

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- It is most important that responses are closely focused on the terms of the question. This is important in both questions but many responses to **part (a)** were weakened by lacking an appropriate focus. The task is not simply to compare the sources but to compare them in such a way that the question is answered.
- In **part (b)** answers should consider how the sources support and challenge the prompt in the question. It will always be possible to develop a two-sided argument from the sources.
- Commentaries about the reliability or 'bias' of the sources, which do not serve the needs of the question, are not relevant.
- Responses are most effective when **part (a)** is answered first.

General comments

A considerable proportion of responses addressed **part (b)** before they answered **part (a)**. The question paper is designed to help candidates focus by addressing a two-source question and then a four-source question. It is helpful for candidates to answer **part (a)** first. Those who elect to answer **part (b)** first often misjudge their timings and find it challenging to maintain the correct focus for **part (a)**. The question paper is designed to help candidates focus by addressing a two-source question first.

It is important to read the sources carefully and to work out what they are arguing. In some instances, candidates missed nuances in sources or misrepresented the argument. This meant that they drew comparisons or attempted to make support/challenge arguments which were not valid. The best responses result from careful planning where candidates have given themselves time to read and think about the sources before starting their answer.

Most responses demonstrated the ability to comprehend and analyse the sources. Candidates were aware that **part (a)** requires identification and explanation of similarities **and** differences, and that **part (b)** requires an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the statement or prompt in the question. Most responses used source content and provided relevant quotations or direct paraphrases to support the comparison or explain the support/challenge argument. Short quotations were adequate. However, the use of ellipses weakened source use in some answers. It is important that candidates show how the sources support the comparison in **part (a)** or the challenge/support argument in **part (b)**. Long quotations, and the use of ellipses, raise questions about how well the source has been understood.

In each of the **part (a)** questions candidates were required to consider a specific focus when comparing the sources. This involved discussing 'attitudes' in **Question 1(a)**, 'attempts to deal with the Depression' in **Question 2(a)** and 'whether the French invasion of the Ruhr was justified' in **Question 3(a)**. Weak answers often resulted from overlooking these specific terms. This was most noticeable in responses to **Question 3(a)**, however, many responses to **Question 2(a)** contained attempted comparisons on the causes of the depression which were not relevant and could not be credited. To be valid, the comparison must be based on a detail, inference or sub-message which is addressed by both sources and relates to the question. Weaker responses sometimes asserted similarities or differences for points which were not comparable or wrote about the provenance.

Some responses demonstrated knowledge of the topic covered by the sources but this was rarely used to the best effect. Contextual understanding is vital for responses to achieve marks in the higher levels. In **part (a)**, achieving Level 4 is based on explaining the similarities or differences between the sources. It is necessary to consider the sources in context to work out why they are similar or different. In **part (b)** the reward of higher-level marks requires evaluation of the sources to assess their weight as evidence. However,

evaluating the sources is not creditworthy unless the evaluation is linked to the question. Many responses contained lengthy sections of background information or generalised commentary on the bias and reliability of sources. In **part (b)**, candidates might ask themselves if their knowledge supports or challenges the claims made in a source as a way of assessing the weight of the source as evidence. Alternatively, if a source was written for a specific audience or to achieve a specific outcome, candidates should consider how that affects its weight as evidence. It is important to remember that each question and set of sources work differently. Generalised comments about a source being a political speech and therefore biased, or a cartoon being designed to entertain the audience do not constitute evaluation.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: European option: The Industrial Revolution in Britain, 1750 – 1850

Question 1

- (a) Read Source B and Source C. Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about attitudes towards child labour in the textile industry.**

For comparisons to be effective it was essential that inferences were made about the attitude being expressed. Simply comparing details without explaining what they showed about attitudes was not enough. The most commonly seen comparison was that Source B demonstrated a negative attitude towards child labour and Source C was more positive in its attitude. This was often developed with effective source use to illustrate the attitudes shown in each source. Many referred to the comments in Source B about child labour being worse than slavery to support the negative attitude. This was compared against Source C's writer expressing concern that children were actually worse off when they were not working. Many responses identified a valid similarity, as they expressed a regretful attitude about the physical wellbeing of the child workers. Source B explained how some child labourers could barely walk when they reached adulthood. Source C admitted that children worked '*beyond their strength*'. A few responses demonstrated specific contextual knowledge of the Factory Acts or general understanding of the impacts of industrialisation. Too often attempts at explanation took the line that Source C was by a factory owner so '*he would say that wouldn't he*.' Specific contextual knowledge about factory conditions could have been used to explain the similarity between the sources.

