were characterised by the explanation of several factors which limited the League's success (USA not being a member, the need for votes to be unanimous, the notion of it being a 'victors club' or the lack of an army to enforce decisions). Whilst most responses were able to identify a relevant factor, weaker responses went beyond the question's timeframe of '1920s' and wrote about Manchuria and/or Abyssinia.

- (b) **'The peace settlement of 1919–20 succeeded in creating stability in Eastern Europe.' How far do you agree with this statement?**

The key to a successful answer to this question was keeping the geographic focus of 'Eastern Europe.' Successful answers noted that the peace settlement did establish some sound governments amongst its newly created successor states, such as Czechoslovakia, and the creation of Yugoslavia did resolve some pre-war issues in the Balkans. Issues such as the Silesian

coalfields and the Greco–Bulgarian dispute, 1925, showed the role of negotiation in resolving tension in the region. This was balanced by references to problems most of the newly-created countries of Eastern Europe faced – ethnic tensions, weak economies, and political dysfunction. Weaker answers wrote at length about problems between France and Germany created by the peace settlement, as a result, the question’s focus was lost.

Question 9: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1930s

(a) Explain why the Great Depression encouraged the rise of political extremism in Europe.

Strong responses explained the roles played by rising unemployment, economic distress, and the seeming inability of democratic governments to respond effectively, which led to the rise of political extremism; also, references were made to events in Weimar Germany and Spain as further support. Many responses were able to identify at least one factor. Some responses lost their of the 1930s aspect of the question by writing about Mussolini, who had been in power since 1922.

(b) How successful was the Non-Intervention Agreement of August 1936 in preventing foreign involvement in the Spanish Civil War?

Some good responses were seen showing clear knowledge and understanding which led to a balanced assessment of the question. The actions of Germany, Italy, and the USSR with regard to the Nationalists and Republicans were noted alongside that of the volunteer International Brigade. This was balanced by an examination of the British, French, and American approaches to non-intervention. Other responses, however, focused on the lack of success of the Agreement, which whilst containing relevant evidence were imbalanced in their assessment. Some weaker responses were confused as to which sides in the conflict were aided by which foreign power/s and/or referred, incorrectly, to the Spanish-American War of 1898.

HISTORY

Paper 9489/22
Outline Study

Key messages

- Candidates should always read the question carefully to make sure they have fully understood the requirements. Candidates must also be fully aware of the meaning of time-related phrases and dates used in the questions. For example, if an end date is given, for example, 'by 1850', references to events/figures after this date are not relevant to the question posed.
- In **part (a)** questions, it is important to recognise the difference between describing actions, events or intentions that affected something and explaining exactly why these things happened or what effect they had on the outcome. Candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a range of factors to show how they are connected and reach a supported conclusion.
- In **Part (b)** questions, candidates should address the specific question rather than writing about the topic in general terms, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported. The strongest responses reach a supported judgement about the extent to which the sources support the statement and weighs the evidence in order to do this.

General comments

Many candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of the topics that had been studied and produced well-constructed and analytical essays. Weaker responses often included a lot of factual detail but struggled to fit that detail into an answer to the specific question that had been set.

Part (a) questions are about causation. Effective answers were distinguished by detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. They focused clearly on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, both long and short-term, demonstrating how they were connected and produced reasoned conclusions. Most candidates made the identification and explanation of some relevant causal factors. Less successful answers tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. The weaker responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology; they were over-reliant on vague and generalised assertions lacking appropriate factual support.

For **part (b)** questions most candidates were able to offer some explanation of events. Most recognised the need to consider different possibilities and made some effort at providing details to support different interpretations of events. Good responses included detailed knowledge of the topics and were characterised by carefully considered and well-supported analysis of alternative perspectives. The best responses were able to compare the relative strengths of different arguments and draw reasoned conclusions in answer to the specific questions that had been set. Other responses provided arguments which considered only one interpretation of the issue. Responses which were less successful fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question, or relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance (often by ignoring a timeframe given in the question).

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Modern Europe, 1750–1921

Question 1: France, 1774–1814

(a) Explain why the September Massacres of 1792 happened.

The strongest responses were characterised by an understanding of who was massacred in September 1792. Responses which showed this awareness were able to explain why the massacres took place in terms of both internal conflicts and external threats. Weaker responses, however, did not demonstrate this level of understanding and wrote more generally about the problems of France in the period for 1789 to 1792. Such descriptions sometimes managed to identify some of the factors that led to this event but were often generalised.

(b) How far was the passing of the August Decrees in 1789 caused by ideas of the Enlightenment?

The strongest responses showed understanding of the content of the August Decree and used this knowledge to construct effective answers. They provided relevant details of the ideas of different writers and the most successful of these then linked these to the measures adopted by the National Assembly in the August Decrees. Many responses showed some understanding of the Enlightenment, though a few candidates did not fully grasp this, writing mainly about the effects of the American Revolution. Some weaker responses showed confusion regarding the chronology of events, and some responses said little about the events that led to the passing of the Decrees. Therefore, these responses lacked balance.

Question 2: The Industrial Revolution in Britain, 1750–1850

(a) Explain why the Swing riots happened.

Many candidates showed an understanding of the agricultural basis of these disturbances. Stronger responses focussed on the introduction of a new threshing machine coupled with general rural poverty and unemployment. Identifying low wages and poor living conditions, in general, was an acceptable identification of factors. However, many answers tied these so closely to life in towns that they were not creditable as factors of why the Swing riots happened. A number of weaker responses wrote about working conditions in factories and mines and insanitary living conditions in towns without any reference to the rural issues that actually caused the Swing riots.

(b) ‘The factory system was the main reason for the rapid development of industry after 1780.’ To what extent do you agree?

Many candidates demonstrated a good knowledge of this topic and produced some very effective and well-balanced responses. The strongest answers were able to demonstrate the links between factories, transport, and new inventions such as the Steam Engine to show that it was complex web of factors that led to rapid development. For example:

In conclusion I don't fully agree with the statement as I believe the rapid development of industry was due to a number of interconnected factors. Inventions in the textile industry like the flying shuttle and water frame made factories a more efficient way of producing cotton but factories needed a workforce and without the agricultural revolution there would not have been a surplus of working people available to go to work in the factories. Factories themselves grew more rapidly after the steam engine was developed to drive the machines and the development of the steam locomotive allowed the goods produced to be transported quickly over much greater distances thus expanding the market and providing a push factor for further growth of factories. So rapid industrialisation was a result of a complex web of factors in which growth of the factory was an important link.

Weaker responses often included descriptions of the factory system and how it worked and increased production, providing some knowledge of the factory machines that brought this about, though this sort of detail did not add substantially to the analysis. Other factors were considered in varying levels of detail and sometimes links were asserted, but not properly demonstrated.

Question 3: Liberalism and nationalism in Germany, 1815–71

(a) Explain why Bismarck was appointed Minister President of Prussia in 1862.

Good responses recognised that at the centre of this appointment lay the constitutional crisis in Prussia caused by the parliamentary refusal to fund the king's military reforms and that other factors like his loyalty to the crown and his underlying conservatism were simply supporting factors that made him more acceptable to the king. Similarly, the recommendation for Von Roon and other key figures was identified as significant, but in the end contributory idea was that he was the man to get the job done as far as the constitutional confrontation was concerned. Strong responses were able to express this in a clear final judgement. For example:

In conclusion the constitutional crisis is the main reason for his appointment as it directly linked to the king seeing no other alternative to appointing him His previous experience would have helped with this but was less important as other people had similar experience. Likewise sharing similar aims to the king was useful it was not a unique characteristic. The fact that he was seen as the one man who could break the parliamentary deadlock was a product of these other factors and so it was the main reason for his appointment.

Weaker responses tended to write descriptively about Bismarck's ambitions for unification of Germany and his 'Blood and Iron' speech or described what he did in the years following his appointment as Minister President. These responses did not adequately respond to the specific question set.

(b) 'Austrian opposition was the main obstacle to German unification in the period 1815–50.'
How far do you agree with this view?

Many candidates understood the issue of Austria's role in the German Confederation and provided some explanation of Austrian opposition to unification. Most offered some detail on the role of Metternich in holding back any moves towards unification. However, in less successful responses this was not followed up by an effective counterargument. Many candidates were able to identify some moves within Germany towards unification and suggested reasons why these were not very effective. For example, the self-interest of the princes and the lack of interest of the peasants. The Frankfurt parliament was also often identified as a missed opportunity because of lack of unity on what form unification should take. Some weaker responses went beyond the 1850 end point of the question and provided details of Austro-Prussian conflict into the 1850s and 1860s. This material could not be credited.

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

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

(a) Explain why the Fugitive Slave Act of 1850 was difficult to implement.

Most candidates showed good knowledge and understanding of this topic and were able to explain, to some extent, that this Act faced fundamental opposition from many in the North. Effective answers recognised that at some level it was about opposition to slavery. The most successful answers were able to show that at some level it was about the imposition by federal government of an essentially unfair law. Strong responses were able to provide examples of specific cases and events that demonstrate the difficulty in implementing the Act, such as the case of Anthony Burns and the Boston Slave Riot. There were also many useful accounts of the purpose and success of the Underground Railway.

(b) ‘The election of Lincoln was the reason the Civil War began in April 1861.’ How far do you agree with this view?

Successful responses usually recognised that Lincoln’s election was a trigger event that tipped the United States over the edge towards a Civil War. A sound introduction can often set the parameters for a successful answer. For example:

The main reason that I agree with this statement is that ultimately it did lead to the US dividing. The evidence for this is the fact that immediately after the results were known, South Carolina seceded in December 1860. Then followed 6 other states by the time of his inauguration in March 1861. This created the ultimate divide that led to war. However, the main reasons for the war were the events that preceded Lincoln’s election like the Dredd Scott Case and the events in the west that became known as ‘Bloody Kansas’. In fact, the war can be traced back to the Compromise of 1850 which was a compromise that satisfied no-one and simply led to a growing rift over the issue of free vs slave statehood.