- (b) Read all of the sources. How far do the sources show that factory reform was in the wider public interest?**

Most candidates gave a two-sided response to the question and there was evidence of effective source use in many answers. Source A was identified as a challenge source. Responses explained that reforming the factories by reducing the hours of the workers would be bad for Britain as it would damage profits. In turn this would be bad for the workers as their wages could be reduced. Source B, on the other hand, was argued as a support source, although some responses tried to argue that it was neutral or had nothing to do with the idea of 'wider public interest'. The most effective answers used their knowledge of the context and understood that ensuring that children were safe from harm or were not encouraged to commit crimes was in the public interest. Some used the comments made by the slave owner in the source to explain that reform was needed because child labour was 'unethical' or 'immoral'. Source C was seen as a support source, responses pointing out that if factory reforms were introduced they could '*benefit our foreign rivals*', with the added impact of reducing the wages of the workers. The source could also be used to show that some reform had already taken place. The reference to children under thirteen now working 'only eight hours daily' was evidence that factory reform was advocated by some people and was considered by them to be in the public interest. Source D was often used well as a support source and candidates understood the mill owner's argument that more hours did not result in workers being more productive. Responses which used their knowledge to evaluate the sources to decide whether the support or challenge element of the argument was stronger were seen very rarely. Most attempts to evaluate were generic, often stating that the source was biased or unreliable because it was from a mill owner or a reformer without making any link to the context or the question. A significant minority of responses took a one-sided approach to the question and some dismissed sources as being irrelevant to the question.

Section B: American Option: The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal policies, 1920 – 1941

Question 2

- (a) **Read Sources B and C. Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about Hoover's attempts to deal with the depression.**

The most frequently explained similarity was that both sources accepted that Hoover had attempted to tackle the problem of unemployment through a public works programme. Source C mentioned that Hoover's administration had spent '\$2 billion...on public works', while Source B accepted that '*public works initiatives*' had been taken. However, some responses misrepresented the argument of Source B and suggested that both sources agreed that what Hoover had done was successful. Source B stated that Republicans praised what Hoover had done but that was not the argument of the article as a whole. Another equally valid similarity was that both sources showed measures had been taken to support the banking system. Many candidates also pointed out a difference between the sources, often focusing on Source B's argument that Mellon was only helping out the Federal Reserve, and not the smaller banks, whereas Source C claimed the entire banking system was supported. Some responses were weakened by a lack of focus and included comparisons on the causes of the Depression. Many responses added a paragraph of contextual knowledge, or a discussion of reliability, which did not serve the needs of the question. The most successful responses were able to explain the differences between the sources using knowledge of what Hoover had, or had not, done in response to the Depression.

- (b) **Read all of the sources. 'The Depression in the United States was caused by international factors.' How far do the sources support this view.**

Many responses made effective use of the sources and produced a balanced answer. Source A was often argued as a supporting source, although some responses listed aspects in their explanation, such as '*stock market*' which were not international. Others used Source A as a challenge and pointed out that more factors in the cartoon were internal to the United States, such as '*Congress*' and '*Prohibition*'. Some misread the cartoon and thought it was blaming Hoover. In fact, the characters portrayed were blaming each other. Source B was used as a challenge source and responses often pointed out that internal issues, such as the Republicans laissez-faire attitude, were to blame instead. Some attempted to build an argument around the idea that there was a crisis in agriculture and manufacturing and these had caused the Depression. However, the crisis was a symptom of depression rather than a cause. Source C could be used on both sides of the argument. It supported by focusing on issues created by war (a reference to the First World War) and trade barriers in many parts of the world. However, it also mentioned internal issues such as '*reckless speculation*'. Some attempted to argue that the phrase '*factors beyond our control*' related to international factors but this not necessarily the case and Hoover followed this comment by discussing internal factors. Source D was used effectively as a support source, with Roosevelt's comment about 'foreign demand...has undergone substantial decline' used to develop the point. While some candidates attempted to consider the authorship of the sources and comment on their reliability, usually dismissing Sources C and D as unreliable because they were written by politicians which fell short of evaluation. It was common to see stock evaluation such as Source A was unreliable as it was a cartoon. Few one-sided responses were seen although some lacked understanding of the term 'international' and others inverted the question to discuss whether 'internal' factors were to blame.

Section C: International Option: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1920s

Question 3

- (a) **Read Source A and Source B. Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about whether the French invasion of the Ruhr was justified.**

The main issue with this question was that very many candidates did not address the 'was justified' element. Both Sources A and B contained elements which suggested that the French were not justified in their actions. Stresemann argues in Source A that '*No threat can give France an excuse...*', a clear indication that he thought the invasion was not justified. Although Source B was more ambivalent, there was an argument that some Americans thought the French should be stopped. This also suggested a lack of justification. Some responses pointed out that both sources

showed that France's actions made things worse for the German economy and so their attempt to recover reparations would not work. This idea of France's invasion of the Ruhr being self-defeating was valid if it was developed by adding an inference to explain that it was therefore not justified. Source B argued that some Americans hoped that France would succeed and was '*justly entitled*' to try and claim their reparations. This suggested that France was justified. However, some responses made a comment along these lines without making the link back to Source A, leaving the comparison incomplete. Weaker responses resulted from a lack of focus on the question.

(b) Read all the sources. How far do the sources support the view that the economic disaster in Germany in 1923 was a consequence of the Ruhr invasion?

Most responses made effective use of the sources to support and challenge the idea that the economic disaster in Germany was a consequence of the invasion. Source A was correctly used as a support source in many answers, although the quality of the explanation based on source content varied considerably. Quotations such as '*trade has declined*' and '*the Mark has fallen*' were understood as evidence that economic problems resulted from the invasion. Some quoted elements of the source such as '*France hopes that...German unity will collapse*' which was not a reference to the economic disaster taking place. Source B was used as a support source by many candidates. Americans were worried that it would lead to '*economic disaster*' and had a negative impact on '*Germany's capacity to export*'. Some tried to argue that Source B also challenged the prompt but the argument was usually about whether there was support for what France had done, rather than whether France had caused an economic disaster. Source C was used as a challenge source and referred to exaggeration of the impact of the invasion and the fact that German finance was in '*a dangerous condition*' before the invasion took place. Contextual knowledge could be used to support this point as hyperinflation, described in the first paragraph, started in Germany in 1922. Source D was generally argued as a challenge source although some saw an element of support in the comment about the '*bad situation in the Ruhr*'. However, the main argument of the source was that the German government did not do enough and their inaction made the situation worse. Some candidates used their contextual knowledge to explain Rosenberg's viewpoint. As a Communist, he opposed capitalism and it was not surprising that he blamed the industrialists' focus on their own profits for the economic problems experienced by Germany. In a small minority of responses this was used to suggest that Source D was weaker as evidence in response to the question.

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- The most effective responses are closely focused on the terms of the question.
- 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. Each source should be viewed holistically rather than divided into individual sentences or part sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to that of the whole source.
- It is important to use source content to support points made in both sections of the question paper. Quotations should be precisely selected rather than a section of the source being identified in general.
- In **part (a)** evidence from the sources should be given to support the comparison being made.
- In **part (b)** source content should be used to explain how the source supports or challenges the statement in the question. It is important that the argument is explained rather than asserted.
- In **part (a)** the purpose of evaluating the sources is to explain the similarities or differences between them. Commentaries on the context, or discussions on reliability, are not relevant unless they are used in this way.
- In **part (b)** the purpose of evaluating the sources is to decide which side of the argument (support or challenge) is stronger. Sources should be placed in context and evaluated to decide whether they lend weight to the argument. Commentaries on the context or reliability of sources are not creditworthy unless they serve the question.

General comments

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

It is important to read the sources carefully and to work out what they are arguing. In some instances, candidates missed nuances in sources or misrepresented the argument. This meant that they drew comparisons or attempted to make support/challenge arguments which were not valid. The best responses result from careful planning where candidates have given themselves time to read and think about the sources before starting their answer.

Most responses demonstrated the ability to comprehend and analyse the sources. Candidates were aware that **part (a)** requires identification and explanation of similarities **and** differences, and that **part (b)** requires an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the statement or prompt in the question. Most responses used source content and provided relevant quotations or direct paraphrases to support the comparison or explain the support/challenge argument. Short quotations were adequate. However, the use of ellipses weakened source use in some answers. It is important that candidates show how the sources support the comparison in **part (a)** or the challenge/support argument in **part (b)**. Long quotations, and the use of ellipses, raise questions about how well the source has been understood.

In each of the **(a)** questions, candidates were required to identify and explain similarities and differences between two sources; in **Question 1(a)** the focus was evidence about the growth of towns, in **Question 2(a)** evidence about the Schechter 'Sick Chicken' case, and in **Question 3(a)** comparing and contrasting evidence about the arrangements for the Saar. Identifying the specific focus of the question is essential to successful responses to the question. This was most noticeable in responses to **Question 3(a)**. To be valid, the comparison must be based on a detail, inference or sub-message which is addressed by both sources and relates to the given question. Some responses contained detailed comparisons of the sources which

were not focused on the question, instead focusing on reparations or the Treaty of Versailles in general rather than specifics related to the post-war arrangements for the Saarland. Weaker responses sometimes asserted similarities or differences which were not comparable or simply wrote about the provenance.