An introduction like this could provide a suitable framework for a balanced and detailed analysis or each factor leading to an appropriate and carefully reasoned judgment. Weaker responses tended to describe each of the factors listed above without any real link to how they led to the Civil War.

Question 5: The Gilded Age and Progressive Era, 1870s to 1920

(a) Explain why new inventions were important to the rapid industrialisation of the late nineteenth century.

Not all candidates were clear about what exactly ‘new inventions’ meant, and some of the weakest answers included long explanations of how the railways helped the growth of industry and the development of new markets. However, since railways were not a ‘new invention’ of ‘the late nineteenth century’ this content was not relevant to answering the question. The only viable way of using the railway was the invention of the air brake which made rail travel much safer and therefore aided the growth of travel for business and for transporting volume of goods.

Better responses did use the example of genuine inventions to demonstrate how they helped the growth of industrialisation. The most commonly referred to were the invention of the light bulb which extended working hours, the telephone which improve communication and business links, and the Bessemer process for making steel which increased volume with all sorts of implications for other industries like building, machinery making, and railways. Effective answers were characterised by the inclusion of these ideas.

(b) ‘The impact of the Progressive Movement was significant.’ How far do you agree with this view?

There were too few responses to this question to make a general comment appropriate.

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

(a) Explain why Roosevelt put together the New Deal Coalition.

Responses to this question were generally weaker due to lack of clarity of what the 'New Deal Coalition' was. Instead, these responses were often a general account of the Hundred Days and/or the Alphabet Agencies without any mention of any sort of 'coalition'. More effective responses were able to explain what 'the New Deal Coalition' was and why it was formed and with what consequences.

(b) 'Overproduction was the most significant weakness of the US economy in the 1920s.' How far do you agree with this view?

Effective answers showed awareness of a range of factors that contributed to the collapse of the US economy in 1929 and constructed a balanced account of the role of each of these. The strongest responses recognised that overproduction applied to both industry and agriculture for different reasons and was able to explain these in some detail. Alternative factors included the banking system, the *laissez faire* attitude of government and its tariff policy, the rapid expansion of credit and the effects of 'gambling' on the stock market. The strongest responses were able to draw these threads together into a reasoned conclusion. For example:

Republican presidents pursued economic policies like high tariffs and low interest rates that allowed and encouraged wild lending. I think this was the biggest weakness of the US economy as it exacerbated the other weaknesses. For example, the problem of overproduction could have been solved by removing the high tariffs to encourage other countries to lower their tariffs against the US which would have opened up foreign markets and released some of the pressure that over production was putting on local markets. The problem of speculation could have been solved by raising interest rates which would have caused a fall in demand for loans to fund stock market speculation, but the government failed to recognise this as they believed in non-intervention. So overall it was government's failure to regulate the economy that made some sort of crisis inevitable.

Less successful responses were characterised by a tendency to write generally about the Wall Street Crash, these responses tended to be more descriptive and poorly balanced with little consideration of over production.

Section C: International history, 1870–1945

Question 7: Empire and the emergence of world power, 1870–919

(a) Explain why the Boxer Rising occurred in China between 1899 and 1901.

Most candidates were able to provide some general information citing anger at foreign influence as a significant reason for the rising. Stronger responses broke down the issue of foreign influence into more specific factors. These included anger at the granting of Treaty Port privileges, at the undermining of traditional Chinese culture and at the infiltration of Christianity into Chinese society. This was coupled with anger at the imperial government for failure to take a stand against these influences and that came to a head in these risings. The best responses were able to link the factors in an overall judgment. For example:

In conclusion the main cause of the Boxer rising was the fear of being overtaken by the West. This was the root cause of other more specific issues as the West were against traditional values. It was the West who introduced opium which undermined the national spirit, the West was also responsible for the arrival of Christian missionaries and was seen as the greedy foreigner for taking over the main ports of China as their own trading centres, so all these smaller issues added up to an overall fear of Western domination.

A less successful conclusion might be:

The Boxer rebellion occurred because of a number of reasons. The most important was that the Chinese traditional values were being undermined and the least important being that China wanted to prove that it could stand up to the West.

Though it mentions two factors it does not establish any link between them or explain their relative importance, this is just assertion without any supporting comments.

(b) To what extent was tension over South Africa between Britain and Germany a result of economic rivalry?

This question proved difficult for many candidates who knew all about the events of the Boer War, but not so much about how it involved Anglo–German relations. The result was often quite descriptive essays about conflict between Britain and the Boers, describing the cause and outcomes of both Boer Wars, with only occasional references to Germany or economic issues. Effective answers were able to establish a context in the Scramble for Africa that set up conflict between Germany and Britain as economic rivals that then manifested itself in the issue of the Boers. Most candidates were aware of the Kruger Telegram as a source of conflict, and some were able to use this to consider economic benefits for Germany in terms of the mineral wealth of the Boer Provinces. Strong responses also considered the Kaiser’s personal ambitions and agenda in terms of challenging British supremacy as an imperial power. Those answers who successfully did both, were awarded marks in the higher levels of the mark scheme.

Question 8: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1920s

(a) Explain why the Genoa Conference failed to improve international relations.

This question was generally answered well. Successful responses often included a strong introduction which set out their argument clearly. For example:

The Genoa conference failed because most countries were still not happy with the Treaty of Versailles, but everyone wanted different things. Britain wanted to help Germany with its problems, but France still wanted Germany punished so much that they could not recover.

Candidates then used this as a plan for the rest of their essay and could, by examining each point in turn, produce a complex explanation of the causes of failure at Genoa. Most candidates were able to provide explanation of at least some of these factors, and the best produced explanations linked the different factors to show the complexities of failure.

(b) The League of Nations enjoyed considerable success in dealing with international conflict in the 1920s.’ How far do you agree?

Most candidates demonstrated a sound knowledge of the work of the League of Nations in the specified period, though some attributed achievements to the League that were not part of its work, and suggested failures simply through non- involvement without really establishing the circumstances in which the League was empowered to intervene in international disputes. Many candidates produced a sound analysis of successes and failures supported by appropriate examples. On the success side the Aaland Islands, the Silesia coalfield dispute, and the Greco - Bulgarian war were frequent examples used; whilst Vilna and Corfu were the most often quoted examples of failure. Many candidates quoted Teschen as an example of success but, whilst the Czechs and Poles agreed to the ceasefire arranged by the League, the Poles never accepted this loss of valuable coal mines in this arrangement, so it wasn’t really a success. For example:

Overall, although the League did achieve some success, they had been only involved in minor conflicts. The League was shown to be rather unable to confront the interests of the European powers either directly, such as Italy in Corfu, or less directly as in Vilna where the League took no action when Poland defied the Leagues ruling and refused to surrender the city, arguable because of French support of Poland as a possible ally. So, I somewhat agree with the statement even though there were fundamental weaknesses which later lead to the collapse of the League.

This demonstrates the sort of balanced judgment that might be reached on the basis of a careful consideration of the positive and negative aspects of the work of the League, in dealing with international conflict. Weaker responses were characterised by a lack of focus on ‘international conflict’. These responses tended to include details on the work of the committees of the League on issues like refugees and slavery. Though there were successes in these areas, they are not part of the Leagues work on international conflict which was the core responsibility of the League.

Question 9: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1930s

(a) Explain why Hitler wanted to achieve Anschluss with Austria.

Many candidates showed an awareness of the basic reasons for Anschluss, but some of confused Anschluss with the search of lebensraum which had a different motivation (lebensraum was about

taking over non-German lands in eastern Europe to gain 'living space' for the Germans, but Austria was already seen as German. Strong responses recognised that Anschluss fulfilled two of Hitler's significant ambitions, as set out in his book, *Mein Kampf*, the uniting of German speaking peoples into a single nation; the destruction of the Treaty of Versailles; and the fact that Hitler himself was Austrian added a powerful incentive. Access to additional resources was also given as a significant factor for Anschluss. Some candidates also included the role of Austria, which had a long border with Czechoslovakia, in future plans for a concerted attack on that country which not only contained many German speakers but was also a military threat to Germany as an ally of the western powers.

(b) To what extent did British policy towards the USSR change during the 1930s?

Responses to this question were generally less successful. Less successful responses often spent too much time on establishing background relationships in the 1920s or wrote generally about 'fear of communism' without really explaining why communism might be more feared in the 1930s because of the social context of the time. Better responses focussed on the 1930s and identified the positive and negative aspects of the relationship. Positives included the admission of the USSR to the League and the consideration of an agreement in defence of Poland after the fall of Czechoslovakia in 1939. However, on the negative side Russian involvement in the Spanish Civil War raised fresh suspicions of attempts to spread communism, whilst the Nazi Soviet Pact turned the USSR into an enemy power. Stronger responses included an explanation of these different aspects of Anglo–Soviet relations and developed a detailed analysis of the relationship and in the best cases reach a reasoned conclusion. For example:

Though there was some improvement in relations between the two countries and even an attempt to reach an agreement to restrict Hitler's expansionist plans, in the end British distrust of Stalin led to failure and a complete collapse of relations between the two countries as a result of the Nazi-Soviet Pact.

HISTORY

Paper 9489/23
Outline Study

Key messages

- Candidates should always read the question carefully to make sure they have fully understood the requirements. Candidates must also be fully aware of the meaning of time-related phrases and dates used in the questions. For example, if an end date is given, for example, 'by 1850', references to events/figures after this date are not relevant to the question posed.
- In **part (a)** questions, it is important to recognise the difference between describing actions, events or intentions that affected something and explaining exactly why these things happened or what effect they had on the outcome. Candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a range of factors to show how they are connected and reach a supported conclusion.
- In **Part (b)** questions, candidates should address the specific question rather than writing about the topic in general terms, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported. The strongest responses reach a supported judgement about the extent to which the sources support the statement and weighs the evidence in order to do this.

General comments

Many candidates demonstrated a clear understanding of the topics that had been studied and produced well-constructed and analytical essays. Weaker responses often included a lot of factual detail but struggled to fit that detail into an answer to the specific question that had been set.

Part (a) questions are about causation. Effective answers were distinguished by detailed knowledge and understanding of the reasons why a specific event occurred or why someone adopted a particular course of action. They focused clearly on the key issue of causation and contained analysis of a wide range of factors, both long and short-term, demonstrating how they were connected and produced reasoned conclusions. Most candidates made the identification and explanation of some relevant causal factors. Less successful answers tended to drift into narrative or descriptive accounts of how something occurred, rather than why. The weaker responses were characterised by a tendency to drift into irrelevancy and factual inaccuracy and/or confused chronology; they were over-reliant on vague and generalised assertions lacking appropriate factual support.

For **part (b)** questions most candidates were able to offer some explanation of events. Most recognised the need to consider different possibilities and made some effort at providing details to support different interpretations of events. Good responses included detailed knowledge of the topics and were characterised by carefully considered and well-supported analysis of alternative perspectives. The best responses were able to compare the relative strengths of different arguments and draw reasoned conclusions in answer to the specific questions that had been set. Other responses provided arguments which considered only one interpretation of the issue. Responses which were less successful fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question, or relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to drift into irrelevance (often by ignoring a timeframe given in the question).

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Modern Europe, 1750–1921

Question 1: France, 1774–1814

(a) Explain why the Assembly of Notables met in 1787.

Generally, candidates had a sound understanding of the problems that faced France in the 1780s and were able to offer reasonable explanations. The best responses were those that had a clear understanding of what the Council of Notables was and what it might be able to do. Less successful responses were characterised by general explanations of the various problems faced by the government of Louis XVI, and a few confused this Council with the Estates General. The best responses were able to show how factors were linked and included a reasoned judgement of its relative importance. For example:

Wars and royal extravagance placed a huge burden on a tax system that was unfair and inefficient. Louis' minister Calonne came up with a plan to solve this problem and this was why the Assembly of Notables was called, to discuss the plan. But this was just the trigger for the meeting, the main problem was the tax system which was not up to supporting the costs of royal government.

(b) To what extent did Napoleon's domestic policies change France in the period 1799–1814?

Many candidates had a good knowledge of Napoleon's reforms and were able to write clearly, and in detail about them. However, some weaker answers had difficulty in making the shift into evaluating the extent to which these reforms led to change in France. Stronger answers found different ways of judging change. Some looked back to the Ancien Regime considering progress made since then against the revival of certain features of the former system of royal government. Other responses compared Napoleon's changes with the measures achieved by the revolution seeking to judge between continuity of revolutionary principles against policies that moved away from these. Both these approaches produced valid arguments. However, less effective answers struggled with the idea of continuity and change and often resorted to general points about positive and negative aspects of Napoleon's reforms. The weakest responses wrote in general terms about everything Napoleon did, with no real focus on the question of change.

Question 2: The Industrial Revolution in Britain, 1750–1850

(a) Explain why access to international markets helped to increase the development of industry after 1780.

Few answers took the opportunity to write about the slave trade and its impact on Britain's economic growth, and instead wrote generally about resources and markets that became available because of access to international markets. A few stronger answers used specific examples such as the British East India Company, and some good responses looked at how international trade helped to finance internal developments such as ports and transport infrastructure. Most candidates were able to explain several significant developments that were encouraged by international trade.

(b) To what extent did working conditions improve for the lower classes after 1800?

Many candidates wrote about poor working conditions in factories and mines with detailed description of child labour, dangerous machinery, long hours, etc. For most candidates this was a basis of solid description. Stronger responses used their detailed knowledge of working conditions to address the key aspect of the question 'the extent to which conditions improved' whereas weaker responses just tended to largely ignore this part of the question. Good responses set the poor conditions against the attempts by radical campaigners to get parliament to introduce more legal protections for workers in all circumstances as well as those more philanthropic factory owners like Salt and Owen who provided better basic working conditions for their workers. Strong responses often highlighted various factory and mines acts in the period that sought to improve working conditions, whilst at the same time acknowledging the limitations of these changes. However, weaker answers, whilst having written about work conditions then wrote about poor housing and failures in public Health, and therefore failed to stick to the specified question focus. A few candidates went beyond the prescribed date of 1850 for their examples.

Question 3: Liberalism and nationalism in Germany, 1815–71

(a) Explain why the Zollverein was created.

Many responses showed a good understanding of the purpose of the Zollverein and wrote clearly about the problems of trade barriers within Germany between the separate states. These effective responses showed good awareness of the advantages of getting rid of these barriers, in terms of the industrial development, including the growth of railways, that could be gained from the creation of the Zollverein. Strong responses explained how this stemmed originally from the Settlement of Vienna that left Prussia with geographically separated territories facing high tolls to get goods from one part of the country to another which was what drove Prussia's original proposal. Weaker responses often focused on the political aspects of the Zollverein and of possible Prussian ambitions for German unification, giving little attention to the underlying economic aims that were the original reason for the Zollverein. In weaker responses there was also some overlap with the part (b) answers.

(b) 'Prussia's actions caused the Franco-Prussian War.' How far do you agree?

The whole subject of the Luxemburg Crisis, the Hohenzollern candidacy, and the Ems telegram is quite complex, but effective answers were characterised by clear summaries of the main issues. For example:

In conclusion, while France's unprovoked aggression during the Luxemburg crisis of 1867 and Napoleon's own ambitions to restore his prestige in France, may have catalysed the deterioration of Franco-Prussian relations it was ultimately Prussia's manipulative actions of strategically attempting to place Prince Leopold on the Spanish throne, exemplified in the manipulation of the Ems telegram in 1870 which brought about the war. These are consistent with Bismarck's earlier policies to ensure the primacy of Prussia in Germany and ultimately achieve German unification.

All responses showed awareness of Bismarck's manipulative role in the whole affair. However, less successful responses often ended up with poorly balanced analysis in which there was significant detail on Bismarck's role in the lead up to the war, but little on the role of the French or specifically Napoleon III. The weakest answers were just a general essay on the unification of Germany including the Prussian campaigns against Denmark and Austria. These answers tended to ignore the question of French responsibility in the Franco-Prussian War.

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

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

(a) Explain why Lincoln won the 1860 Presidential election.

Almost all candidates showed some awareness of Lincoln as an anti-slavery candidate, but in weaker answers there was little knowledge of issues beyond slavery. In effective responses there was often a clear explanation of how the voting system in the US helped him win. The best responses showed awareness of other factors such as the split of the democratic vote between several other candidates and the significance of the Lincoln Douglas debates of 1858 in giving Lincoln a national profile. Strong responses also demonstrated and explained why he appealed to both abolitionists and those towards the centre in politics, who were less certain about the issue of slavery. For example:

One reason why he won was because of his neutrality on the issue of slavery and abolitionism that allowed him to gain a majority vote in the election. Within his own party he was considered a moderate and the rising issue of abolition was prevalent but still split many northerners; many were abolitionists but just as many were indifferent to the issue or feared that freeing the slaves would put northern jobs at risk. Therefore, as the most controversial topic in antebellum America was not something that Lincoln took an extreme stance on, he was able to win a majority of votes in the northern states.

(b) To what extent was Texas joining the Union the biggest challenge to the Missouri Compromise before 1850?

A number of candidates struggled with this question because of uncertainty about the status of Texas, but all seemed to have some understanding of the Missouri Compromise and its purpose and offered some explanation of the issue of slavery. Strong responses went beyond a general description of this and were able to offer an answer which dealt with both the issue of Texan accession to the Union and the other factors that created stresses over the Compromise. Some of the most effective answers showed awareness of the impact of westward expansion, but few mentioned the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and how the acquisition of the New Mexico and Californian territories impacted on the debate over slave versus free statehood.

Question 5: The Gilded Age and Progressive Era, 1870s to 1920

(a) Explain why the Progressive Movement was successful in amending the Constitution.

Some strong answers explained the purpose of each of the Progressive Amendments. However, less successful answers did not offer any detailed explanation of how these were passed and showed only a limited grasp of the purpose of each amendment, and who was responsible for them. Better responses also contained more specific detail on the important role of the Progressive presidents and the effect of the First World War on the passage of the two later amendments.

(b) ‘The rise of organised labour was the most significant consequence of rapid economic growth in the late nineteenth century.’ How far do you agree?

Most responses to this question showed some knowledge of the consequences of rapid economic growth and wrote about living and working conditions, the rise of the robber barons etc. However, some weaker responses did not go beyond this. There was evidence of a misunderstanding of the term ‘organised labour’ in weaker responses which simply wrote about how immigration provided extra labour for the growing industries. A few stronger responses showed a clearer grasp of the topic and highlighted the efforts of the Knights of Labour and American Federation of Labour, with some even mentioning the Granger movement to organise the farming community to work for a better deal for farmers. However, this level of detail was a feature of only a minority of responses, leading to a lack of a balanced argument.

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

(a) Explain why the New Deal was criticised by those on the right.

Most candidates were able to provide some insight into why people opposed the New Deal, even if it was only in just identifying factors. Effective answers were characterised by clear explanations of the opposition, though not all managed to distinguish between Right and Left, citing the opposition of people like Huey Long, who was clearly not part of the opposition from the ‘Right’. Less effective answers tended to just describe the New Deal and make general assertions about opposition without properly focusing on the question.