Some responses demonstrated knowledge of the topic covered by the sources but this was rarely used to the best effect. Contextual understanding is vital for responses to achieve marks in the higher levels. In **part (a)**, achieving Level 4 is based on explaining the similarities or differences between the sources. It is necessary to consider the sources in context to work out why they are similar or different. In **part (b)** the reward of higher-level marks requires evaluation of the sources to assess their weight as evidence. However, evaluating the sources is not creditworthy unless the evaluation is linked to the question. Many responses contained lengthy sections of background information or generalised commentary on the bias and reliability of sources. In **part (b)**, candidates might ask themselves if their knowledge supports or challenges the claims made in a source as a way of assessing the weight of the source as evidence. Alternatively, if a source was written for a specific audience or to achieve a specific outcome, candidates should consider how that affects its weight as evidence. It is important to remember that each question and set of sources work differently. Generalised comments about a source being a political speech and therefore biased, or a cartoon being designed to entertain the audience do not constitute evaluation.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: European option: The Industrial Revolution in Britain, 1750 – 1850

Question 1

(a) Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about the growth of towns.

Most responses identified relevant similarities between the sources and supported this with effective use of source details and inferences from the engraving 'London Going out of Town', with most comparing unhealthy living conditions. Some responses highlighted the rapidity of growth. Many responses identified valid differences with the sources, with most candidates identifying the lack of regulation in London in comparison to Manchester. To make effective use of knowledge and reach Level 4, it was necessary to use relevant details to explain the similarities or differences between the sources, and many candidates used their knowledge of legislation such as the 1835 Municipal Corporations Act to explain differences in regulation.

(b) How far do these source show that regulation was needed to improve public health in the towns?

Many candidates gave a substantial response to the question and there was evidence of effective source use in most answers. Source A was identified as a support source, with many candidates inferring difficult living conditions which required regulation. Elements of support and challenge were identified correctly from source B. Sources C and D were recognised as challenge sources, with the elements of nuance in C – that it admitted popular support for regulation – being a valid identification. Stronger responses used contextual knowledge to evaluate the sources to decide whether the support or challenge element of the argument was stronger, while weaker responses adopted general evaluation and often stated that the source was biased or unreliable. The sources will always offer opportunities to address both elements of the argument, and all sources will be relevant to the view in question.

Section B: American Option: The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal policies, 1920 – 41

Question 2

(a) Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about the Schechter 'Sick Chicken' case.

Most responses dealt with this question very well and could clearly draw similarities and differences between the two sources. The question was focused on the Schechter case. Therefore, answers had to focus on the details of the case and the reasons for its outcome. Most responses offered support from the sources to explain and develop their points and remained focused on the Schechter case and its outcomes. Some weaker responses asserted that the sources were similar

or different but did not provide relevant material from both sources to support their comparison, while in others the focus drifted from the case to wider issues of court packing and the Supreme Court.

(b) How far so the sources support the view that the opposition to the Court packing plan was based on a fear that it would give too much power to the President?

Most responses made effective use of the sources to support and challenge the view that opposition to the Court packing plan was based on fear of too much power being given to the President. Source A was argued to support the hypothesis, with most candidates identifying key messages from the cartoon. Source B was also a support source and many candidates identified key messages around the 'personal power of the Executive'. Source C was also used effectively to challenge the view with many candidates identifying the personal and political reasons highlighted by Roosevelt when trying to justify his actions to Democratic supporters. Source D was used in challenge, but several responses did not identify that the opposition highlighted was for political rather than constitutional reasons.

Section C: International Option: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1920s

Question 3

(a) Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about the arrangements for the Saar.

This question required candidates to compare evidence about arrangements for the Saar after the First World War. Most candidates were able to recognise both similarities and differences in the sources as detailed in the mark scheme. However, the focus of some responses drifted into giving a great deal of detail about other elements to the Peace Conference in Versailles and summaries of the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles which were not relevant to the question. The strongest responses began to use their knowledge of the period to explain the differences between the sources using contextual detail which went beyond rote evaluation, in particular their knowledge of the plebiscite and the League of Nations commission. Some weaker responses added a stand-alone discussion of the provenance and reliability, which did not serve the needs of the question, while others did not identify key facts from the sources because of a lack of specific focus on the Saar. These responses listed narrative detail which was too general for the needs of the evaluation.

(b) How far do the sources support the view that German anger about reparations was justified?