(b) ‘The policies of Republican governments were the main cause of weaknesses in the US economy in the 1920s.’ How far do you agree?

Most candidates managed to provide some insight into a range of problems that built up in the US economy in the 1920s. Effective answers provided a clear assessment of the policies that were adopted including the use of tariffs, but less effective answers tended to focus only on the laissez faire approach adopted by the Republican Presidents of this period. This left a lack of balance in many otherwise good responses with many candidates providing effective coverage of the major issue like overproduction, lack of banking controls and the effect of growth in credit sales and of the rising frenzy of stock market investment that led to the Wall Street Crash. Some weaker answers showed general knowledge of the Wall Street Crash, but just wrote an account of its causes rather than focusing on the specific question.

Section C: International History, 1870–1945

Question 7: Empire and the emergence of world powers, 1870–1919

(a) Explain why the sinking of the Lusitania led to US involvement in the First World War.

Strong responses recognised that the sinking was a necessary turning point in US attitudes to the war, but was not, in itself, sufficient reason for an immediate declaration of war. These more effective answers were able to explain how further issues, such as the renewal of all-out submarine warfare and the Zimmerman telegram, steadily increased US hostility, leading to the declaration of war on April 6th, 1917. In weaker answers the main focus was the loss of 123 American lives and the effect that had in the US, often with significant description around the reason why the Lusitania was targeted without focusing on the effect that the sinking had. The most common error was suggesting that the Lusitania was an American ship. Weaker responses also often failed to make any successful link between the sinking in April 1915 and the outbreak of war in April 1917.

(b) How successful was the Berlin Conference of 1884–85 in resolving conflicts over imperial expansion in Africa?

The strongest responses to this question showed a solid understanding of why the Berlin Conference was called and what was agreed there. This provided a solid base from which to judge whether the agreements made were successful or not in preventing conflict over imperial expansion in Africa. For example, the Fashoda incident, where diplomatic negotiation resolved the potential conflict, suggested success; and the Moroccan question where Germany attempted to subvert the agreement by interfering in an area to which France had laid claim under the terms of the Berlin Treaty, which suggested failure. Effective answers showed awareness that the Berlin Conference was successful in its short-term aim of settling disputes over the development of the Congo River basin. Less successful answers simply described Fashoda and Morocco as conflicts which showed the Berlin Treaty had failed with little consideration of alternatives. In addition, some weaker responses wrote about Anglo-French disputes in Egypt even though these were settled before the Berlin Conference even began.

Question 8: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1920s

(a) Explain why the Treaty of Versailles was described as a Diktat by many Germans.

There were some very good and well-constructed responses to this question, but poorer responses struggled with the difference between simply being unhappy with the Treaty and calling it a Diktat. Strong responses recognised that Diktat meant that the German had no say in the terms of the treaty and that it was presented to them with no choice on a whole range of controversial issues like War Guilt and reparations. Recognition of this difference, usually led to thorough and well-focused explanations. An appropriate analysis might produce the following conclusion for example:

In conclusion, the Germans felt humiliated by the terms of the Treaty of Versailles. They believed that the true motives of the Treaty was the Allied powers eagerness to keep Germany weak and seek revenge. So, when they were forced to sign a treaty with such harsh terms without even having been consulted, they felt that the peace was largely a dictated one or '...a Diktat'.

Weak answers often merely described how the terms of the treaty were unsatisfactory for many Germans.

(b) 'International conferences did little to improve international relations in the 1920s.' How far do you agree?

Good responses showed a clear understanding of the aims and achievements of a number of conferences in this period. This included the failures of Genoa to the 'spirit of Locarno', and the cautious optimism of the Kellogg Briand Pact. Successful answers were characterised by a balanced and detailed assessment of the successes and failures of international negotiation in the 1920s. Weaker responses sometimes failed to distinguish between different meetings and were confused about the chronology often conflating events surrounding the Genoa Conference, the Dawes Plan, and the Ruhr Crisis for example. Some weaker answers described extensively the Versailles Peace Conference even though negotiations were over before the 1920s began. A few

candidates thought this was a question about the League of Nations and wrote accordingly. Nevertheless, many candidates had good knowledge and wrote effective responses.

Question 9: The League of Nations and international Relations in the 1930s

(a) Explain why Stalin agreed to the Nazi-Soviet Pact.

Good responses understood what Stalin gained from what seemed like a highly unlikely collaboration and were able to explain this clearly. The best answers were able to demonstrate how different factors linked together to convince Stalin that this was the best option for him in August 1939. Most candidates were aware that one important result of the pact was that it gave Stalin time to improve his armed forces, and that in the meantime it gave him the opportunity to take control of eastern Poland. However, fewer candidates understood or could explain his problem regarding the western allies. For example....

Stalin thought Britain and France did not want to make alliance with him to stop Hitler invading Poland. Stalin invited them to be allies but they only sent a low-level government minister to negotiate with him, which made him feel he was being humiliated. So, in order to keep the USSR safe, he agreed to the Nazi Soviet Pact with Hitler.

Answers which showed an understanding of this aspect of Stalin's thinking usually wrote clearly about other factors and were effective.

(b) 'Appeasement was the most sensible policy for Britain in dealing with Hitler.' To what extent do you agree?

Stronger responses showed a clear understanding of this topic and were able to produce detailed and well-balanced analysis with the best responses including reasoned overall judgements and focussed on the fact that the question was focused on Hitler and not British foreign policy.

The most successful responses were able to explain the development of appeasement through the 1930s suggesting why, at each stage, it seemed like a sensible policy and identifying a range of factors from military weaknesses to public pacifism. However, clear explanations in support of appeasement were not always set against a strong counter argument with some otherwise strong answers let down by what basically amounted to a claim that it allowed Hitler to take advantage with only limited support. The best answers did however produce a balanced argument, sometimes with interesting conclusions. For example: the following conclusion sums up how change over time can affect overall judgment

With all the factors in mind I believe that despite appeasement leading to massive repercussions it was a sensible choice at first, due to Britain's lack of power at the time and the absence of support from France. However, I do believe that appeasement should have been stopped well before it was finally abandoned. For example, if it had been abandoned before Hitler launched his four-year plan to put the German economy on a war footing, then Britain would have been able, with French help to stand up more effectively to Hitler. Hence in the long-term appeasement was not a sensible policy, though clearly in the first half of the 1930s no other policy seemed possible.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/31 Interpretation question</p>
--

Key messages

- The question asks candidates to write about the extract, specifically what one can tell from the extract about the approach and interpretation of the historian who wrote it. It follows from this that not writing about the extract is not answering the question. Writing about events, or writing about the views of other historians, can only be relevant if it is made part of writing about the extract: that is, part of explaining what the extract tells you about the historian's views.
- Repeating what the extract says is not the same as explaining what it tells you about the historian's interpretation and approach. An explanation involves selection of relevant material from the extract to illustrate how the historian's views can be inferred.
- The historian's interpretation will apply to the extract as a whole, therefore all of the inferences that can be made about it from the extract will be consistent with each other. If some inferences appear to contradict each other, then either some way must be found to reconcile them within the interpretation, or some must be flawed. It is never the case that one part of the extract contains one interpretation, and another part a different one.
- The most successful approach is careful reading the extract, thinking about what it signifies, and making notes on those aspects of the extract that seem most significant prior to beginning to write the response. There is no need to rush into writing the answer, and particularly not into adopting a line-by-line, paragraph-by- paragraph approach to the extract.

General comments

It was clear from candidates' answers that there is an almost universal understanding of what the question demands, and with it a positive response to the detection of the historian's interpretation. The strongest responses put together the pieces of evidence contained within the extract, understanding which pieces were the most important, and what part each piece played within the historian's explanation. Good responses identify elements of this, but do not see the full picture.

Many of the less successful answers give the impression that they are searching for the interpretation as their essay progresses. Others state up front what they think the interpretation, or more often the approach, is, but then lose sight of this, or even change course, as the answer progresses. Responses of this kind could be improved by keeping something fundamental in mind – the key question that the historian is trying to address. For each topic, the syllabus gives some key questions: *Who was to blame for the First World War? Why did the Holocaust occur? Who was to blame for the Cold War?* Many of the extracts will focus on these questions, and so should candidates' answers.

Almost all candidates work through the extract, drawing inferences about the historian from details in each sentence or paragraph, and to a greater or lesser extent managing by the end of the answer to pull these inferences together to reach a conclusion about the interpretation. In weaker answers, this produces a series of unrelated and often inconsistent inferences, with a conclusion that is effectively asserted rather than explained. In better answers the inferences are related, consistent and produce a logical conclusion. The strongest answers state the interpretation at the start and then build the response using evidence from the extract to explain and illustrate. Taking this approach requires planning, knowing what they want to say and how to organise their material to support this.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: The origins of the First World War

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

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that there was no original intention to exterminate the Jews, but that under the circumstances of war Hitler took the decision as a means of implicating the entire German people in the crime. The best responses acknowledged these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. In detecting the interpretation/approach it is often the case that a couple of references are so significant that they can be seen as fundamental. In this extract the claims that the extermination of the Jews was not one of the Nazis' original aims, and that the decision for extermination was taken some time in 1940–41, should have signalled functionalism, and led to the rejection of intentionalism. In less successful responses, many candidates persisted in seeing at least some aspect of intentionalism in Hitler authorising genocide. Alternatively, as the extract mentioned Bormann and Goebbels, other candidates concluded that the approach must be structuralist. Even amongst those who appreciated the importance of the wartime context, the desire to fall back on the standard functionalist argument about the Holocaust being an ad hoc reaction to events got in the way of the specific argument made by this historian. Other aspects of the extract, such as the references to anti-Semitism in the final paragraph, also served to distract candidates from the main message about the Holocaust being used to implicate the German people. The weakest answers paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