Most responses engaged with the sources effectively to offer support and challenge for the assertion that German anger about the reparations was justified. Source B was used well by candidates as a support source who used the 'victorious violence' discussed to identify justification on the grounds of being unreasonable and excessive. Source D was used less effectively, but some responses used its description of 'economic slavery' to support the view. A few responses found the implications of source A – that Germany 'will pay' more – difficult to use to challenge the hypothesis, but most candidates successfully used source C with Clemenceau's argument of the demands being quite reasonable, to challenge the idea of the right of Germany to feel angry about the reparations. Some responses showed uncertainty over the term 'justified' and this led to some misreading and confusion about the meaning of the sources.

The strongest responses used contextual knowledge of the period to evaluate the sources and explain how this evaluation made them more or less valuable when answering the question. Most responses demonstrated some contextual knowledge, often about the details of the provisions of the Treaty of Versailles on Germany, but only a few used this to evaluate the sources to decide whether the support or challenge element of the argument was stronger. In weaker responses evaluation was quite general, often stating that the source was biased or unreliable without any links to the context or the question. The weakest responses described source content without making a clear link to the question.

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- It is most important that responses are closely focused on the terms of the question. This is important in both questions but many responses to **part (a)** were weakened by lacking an appropriate focus. The task is not simply to compare the sources but to compare them in such a way that the question is answered.
- In **part (b)** answers should consider how the sources support and challenge the prompt in the question. It will always be possible to develop a two-sided argument from the sources.
- Commentaries about the reliability or 'bias' of the sources, which do not serve the needs of the question, are not relevant.
- Responses are most effective when **part (a)** is answered first.

General comments

A considerable proportion of responses addressed **part (b)** before they answered **part (a)**. The question paper is designed to help candidates focus by addressing a two-source question and then a four-source question. It is helpful for candidates to answer **part (a)** first. Those who elect to answer **part (b)** first often misjudge their timings and find it challenging to maintain the correct focus for **part (a)**. The question paper is designed to help candidates focus by addressing a two-source question first.

It is important to read the sources carefully and to work out what they are arguing. In some instances, candidates missed nuances in sources or misrepresented the argument. This meant that they drew comparisons or attempted to make support/challenge arguments which were not valid. The best responses result from careful planning where candidates have given themselves time to read and think about the sources before starting their answer.

Most responses demonstrated the ability to comprehend and analyse the sources. Candidates were aware that **part (a)** requires identification and explanation of similarities **and** differences, and that **part (b)** requires an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the statement or prompt in the question. Most responses used source content and provided relevant quotations or direct paraphrases to support the comparison or explain the support/challenge argument. Short quotations were adequate. However, the use of ellipses weakened source use in some answers. It is important that candidates show how the sources support the comparison in **part (a)** or the challenge/support argument in **part (b)**. Long quotations, and the use of ellipses, raise questions about how well the source has been understood.

In each of the **(a)** questions candidates were required to make comparisons based on evidence about attitudes towards developments in the woollen industry for **Question 1(a)**, evidence about Secretary Mellon for **Question 2(a)** and evidence about German disarmament after the Treaty of Versailles in **Question 3(a)**. Where answers were weak, this often resulted from overlooking specific terms, for example not focusing on attitudes but instead comparing outcomes or impacts of events. This was most noticeable in responses to **Question 1(a)**. To be valid, the comparison must be based on a detail, inference or sub-message which is addressed by both sources and related to the question. Some responses contained detailed comparisons of the sources which were not focused on the question regarding attitudes but instead compared impacts or surface details. Weaker responses sometimes asserted similarities or differences for points which were not comparable, wrote only about the provenance, or described the content of the sources in turn with no comparison.

Some responses lacked contextual understanding which would have encouraged more effective reading of the sources beyond face value. Knowledge is also key to achieving marks in the higher levels. In **part (a)**, achieving Level 4 is based on explaining the similarities or differences between the sources. This can be

done using contextual knowledge. In **part (b)** the reward of higher-level marks requires evaluation of the sources to assess their weight as evidence. However, it should be noted that evaluating the sources is not creditworthy unless the evaluation is linked to the question. Many responses contain lengthy sections of background information or unfocused commentary on the bias and reliability of sources. More effective responses to **part (a)** explain how the sources are similar and different and to consider why the similarities or differences exist. For instance, in **Question 1(a)** it was possible to use knowledge about handloom weavers, spinning machines and then the adoption of power looms to evaluate the sources in context. In **part (b)**, it is useful for candidates to ask themselves whether their knowledge of the topic supports the claims made in the sources. If so, that might increase the value of a source. Alternatively, if a source was written for a specific purpose or audience, they should consider how that affects its weight as evidence. Candidates could use their wider contextual knowledge of key figures such as Mellon and Hoover and impeachment proceedings to weigh up the sources discussing Mellon and his policies and creations such as the RFC. In **Question 3(b)** it was possible to use contextual knowledge of the Dawes Act, the Rapallo Treaty and the Locarno conference to assess the question of the likelihood of disarmament.