Section C: The origins and development of the Cold War

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that American policy deliberately risked the breakdown of relations with the Soviets, but that Stalin's reaction, whilst understandable, was an over-reaction. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. To most candidates it was clear that the historian was placing some element of blame on both the Americans and the Soviets, although a few were deflected into a post-revisionist, 'nobody being blamed', viewpoint by the quote from Stalin about the Cold War being inevitable. The real challenge was not simply to see both sides being blamed, but to understand the nature and extent of blame. Once again, a few significant points in the extract provided the central arguments. First, the historian says Stalin 'quite rightly' believed that US economic policy was aimed at opening up eastern Europe to capitalist influence. This justified his reaction. But the historian went on to show that Stalin did more than simply reject the American plans. He launched a new round of purges in eastern Europe and placed his 'henchmen' in power. By picking out these pieces of evidence the strongest responses concluded that the historian placed greater blame on the United States for initiating the hostility, but also disapproved of Stalin's disproportionate response. Few responses made these distinctions, instead concluding simply that the approach was post-revisionist, blaming both sides. Weaker answers saw only blame on Stalin and labelled the extract orthodox or post-post-revisionist. The weakest answers paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/32 Interpretation question</p>
--

Key messages

- The question asks candidates to write about the extract, specifically what one can tell from the extract about the approach and interpretation of the historian who wrote it. It follows from this that not writing about the extract is not answering the question. Writing about events, or writing about the views of other historians, can only be relevant if it is made part of writing about the extract: that is, part of explaining what the extract tells you about the historian's views.
- Repeating what the extract says is not the same as explaining what it tells you about the historian's interpretation and approach. An explanation involves selection of relevant material from the extract to illustrate how the historian's views can be inferred.
- The historian's interpretation will apply to the extract as a whole, therefore all of the inferences that can be made about it from the extract will be consistent with each other. If some inferences appear to contradict each other, then either some way must be found to reconcile them within the interpretation, or some must be flawed. It is never the case that one part of the extract contains one interpretation, and another part a different one.
- The most successful approach is careful reading the extract, thinking about what it signifies, and making notes on those aspects of the extract that seem most significant prior to beginning to write the response. There is no need to rush into writing the answer, and particularly not into adopting a line-by-line, paragraph-by- paragraph approach to the extract.

General comments

It was clear from candidates' answers that there is an almost universal understanding of what the question demands, and with it a positive response to the detection of the historian's interpretation. The strongest responses put together the pieces of evidence contained within the extract, understanding which pieces were the most important, and what part each piece played within the historian's explanation. Good responses identify elements of this, but do not see the full picture.

Many of the less successful answers give the impression that they are searching for the interpretation as their essay progresses. Others state up front what they think the interpretation, or more often the approach, is, but then lose sight of this, or even change course, as the answer progresses. Responses of this kind could be improved by keeping something fundamental in mind – the key question that the historian is trying to address. For each topic, the syllabus gives some key questions: *Who was to blame for the First World War? Why did the Holocaust occur? Who was to blame for the Cold War?* Many of the extracts will focus on these questions, and so should candidates' answers.

Almost all candidates work through the extract, drawing inferences about the historian from details in each sentence or paragraph, and to a greater or lesser extent managing by the end of the answer to pull these inferences together to reach a conclusion about the interpretation. In weaker answers, this produces a series of unrelated and often inconsistent inferences, with a conclusion that is effectively asserted rather than explained. In better answers the inferences are related, consistent and produce a logical conclusion. The strongest answers state the interpretation at the start and then build the response using evidence from the extract to explain and illustrate. Taking this approach requires planning, knowing what they want to say and how to organise their material to support this.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: The origins of the First World War

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that both Germany and Austria are blamed, but for different reasons: Germany for lacking any proper policy or competent leadership, and Austria for being determined on war with no adequate justification. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Most answers saw that Germany was being blamed, but not necessarily for the reason in the main interpretation. A lot was made, for example, of Germany's 'bid for continental supremacy'. Only a few responses dealt sufficiently with the blame placed on Austria. The language used by the historian was a clear pointer to the interpretation, particularly the dismissive tone applied to the German leadership. Better answers often quoted examples, such as the comment that Bethmann and William 'were incapable of consistent policy'. But the same was true of what was written about Austria – 'The Hapsburg monarchy brought about its fatal crisis to prove it was still alive' – yet fewer answers made anything of this. The weakest answers paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the origins of the First World War with no reference to the extract.

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that the Final Solution was driven by virulent hatred of Jews, and the war merely allowed the Nazis to carry out a genocide that they already intended. The best answers recognised these features of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Understanding that the first paragraph of the extract constituted a refutation of structuralism, and even of functionalism, was essential if the interpretation was to be properly explained. The importance placed by the historian on 'deep, irrational hatreds', and the rejection of the idea that the Nazis 'somehow stumbled into murdering millions of people', were clear indicators of an intentionalist approach. Yet many responses missed the significance of such comments. Some even took the historian's remarks about structuralism as approval of the approach, whilst others, more understandably, mistook what the extract said about the war as arguing that it caused the Holocaust, as opposed to the real argument that it simply made it easier to carry out what was always intended. Better responses identified that the mention of the Madagascar Plan as being about physical extermination was support for the main interpretation, and further undermined the idea that the historian was a functionalist. Those answers that saw the intentionalism of the approach could effectively integrate the material on the profound anti-Semitism of the Nazi regime, with the pre-war threats to annihilate the Jews, to illustrate the interpretation. Arguments for any other approach were based, to a greater or lesser extent, on misreading of the extract, and answers that dealt with the extract line-by-line were particularly susceptible to this, often suggesting multiple approaches based on individual phrases or sentences. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

Section C: The origins and development of the Cold War

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that Stalin exploited the Cold War for his own internal purposes, and thereby brought about intensification of the Cold War. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Most answers perceived that Stalin was, in some way or other, being blamed. However, the stress on internal factors seemed to take some candidates by surprise, and these answers tried to pull the explanation onto the more familiar material in the last two paragraphs of the extract. Weaker responses mistook the more general explanation of the Cold War offered in the first paragraph as being the interpretation, despite the historian explicitly seeking to refine it. Given that the importance of internal factors was appreciated, candidates still had to explain the link to the Cold War, that it was something used by Stalin for his own ends, and that it had consequences for which Stalin can be blamed. Here the historian's comment about Stalin provoking a Western response 'far more significant than anything in the inter-war period' was a vital piece of evidence used in many answers. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9489/33 Interpretations question</p>

Key messages

- The question asks candidates to write about the extract, specifically what one can tell from the extract about the approach and interpretation of the historian who wrote it. It follows from this that not writing about the extract is not answering the question. Writing about events, or writing about the views of other historians, can only be relevant if it is made part of writing about the extract: that is, part of explaining what the extract tells you about the historian's views.
- Repeating what the extract says is not the same as explaining what it tells you about the historian's interpretation and approach. An explanation involves selection of relevant material from the extract to illustrate how the historian's views can be inferred.
- The historian's interpretation will apply to the extract as a whole, therefore all of the inferences that can be made about it from the extract will be consistent with each other. If some inferences appear to contradict each other, then either some way must be found to reconcile them within the interpretation, or some must be flawed. It is never the case that one part of the extract contains one interpretation, and another part a different one.
- The most successful approach is careful reading the extract, thinking about what it signifies, and making notes on those aspects of the extract that seem most significant prior to beginning to write the response. There is no need to rush into writing the answer, and particularly not into adopting a line-by-line, paragraph-by- paragraph approach to the extract.

General comments

It was clear from candidates' answers that there is an almost universal understanding of what the question demands, and with it a positive response to the detection of the historian's interpretation. The strongest responses put together the pieces of evidence contained within the extract, understanding which pieces were the most important, and what part each piece played within the historian's explanation. Good responses identify elements of this, but do not see the full picture.

Many of the less successful answers give the impression that they are searching for the interpretation as their essay progresses. Others state up front what they think the interpretation, or more often the approach, is, but then lose sight of this, or even change course, as the answer progresses. Responses of this kind could be improved by keeping something fundamental in mind – the key question that the historian is trying to address. For each topic, the syllabus gives some key questions: *Who was to blame for the First World War? Why did the Holocaust occur? Who was to blame for the Cold War?* Many of the extracts will focus on these questions, and so should candidates' answers.

Almost all candidates work through the extract, drawing inferences about the historian from details in each sentence or paragraph, and to a greater or lesser extent managing by the end of the answer to pull these inferences together to reach a conclusion about the interpretation. In weaker answers, this produces a series of unrelated and often inconsistent inferences, with a conclusion that is effectively asserted rather than explained. In better answers the inferences are related, consistent and produce a logical conclusion. The strongest answers state the interpretation at the start and then build the response using evidence from the extract to explain and illustrate. Taking this approach requires planning, knowing what they want to say and how to organise their material to support this.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: The origins of the First World War

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

Section B: The Holocaust

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that Nazi genocide rested on ‘scientific’ ideas that pre-dated the Nazis, and were adopted into Nazi racial policy, and that this policy was applied to all excluded groups. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. The historian uses a definition of the Holocaust that views not just the Jews, but also other excluded groups, as victims. The strongest answers understood that the war was not seen by the historian as a cause of the genocide, but that it simply made possible what was anyway intended. These responses acknowledged that killings of the handicapped had already started very early in the war and were extended to other groups as conditions allowed. There was no argument that genocide was an ad hoc response to the conditions of war, but rather that the killings were ‘the result of old beliefs and new policies’. If any label was attached to this interpretation, then it had to be intentionalist. Weaker answers saw mention of the war and assumed that the approach was functionalist. The weakest answers paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

Section C: The origins and development of the Cold War

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that Stalin was responsible for the Cold War because i) he was an ideologically driven expansionist, and ii) he made mistakes and misjudgements in his dealings with the West. The best responses recognised these features of the interpretation and supported them using material from the extract. They appreciated that the focus on Stalin personally, and on the importance of ideology to him, marked out the historian as using a post-post-revisionist approach. The extract was explicit in placing blame on Stalin – ‘Stalin’s actions helped to pave the way for the Cold War’ – and it was possible to make out an argument illustrating this without properly engaging with the specific nature of the historian’s interpretation. The extract mentioned his toughness, his expansionism, and his over-simple world view, all of which could be turned to arguing that he was to blame, and there were many responses of this nature. There were also a good number of answers that explained one aspect of the interpretation but not both. Weaker responses generally saw some blame being placed on Stalin but would then undermine that argument. There were two ways in which this happened. First, some argued that the extract also blamed the West – this would be supported with reference to the Truman administration deciding there was no alternative to containment, a decision that ‘set the stage for decades of Cold War’. Second, the final paragraph stated that Stalin avoided the mistake of open aggression. This was then given as an example of the historian exonerating Stalin from blame, perhaps even leading to a conclusion that the approach was post-revisionist. The weakest answers paraphrased points identified in the extract or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

Paper 9489/41
Depth Study

Key messages

- A sustained and consistent focus on the specific nature of the question posed is critical in allowing candidates to access the higher levels of the mark scheme.
- Strongest answers are consistently analytical and address all aspects of the question.
- Analysis must be supported by relevant and accurate factual information, which should be wide-ranging in nature.
- Candidates must have a good chronological understanding and should only use material which is relevant to the time period stipulated in the question.
- Effective answers provide a fully balanced argument, which considers any factors stated in the question alongside alternative explanations for events.
- Candidates are advised to read the questions carefully and determine what is required before starting to write their answers. Planning answers before choosing and writing is strongly advised.
- Command words such as assess and evaluate will be frequently used in questions set on Paper 4 of 9489 and candidates should be able to respond effectively to gain marks for AO2 in particular. Detail of command words for this syllabus are given on page 41 of the syllabus.
- Centres should also be fully aware that foreign policy is part of the syllabus for themes 1–3 in **Section A** and that questions specifically on this part of the course may be set.

General comments

The best responses were fully analytical in approach and contained a clearly defined argument, well supported with detailed and relevant subject knowledge in order to reach a logical final judgement, based on a consistent line of reasoning, which was present throughout the essay. A good example of this was **Question 1**, where the strongest answers examined the use of terror by Mussolini in the establishment of his dictatorship, before going on to discuss alternative factors.

The inclusion of a balanced judgement, based on precise and relevant factual knowledge and meeting the requirement to evaluate the significance of the stated factor, strengthened responses. However, weaker responses tended just to describe the events of the period and offered no clear judgement or tended to focus either on the stated factor or on others without discussing the original aspect.

Strong subject knowledge was apparent in many answers, where candidates often were familiar with the precise details needed. However, analysis would have been strengthened by comparing aims to outcomes and judging policies as a whole in the conclusion, rather than on a case-by-case basis.

Some candidates were unable to answer all aspects of the question, perhaps reflecting a lack of full understanding of the requirements and this was illustrated in **Question 5** where many responses appeared uncertain of the implications of social mobility and responded by discussing physical mobility instead and included just general descriptions of social changes in the 1950s. This inevitably limited the marks available to them.

Comments on specific questions

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

1 Evaluate the significance of terror in the establishment of a dictatorship under Mussolini.

This question was attempted by a relatively small number of candidates, with generally competent responses being produced. Most answers avoided the generalisation of discussing Mussolini's overall rise to power and focussed mainly on the period 1922–29. There were good arguments seen such as where the role of terror was compared with other factors such as the support of the Church and the elites and the fact that many Italians were so disenchanted with the style of government they had had before 1922 that they would put up with anything else. There was a suggestion that Mussolini was too incompetent and lazy to get an effective system of terror going and that the Italian people would not have tolerated it at any rate.

2 Assess the impact of collectivisation on the people of the Soviet Union.

Relatively few candidates attempted this question. The most effective answers understood that an assessment of the impact of collectivisation meant a balanced examination of the outcomes. An example of an argument put forward that collectivisation had a positive impact on the people of the Soviet Union was that it allowed the industrialisation programme to go ahead and therefore allowed the nation to 'progress.' Counterarguments made use of the terror unleashed on kulaks and the deaths of millions as a result of famine to highlight the negative consequences. Answers with a balanced approach would often be awarded the higher levels for AO2. Less successful approaches included narrative accounts and Soviet economic policy, including largely irrelevant material on the five-year plans.

3 Assess the impact of foreign policy on the economy in Nazi Germany in the period 1933–39.

There were relatively few responses to this question. Centres should note that this question was taken directly from the fourth bullet point of the third key question on the syllabus and that therefore questions framed in this way are to be expected. The strongest responses were able to tackle the question directly and demonstrated sound knowledge of Nazi foreign policy and argued that there were two driving factors in the economy – one was the need to recover from the Depression and the other the desire to overturn the Treaty of Versailles and expand east, with the latter overriding the former and leading to the resignation of Schacht and the desire for autarky and the massive remilitarisation at all costs.

4 Economic problems were the main reason for the rise of political extremism in Britain.' Discuss this view.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

Section B: The USA, 1944–92

5 Assess the reasons for increased social mobility in the 1940s and 1950s.

This was the most popular question and was answered by the majority of candidates. Effective responses understood the phrase ‘social mobility’ in the correct sense, that of shifts in social and economic status. Centres are reminded that this phrase does appear in the syllabus and therefore a full understanding of it is to be expected. Many answers concentrated purely on ‘mobility’ rather than ‘social mobility’ and were focussed on the creation of highways, car manufacturing and the growth of suburbs to explain why many people were physically mobile. This approach indicated a less than full understanding of the question and led to answers generally receiving AO2 marks at either Level 1 or Level 2. The more effective answers were often able to discuss different factors such as the post-war economic boom and government policies such as the GI Bill, which enabled veterans to access higher levels of education and, in turn, gave opportunities to take up the growing number of white collar/middle class jobs which were being created. However, many answers described various social changes, without making a clear link to social mobility. This often led to Level 3 marks being awarded for AO1, but not for AO2. Another common approach was to attempt to link the African American civil rights movement to social mobility by discussing the Brown Case or the Montgomery Bus Boycott, which did not really address the concept properly. A more successful approach might have been to have discussed the Great Migration in relation to African Americans gaining better paid and higher status employment in the North than in the South.

It is important that candidates understand that question stems such as assess will be used in 9489 and should be aware of what is required. Here, an assessment might have been based on relative significance of factors. It is crucial that candidates go beyond a list of factors to reach the higher levels of AO2 marks.

6 ‘Stagflation was the most serious economic problem faced by US governments in the 1960s and 1970s.’ Discuss this view.

This was a popular choice; this question required the comparison of the relative significance of various problems facing the US economy in the period. There were some responses which showed strong levels of knowledge and were able to discuss a variety of factors. One valid approach was to use the Oil Crisis as an explanation for increasing prices, with the best acknowledging that higher oil prices led to inflation in a variety of products rather than just ‘gas’. There were also arguments advanced about the role of Nixon’s policy in ending the Bretton Woods Agreement, the cost of social policies in the 1960s and the Cold War and Space Race, with the cost of the Vietnam War often blamed. Competition from abroad, especially Germany and Japan and focusing on the automobile industry was also advanced as a problem. Weaker responses tended to cover some of these factors in a generally superficial way and without a clear argument about relevant significance of the various challenges facing the US, thus limiting both AO1 and AO2 marks. Strong answers showed clarity about what the term ‘stagflation’ meant, whilst weaker answers were hampered by poor chronological grasp and wrote about the Great Depression and its aftermath.

7 ‘Clinton mostly owed his electoral success to his personal appeal.’ Discuss this view.

This question demanded an understanding of the reasons behind Clinton’s victories in the 1992 and 1996 presidential elections. Although a relatively popular choice, it was rare to see this question answered well. The better responses were able to identify and explain in relative depth factors such as Bush’s unpopularity in 1992, with some responses showing knowledge of the impact of taxation. There was also discussion of the impact of Perot’s candidature. However, even the most effective answers on these factors lacked much knowledge of Clinton beyond generalised discussions about his charisma and youth. Very few responses considered the 1996 election and there were no responses which discussed Clinton’s record in office during his first term. Clearly, these were issues that should have been focussed on.

8 Assess the impact of involvement in the Korean War on US foreign policy in the period 1950–63.

The focus of this question was the consequences of the Korean War, rather than the causes and course of the war. However, many responses gave a generalised history of the conflict, and this descriptive material did not score highly for AO2 marks. There was some uncertainty among many responses about what was required by the command word 'assess'. The most successful approach was to argue how much impact the war had. Effective responses kept their focus on US foreign policy during the remainder of the 1950s and early 1960s and set out a balanced argument that the war did/did not have an impact on Eisenhower and Kennedy's policies. There was good knowledge of Containment and the Domino Theory and of US policy towards Cuba and Vietnam. The consensus among the stronger responses was that the impact was initially strong and diminished over time.

Section C: International history, 1945–92

There were insufficient responses to **Questions 9 to 12** for any comment on performance.