A significant proportion of responses addressed **part (b)** first. This approach can have a negative impact and this was observed in responses which struggled to focus on **part (a)** as a result of completing that part of the assessment last. It is worth bearing in mind that the assessment is structured to be helpful to candidates. By focusing on two sources, **part (a)** is designed to help the candidates ease themselves into the sources and the topic before moving onto **part (b)** which requires work on all four sources.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: European option: The Industrial Revolution in Britain, 1750 – 1850

Question 1

(a) Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about attitudes towards developments in the woollen industry.

Most responses identified relevant differences between the sources. These included the positive and negative attitudes concerning the future living conditions and commercial implications from the different perspectives of the workers and merchants. Few responses identified the different reactions regarding parish/poor relief for workers and the implications of poor relief and income assistance, particularly the employers' influence with poor relief. Most responses identified valid similarities with the sources, identifying attitudes of 'alarm' and 'distress'. Some weaker responses did not focus on attitudes in the sources but sought to make comparisons on impacts such as numbers of workers who had lost employment which was not the question focus. To make effective use of knowledge and reach Level 4, it was necessary to use relevant contextual details to explain the similarities or differences between the sources, and while many responses showed knowledge of innovations such as the 'spinning jenny', this was not used to explain differences, but was cited as detail in stand-alone paragraphs.

(b) How far do these sources show that mechanisation brought about social and economic benefits?

Many candidates gave a substantial response to the question and there was good evidence of effective source use in most answers. Elements of support and challenge were identified correctly from source B with many candidates inferring the economic benefits of the use of machinery to the merchants and the town as a whole, together with the admission that work might temporarily become scarce. Source C was identified as a support source, with confident identification of the social and economic benefits mentioned in the source. Sources D was also used as a source with both support and challenge elements; highlighting the 'national prosperity' gained from economic benefits and the negative social impacts on the working classes. Source A was clearly identified as a challenge source, with many candidates identifying both the social and economic impacts of mechanisation outlined in the content. The strongest responses used contextual knowledge to evaluate the sources to decide whether the support or challenge element of the argument was stronger, while weaker responses tended to employ general evaluation – often stating the source was unreliable or biased.

Section B: American Option: The Great Crash, the Great Depression and the New Deal policies, 1920 – 41

Question 2

- (a) Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about Secretary Mellon.**

Most responses dealt with this question very well and could clearly draw similarities and differences between the two sources. Most responses identified relevant similarities between the sources, the most frequently discussed being Mellon's belief in a 'leave-it-alone' attitude. In most cases these similarities were supported with effective use of source details. Most responses also identified valid differences, most especially the portrayal of Mellon contrasting between 'not hard-hearted' and 'sympathetic to suffering' and 'ruthless and hard-hearted'. In some instances, possible differences were missed because of limited detailed contextual knowledge being applied to the task, with few responses identifying the differences stated about the work of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

- (b) To what extent do the sources support the view that President Hoover did little to try and solve the Depression?**

Many candidates gave a two-sided response to the question and there was evidence of effective source use in most responses. Source A was identified as a support source, with responses explaining that Hoover did little apart from making suggestions which were impossible to implement. However the tone and emphasis in the source was rarely commented upon, and the potential to evaluate the source in depth using the additional detailed provenance from the official marking the letter 'not worth answering' was seldom taken up by candidates. Source B was also seen as a support source, although more blame is placed on Mellon than on Hoover himself in its content. Source C challenged the assertion with a confident and positive portrayal of Hoover's impact on the Depression with links to four key factors. Most candidates identified this, although some responses found it difficult to identify the affirmative elements of the portrayal or were mistaken about the activity represented. Source D was a nuanced source which could also be used to support the actions for recovery taken by Hoover's approach. As authored by Hoover, it clearly challenges the assertion, highlighting positive steps to recovery. However, the source content also supports the 'did little' view, in that he adopted a 'leave-well-alone' policy deliberately as he felt that would be beneficial for the economy and the slump would 'reform' the people. Many responses identified these nuances and this added depth to their discussions.

Section C: International Option: The League of Nations and international relations in the 1920s

Question 3

- (a) Compare and contrast these two sources as evidence about German disarmament after the Treaty of Versailles.**

This question required candidates to compare evidence about German disarmament. Most candidates were able to recognise both relevant similarities and differences in the sources. Similarities were best identified, with many responses highlighting the breaches of disarmament agreements with 'a few thousand rifles' and the 'cargoes of arms and ammunition'. Some weaker responses drifted from their focus and attempted to write detailed responses on the wider provisions of the Treaty of Versailles which were not relevant to the question in hand. The strongest responses began to use their knowledge of the period to explain the differences between the sources in particular their knowledge of Stresemann's tenure as Foreign Minister and the 'Golden Years'. To make effective use of contextual knowledge and reach Level 4, it was necessary to use relevant details to explain the similarities or differences between the sources. Some responses added a discussion of the provenance and reliability of the two sources which did not explain the differences, and which did not directly serve the needs of the question.

- (b) 'Worldwide disarmament was achievable after the agreement at Locarno.' How far do the sources support this view?**

Most responses engaged with the sources to offer support and challenge to the view that worldwide disarmament was achievable after Locarno. Elements of support and challenge were

identified correctly from source A with many candidates inferring the possibilities of an achievable 'next step' and the gulf between the stones labelled Locarno and Disarmament implying some doubt about whether this could be realised. Many candidates also gave secure inferences from the portrayal of 'Europa' and how this related to worldwide disarmament. Source C was used both to support and challenge the view. Many candidates correctly identified the assertion of 'the beginning of a new era' and others also noted the challenging element that — sometime after the agreements negotiated at Locarno — during October 1925, the German delegate had asserted that 'the efforts which the League of Nations has made to reduce armaments have been unsuccessful so far'. Source C was mostly used as a support source but could be used on both sides of the argument. The comments that the alleged arms deliveries were 'inconsistent with the policies of the present foreign minister, Stresemann' were most frequently cited. Some candidates did use their contextual knowledge to identify that the date of the arms shipments was more than a year after the Locarno agreements which put doubt on the real commitment of Germany towards disarmament. Source B was correctly identified as a challenge source with Stalin's clear comments regarding international cooperation and pacifism as 'all nonsense' used well to challenge the view. Some responses attempted to use contextual knowledge to evaluate Stalin's views. However, this was only creditable if it was used to evaluate the source, rather than adding narrative detail, and if it was linked to the question.

The strongest responses 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. Many responses demonstrated some contextual knowledge, although details on the disarmament conferences or international treaties were sometimes very general. Few candidates used this to evaluate the sources to decide whether the support or challenge element of the argument was stronger. Most attempts to evaluate were broad, often stating that the source was biased or unreliable based on authorship without any links to the context or the question. Some weaker responses described source content without making a clear link to the question.

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- Candidates should develop a good understanding of the chronology of key events as this will help them to link factors accurately and build effective arguments.
- In **Part (a)** questions the key element is explaining why something happened. Identifying several reasons is an important first step but to reach higher levels of the mark scheme it is necessary to give a clear understanding of the connections between causes to reach a supported conclusion.
- In **Part (b)** questions, responses should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported. A well written but one-sided analysis will not allow the candidate to reach the top Level of the mark scheme.
- Candidates should note and act on any timeframe given in the question. This will enable the response to be focused on the question set.

General comments

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

In **Part (b)** the awareness that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways was a characteristic of strong answers. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Responses which were less successful fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question; relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to lose focus, often by ignoring timeframes given in the question.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Modern Europe 1750 – 1921

Question 1: France, 1774 – 1814

(a) Explain why Napoleon became emperor in 1804.

Successful responses were able to provide several reasons for why Napoleon was able to become emperor, showing a good level of understanding. Many were able to explain for example, how Napoleon created a positive image for himself through propaganda or his military successes or argued that after the troubled history of the Directory and Robespierre, Napoleon represented stability. Weaker responses were able to identify reasons, but were unable to support these

statements, for example by saying that he had been a good leader as First Consul but without providing evidence such as the financial reforms or Napoleonic Code.

(b) 'Taxes caused the outbreak of the French Revolution in 1789.' How far do you agree?

Strong responses were able to produce high quality analysis based on the deployment of appropriate factual evidence to aid the development of fully focused and balanced arguments. The impact on the Third Estate of taxes such as the gabelle was assessed against a range of other factors, for example poor harvests, the impact of Enlightenment ideas, and the financing of the American Revolution. Louis XVI's poor leadership was often considered, and in some instances was used to conclude that it was his poor decision making over the factors that was the catalyst for the revolution. Weaker responses either provided description of the revolution without considering causation or attempted to focus on causation but with generalised support. Some answers considered the role of taxation but did not attempt to consider other reasons and these answers therefore lacked balance.