HISTORY

Paper 9489/42
Depth Study

Key messages

- A sustained and consistent focus on the specific nature of the question posed is critical in allowing candidates to access the higher levels of the mark scheme.
- Strongest answers are consistently analytical and address all aspects of the question.
- Analysis must be supported by relevant and accurate factual information, which should be wide-ranging in nature.
- Candidates must have a good chronological understanding and should only use material which is relevant to the time period stipulated in the question.
- Effective answers provide a fully balanced argument, which considers any factors stated in the question alongside alternative explanations for events.
- Candidates are advised to read the questions carefully and determine what is required before starting to write their answers. Planning answers before choosing and writing is strongly advised.
- Command words such as assess and evaluate will be frequently used in questions set on Paper 4 of 9489 and candidates should be able to respond effectively to gain marks for AO2 in particular. Detail of command words for this syllabus are given on page 41 of the syllabus.
- Centres should also be fully aware that foreign policy is part of the syllabus for themes 1–3 in **Section A** and that questions specifically on this part of the course may be set.

General comments

The best responses were fully analytical in approach and contained a clearly defined argument, well supported with detailed and relevant subject knowledge in order to reach a logical final judgement, based on a consistent line of reasoning, which was present throughout the essay. A good example of this was **Question 1**, where the strongest answers examined the use of terror by Mussolini in the establishment of his dictatorship, before going on to discuss alternative factors.

The inclusion of a balanced judgement, based on precise and relevant factual knowledge and meeting the requirement to evaluate the significance of the stated factor, strengthened responses. However, weaker responses tended just to describe the events of the period and offered no clear judgement or tended to focus either on the stated factor or on others without discussing the original aspect.

Strong subject knowledge was apparent in many answers, where candidates often were familiar with the precise details needed. However, analysis would have been strengthened by comparing aims to outcomes and judging policies as a whole in the conclusion, rather than on a case-by-case basis.

Some candidates were unable to answer all aspects of the question, perhaps reflecting a lack of full understanding of the requirements and this was illustrated in **Question 5** where many responses appeared uncertain of the implications of social mobility and responded by discussing physical mobility instead and included just general descriptions of social changes in the 1950s. This inevitably limited the marks available to them.

Comments on specific questions

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

1 ‘Mussolini’s use of propaganda was highly effective.’ Evaluate this claim.

This was a popular question with responses of varying approach and quality. Answers which showed knowledge about Mussolini’s use of propaganda were able to access higher AO1 marks. In some cases, there was good detail about the regime’s use of mass media, art, and culture, although this was not common. There was often reasonably good commentary about the cult of the Duce. Weaker responses relied on Mussolini’s oratory and background as a journalist or focused on the message rather than the method by which it was amplified. Many candidates found the evaluation of success challenging and were not able to access higher levels of AO2. There were many responses where once having described the methods used, simply asserted that they were successful without explaining why. Effective responses were able to argue that it is never simple to assess the impact of propaganda and that whilst there was a good deal of it, this did not necessarily equate to success. Discussion of battles and foreign policy was a valid approach, but in many cases, weaker answers tended to describe the policies and evaluate their success, which did not directly answer the question.

Successful answers sometimes pointed to the existence of repression to argue that propaganda was not a complete success or that social policies were often not popular, for example those relating to women’s roles, or emphasised the importance of religion in Italy. Those who chose to compare propaganda to other factors which led to Mussolini controlling Italy were not answering the question set and could not reach the higher levels. It is crucial that responses are fully focused on the actual question.

2 Assess the aims of Soviet foreign policy in the period 1924–41.

Many candidates answered this question. However, there were a number of responses which showed little knowledge of Soviet foreign policy. More effective answers had in-depth knowledge, sometimes referring to Europe and Asia and were able to decide which criteria to use in order to ‘assess’ them. One successful approach was to consider how Stalin’s aims and policies changed according to changing circumstances. Those accessing higher levels of AO1 understood the concept of Socialism in One Country and discussed how this policy was preferred to Permanent Revolution, as well as how it was carried out. Weaker responses asserted that this was an isolationist policy and proceeded to discuss industrialisation, which was not accepted and inevitably led to low marks being awarded for both AO1 and AO2. There was sometimes good analysis of the search for Collective Security and particularly perceptive candidates had knowledge of the changing use of Comintern, although this was not often. Most candidates were able to say something about the Nazi-Soviet Pact and there was some recognition that the threat from Germany was an important catalyst for changing policy.

3 ‘The main reason why the Nazi regime maintained its control of Germany in the period 1933–39 was its use of terror.’ Discuss this view.

A popular, and generally competently answered question. In terms of AO2, the highest levels were accessed by a consistent focus on the issue of relative significance and many approaches were able to build a line of reasoning which either supported or challenged the statement. A number of responses showed a balanced approach, with terror being compared to propaganda, popular economic, social, and foreign policies, and support from elites. Most answers were able to discuss the role of the Gestapo, use of camps and of events such as the Night of the Long Knives when discussing terror. The most successful responses were also able to discuss the police state by discussing the role of the People’s Court, for example. Some answers lost focus in discussing persecution of minorities and, in particular, irrelevant material on the Holocaust, which did not serve to advance their arguments. There was also a tendency amongst some weaker answers to include every policy that they knew, without really

making it clear how this helped the Nazis to control Germany. An example of this would be education and youth policies, which was often general description with little analysis. Some approaches focussed on a smaller range of factors going into greater depth, ensuring that the analysis was explicit, and this was often a successful approach. However, it was crucial that the stated factor was addressed fully for the higher levels to be reached.

4 Assess the extent to which living standards improved in Britain in the period 1919–39.

Not many responses to this question were seen, although there were some good examples, where candidates were able to discuss issues such as housing and welfare policies in this period. Some responses showed knowledge of the burgeoning consumer culture of the 1930s. The quality of assessment of changing living standards was variable, with the most successful approaches considering the geographical variations in Britain's economic development between the wars in order to argue that living standards improved for those in employment and particularly in areas not dependent on the declining staple industries, with wages rising higher than prices. The counterargument was that mass unemployment, poverty, the means test and the failure to build enough new homes meant that millions did not share these improvements. There was not a great deal of focus on public health, which is a valid line of enquiry for this topic.

Section B: The USA, 1944–92

5 Assess the reasons for Eisenhower's electoral successes in the 1950s.

There were a fair range of responses to this question. The most common approach to the requirement to 'assess' reasons for success was to discuss relative significance by weighing the impact of different factors against each other. Answers which did so in a superficial manner were less likely to reach the higher levels of AO2. A range of factors were used, commonly candidates were able to discuss Eisenhower's personal appeal, referencing his war record and common-sense approach which was sometimes compared to Adlai Stevenson's failure to 'connect' with voters. The best responses were able to combine Eisenhower's foreign and domestic policy offers in 1952 and then go onto explore his record when in office to explain his re-election, setting this against the campaigns and policies of the Democrats. Good depth of supporting detail was necessary to reach the higher levels at AO1, with weaker responses covering fewer factors in less depth. To reach the highest level of AO2, a consistent line of reasoning was expected, rather than dealing with factors individually, before reaching a judgement in the conclusion. The most effective analysis was made consistently, comparing the impact of different factors throughout.

6 Evaluate the impact of the American Indian Movement.

American Indian Movement (AIM) was correctly identified, but knowledge of its ambitions, actions and achievements was often limited. The better responses understood what the movement actually aimed to achieve, the background to its formation and the extent to which its actions improved the rights of Native Americans. Examples given included the occupation of Alcatraz Island and the Battle of Wounded Knee and there was sometimes discussion of social policies such as in education. Some effective answers argued that AIM's biggest achievement was in raising awareness of the plight of Native Americans, and Marlon Brando was referenced by some. Whilst less effective answers tended to write more generally about the Civil Rights Movement and assert that the American Indian population gained more from the work of African Americans. There were also examples where a good deal was written about the Hispanic civil rights campaign, which was not within the terms of the question and did not receive credit.

7 Evaluate the reasons for the rise of the religious right in the 1980s and early 1990s.

Those answers that addressed this question had a good grasp of the relevant arguments and included discussion about the reaction to popular ‘culture’ as a result of the changes from the 1960s onwards and issues such as Roe versus Wade. Effective responses were often characterised by the inclusion of the ways in which people such as Robertson and Falwell used various media outlets to get their message over, and the staggering sums of money they managed to raise, and also the way in which Reagan so successfully managed to utilise it in the 1980 election campaigns. There were a fair number of responses which reached the higher levels for AO1, but less for AO2. Often evaluation was not strong, although the best answers were able to comment on the relative importance of their identified reasons and took care to prioritise them, building a consistent line of reasoning to support their judgement on relative significance.

8 Evaluate the significance of the Nixon Doctrine for US foreign policy.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

Section C: International history, 1945–92

9 Evaluate the impact of the Cuban Missile Crisis on US–Soviet relations.

This was a very popular question. The very best responses knew what they had to do to ‘evaluate’ the consequences of the crisis rather than spending a good deal of their essay explaining the build-up to and course of events. Successful approaches explained the idea that, while the world was close to annihilation, both in the immediate aftermath and in the longer term, the relationship improved. Some consideration of the continued clashes was made, albeit ‘proxy’ wars and that propaganda coupled with a realisation on both sides that Mutual assured destruction (MAD) had been reached and tempers needed to cool. Good analysis tended to examine the immediate aftermath, including the Hotline between the Kremlin and White House and go onto discuss attempts to limit nuclear proliferation and their relative success. The implications of Gorbachev’s fall from power were also successfully explored by some of the more perceptive responses. However, often weaker answers were characterised by long passages of descriptive narrative.

10 Assess the extent to which ideological differences affected Sino–US relations during the Cold War.

There were some very good responses where there was discussion of how ideological difference stemmed from the outcome of the Chinese Civil War and American policies relating to Containment. These responses then went onto explore examples such as Korea and Taiwan, with accurate levels of knowledge. Here balance was achieved by considering the impact of the Sino-Soviet Split that improved relations between China and the USA were achieved despite the ongoing ideological differences. It was sometimes argued that pragmatism came to override ideology as a result of changing geo-politics and mutual economic benefit. Most responses covered the whole period, or at least until the 1970s. There were a small number of responses which were entirely about Sino-Soviet relations, which fell outside of the focus of the question set.

11 Analyse how far Pan-Africanism was affected by Cold War politics.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

12 'The United States' involvement in the Middle East during the Cold War was mainly to prevent Soviet influence in the region.' Evaluate this view.

The best responses evaluated the motives for US involvement with a case for and against; and also developed a sustained judgment one way or the other. Some responses were effective on the United States' role in the Palestine/Israel issue in the 1940s with the impact of the Jewish vote in the US, others started with Iran/Mossadegh, others with Suez. It was common for answers to include oil as a counterargument. There were some good answers which included the motivation behind the support and arming of Israel; the US reasons behind Camp David; and the US role in the Iraq/Iran conflict and the First Gulf War. Responses tended in general to be stronger on US motivation than that of the Soviet Union – arguing on the whole that the Soviet Union was just out to cause trouble, with many candidates reaching the higher levels of both AO1 and AO2.

HISTORY

Paper 9489/43
Depth Study

Key messages

- A sustained and consistent focus on the specific nature of the question posed is critical in allowing candidates to access the higher levels of the mark scheme.
- Strongest answers are consistently analytical and address all aspects of the question.
- Analysis must be supported by relevant and accurate factual information, which should be wide-ranging in nature.
- Candidates must have a good chronological understanding and should only use material which is relevant to the time period stipulated in the question.
- Effective answers provide a fully balanced argument, which considers any factors stated in the question alongside alternative explanations for events.
- Candidates are advised to read the questions carefully and determine what is required before starting to write their answers. Planning answers before choosing and writing is strongly advised.
- Command words such as assess and evaluate will be frequently used in questions set on Paper 4 of 9489 and candidates should be able to respond effectively to gain marks for AO2 in particular. Detail of command words for this syllabus are given on page 41 of the syllabus.
- Centres should also be fully aware that foreign policy is part of the syllabus for themes 1–3 in **Section A** and that questions specifically on this part of the course may be set.

General comments

The best responses were fully analytical in approach and contained a clearly defined argument, well supported with detailed and relevant subject knowledge in order to reach a logical final judgement, based on a consistent line of reasoning, which was present throughout the essay. A good example of this was **Question 1**, where the strongest answers examined the use of terror by Mussolini in the establishment of his dictatorship, before going on to discuss alternative factors.

The inclusion of a balanced judgement, based on precise and relevant factual knowledge and meeting the requirement to evaluate the significance of the stated factor, strengthened responses. However, weaker responses tended just to describe the events of the period and offered no clear judgement or tended to focus either on the stated factor or on others without discussing the original aspect.

Strong subject knowledge was apparent in many answers, where candidates often were familiar with the precise details needed. However, analysis would have been strengthened by comparing aims to outcomes and judging policies as a whole in the conclusion, rather than on a case-by-case basis.

Some candidates were unable to answer all aspects of the question, perhaps reflecting a lack of full understanding of the requirements and this was illustrated in **Question 5** where many responses appeared uncertain of the implications of social mobility and responded by discussing physical mobility instead and included just general descriptions of social changes in the 1950s. This inevitably limited the marks available to them.

Comments on specific questions

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

1 Evaluate the success of Mussolini's economic policies.

This was a popular question which was often answered successfully. Strong responses were characterised by a good level of precise supporting material, particularly in relation to the Battles and were able to provide balance by assessing the success/failure of individual policies. However, not all responses discussed Corporatism with the same degree of confidence. There were weaker responses which showed specific knowledge, without being able to compare what the Corporate State was meant to achieve, against what it actually did. In addition, some answers asserted that the Corporate State was successful without being clear why. Some stronger answers wrote about the responses to the Great Depression and were aware of the IRI, etc., but this was less common; and some included the Battle for Births, which was not credited as an economic policy. Even the strongest responses might have been improved by a more holistic judgement on the overall success of Mussolini's policies rather than a balance sheet approach.

2 'Stalin came to power because Lenin failed to plan for his succession.' Assess this view.

A popular question, with answers providing a range of explanations for the rise of Stalin. The stated factor was generally dealt with well, with many responses able to include material on Lenin's Testament, arguing that it was not his fault that his wishes were suppressed, and some effectively argued that Lenin never intended that an individual would succeed him. There was also relevant arguments on the failure of Lenin and others to grasp the extent of Stalin's ambition and cunning. Other common arguments included the power base that Stalin built, his own political skills, contrasted with the failings of his rivals, principally Trotsky. There was, also, often good detail on Stalin's defeat of his opponents in the power struggle. This is an area that candidates are generally comfortable with and able to score highly on AO1 and AO2. The most effective approaches were characterised by precise detail and consistent analysis providing a clear line of reasoning throughout.

3 Evaluate the effectiveness of Nazi youth policy in achieving its aims.

A popular question, with many responses able to score well on AO1 through detailed knowledge of Nazi education policy and of youth groups. However, despite many responses setting out a number of aims from the outset, weaker answers were characterised by lack of clarity about how far they were achieved. Some perceptive responses did make explicit that it is not always easy to judge the extent to which policies were successful. Others simply asserted that they were, without a clear explanation of how they reached this conclusion. It was common to read that the Hitler Youth was made compulsory in 1936 without the conclusion being reached that this indicated that many young people would not attend voluntarily and some conflated attendance with the successful indoctrination of the youth. Most answers discussed opposition among young people, with Edelweiss Pirates, Swing Movement, and the White Rose (despite being post-1941) usually included to provide balance. Successful analysis of the groups included their size and typicality, with analysis suggesting that these groups did not indicate much in the way of youth rebellion.

4 'British governments followed a policy of appeasement because it was popular with the public.' Discuss this view.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

Section B: The USA, 1944–92

5 ‘The Red Scare was mainly a reaction to the growth of Communism overseas.’ Assess this view.

This was not a very popular question, and there were few responses which showed detailed knowledge. Those who agreed with the statement tended to write about events in Europe and Asia, in variable detail. Some stronger answers developed a balanced argument by discussing domestic events, although, the degree of depth achieved was often relatively limited. Some references were made to how McCarthy used the issue for his own political purposes, but others took his campaign at face value. Few answers referred to other politicians such as Nixon. However, some answers did discuss examples such as Hiss or the Rosenbergs, but no parallels were drawn with the first Red Scare in the years following World War I to explore pre-existing fears of communism.

6 Assess how far Johnson achieved his aims in creating ‘The Great Society’.

A range of approaches to this question were evident. A good starting point was to define what was meant by the Great Society and what it aimed to achieve, although not all responses successfully did so. There were a number of responses which were knowledgeable about examples such as welfare, education, and health, with references to Medicaid and Medicare made. Many answers chose to focus on Johnson’s Civil Rights programmes and went into depth on the Civil Rights Act and Voting Rights Act, as well as the Housing Act. Some responses effectively considered Johnson’s motivations and the extent to which he was motivated by general altruism. It was often agreed that the Vietnam War hindered the ability of the overall package.

7 Assess the impact of multiculturalism in the United States in the 1980s and early 1990s.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

8 Evaluate the motives behind US attempts to limit nuclear arms in the years 1963–79.

There were some competent answers seen in attempts at this question. The most effective answers looked at the various factors which influenced US thinking, such as the cost, including USA’s debt, the prevailing fear of Mutually Assured Destruction influenced by the Cuban Missile Crisis, the thinking of Kissinger and Nixon and Carter’s ideas to cover the whole period in question. These answers then went on to assess which they felt was the most important - and why. Some responses successfully suggested that factors varied over time – fear of nuclear war after Cuba – cost after Vietnam and Johnson’s social programmes, etc. Generally good knowledge was apparent as well as the requirement to evaluate.

Section C: International history, 1945–92

9 Assess the extent to which President Reagan was responsible for the outbreak of the Second Cold War.

This was a popular question. These responses were usually characterised by a successful attempt at tackling the stated factor with Reagan’s anti-communism and escalation of the arms race through Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) commonly cited as support. The best responses understood that neo-conservative views on the Cold War were already developing, and that Carter was being influenced by advisers such as B Brzezinski to explain the Carter Doctrine. An understanding that a balanced approach was essential and was present in most responses. There was also, some very good analysis of the role of the Soviet Union, with the invasion of Afghanistan regularly discussed.

10 Analyse the reasons why the Dutch were unable to reestablish colonial control in Indonesia by 1949.

This was a popular question in this section, although the depth of knowledge and understanding was variable. The best answers were prepared to discuss a range of factors and clearly understood the chain of events. There was focus on the development of independence movements in Indonesia, the role of Japan, Great Britain, the United Nations and the US, with their threat to withhold Marshall Aid from the Netherlands frequently discussed. Dutch weakness after World War II was also commonly discussed, albeit with little supporting detail. Many responses offered relatively little detail and lack of knowledge was evident. Attempts to offer geographical factors as an explanation tended to be unsuccessful.

11 Evaluate Azikiwe's role in achieving Nigerian independence.

Relatively few candidates answered this question. However, successful, responses tended to be knowledgeable about his career and role in bringing about independence for Nigeria, including his ability to bring together disparate strands of Nigerian society. This approach led to some evaluation in terms of weighing up his overall influence and importance. However, most responses were not really able to contrast this with other factors such as the willingness of the British to leave.

12 Analyse why the United Nations was unable to implement successfully its decision to partition Palestine.

Not many candidates answered this, but the responses seen were usually good both in terms of depth and comment. Some arguments included that it was an impossible task because of events going back to Balfour, etc. – the number of Arabs already in Palestine while at the same time looking at the moral impetus towards the state of Israel caused by the Holocaust. Other factors such as the British desire to get out and the determination of the Arab League were also covered. Some good debates and arguments were evident here.