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

(a) Explain why Prussia faced a constitutional crisis in 1862.

This question was about the crisis over the military budget, and the relationship between the Liberals in the Prussian parliament and King Wilhelm I. Stronger responses were able to recognise this and provide some explanation of the military restructuring and the fears of the Liberals. Weaker responses were not confident in the chronology of the period and concentrated either on the earlier period of the Frankfurt Parliament or believed that it was after Bismarck had been appointed. Some responses were able to recognise that there was tension between King Wilhelm and parliament but were unable to explain the reasons for that tension.

(b) How far did the humiliation of Olmütz establish a dominant position in Germany for Austria?

Some strong responses were seen which contained assessment of the impact of Olmütz on Prussia, in particular through the ending of the Erfurt Union. This was then often balanced either through consideration of the unwillingness of the smaller states to be dominated by Austria, or consideration of Austria's relative weakness since their dominant position could be largely attributed to Russian support during the Hungarian Revolution. Very rarely did responses consider the continuing dominance of Prussia through the influence of the Zollverein. Weaker responses were descriptive and often generalised, lacking support specific to the question focus. These responses rarely focused on Olmütz, instead providing descriptions of Bismarck's actions and the Austro-Prussian War.

Question 3: The Russian Revolution, 1894 – 1921

(a) Explain why Stolypin introduced his agricultural reforms.

Some stronger responses were seen which recognised the context of the reforms, set against the 1905 revolution. These explanations considered the reason for reform, and how the reforms would achieve this. For example, *'Stolypin introduced the agricultural reforms to stop the threat of revolutionary groups gaining support from the peasants after the 1905 revolution. By introducing a national land bank, he enabled the peasants to buy land. This helped develop a more prosperous group of 'Kulaks' that would stand to lose if the Tsarist regime was toppled, creating more support from this group.* Alternative reasons seen included to help peasants burdened by redemption payments after emancipation, or to improve production in the east of the country through the resettlement programme. Weaker responses lacked focus on Russia using generalised statements such as *'because they needed more food'*. Some weaker responses wrote about Witte and industrialisation which was not relevant to the question.

(b) Control over Petrograd and Moscow was the most important reason for the Bolsheviks' victory in the Russian Civil War.' How far do you agree?

Many effective responses were seen to this question, with strong answers able to produce a comparative assessment of the reason for the Bolshevik's victory. These answers would initially argue why a factor such as strong leadership was a benefit to the Bolsheviks, before assessing the impact of weak leadership on the White Army. For example, *'The threat of harsh treatment was a*

significant cause for the Bolsheviks because it forced compliance of the citizens and army. Tsarist officers, for example were employed under the Bolsheviks while their families were held hostage. They also reintroduced the death penalty in the military. While the White army suffered from mass desertions the Reds used threats to ensure their numbers remained high. Strong responses were able to analyse the benefits of the central location, factories and access to the railway system provided by Petrograd and Moscow, but also assess alternative reasons for the Bolshevik victory such as War Communism, Trotsky's leadership, and the unpopularity of the Whites. Weaker responses showed some understanding of the importance of Petrograd and Moscow but were unable to access the higher levels as their assessment lacked support.

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

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

(a) Explain why the Dred Scott decision caused anger in Northern states.

Many very good responses were seen to this question, with the circumstances of the Dred Scott case well known and usually accurately described, despite some confusion around the exact circumstances that he found himself in after the death of his owner. The most common approach was to initially describe the case before addressing the issue of why the decision so upset the Northern states. The strongest answers were able to provide several reasons for the anger, before linking them through the context of the ongoing debate over the issue of slavery and the growth of the abolitionist movement in the North. Most candidates understood that the decision blurred the distinction between 'free' and 'slave' states or considered the notion of a 'slave conspiracy' that had the effect of strengthening the constitutional position of slavery within the USA. Other responses argued that the decision was simply seen as 'morally wrong' and indefensible, by defining black Americans as 'property' rather than as humans with an entitlement to some decent treatment. Weaker responses confused the Dred Scott case with the Fugitive Slave Law, erroneously arguing that he was an escaped slave who had to be returned.

(b) 'The entry of Texas into the Union was the biggest threat to the Missouri Compromise'. How far do you agree?

A range of responses were seen to this question, with many answers attempting some form of assessment, and also to provide balance. Stronger responses were able to explain why Texas' entry into the Union in 1845 was a large threat to the Missouri Compromise knowing the terms of the 1820 agreement and demonstrating how the entry of Texas would result in an imbalance between slave and free states. Balance was usually portrayed by discussing the Mexican/American Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo and the territories gained being a geographical and political threat to the Missouri Compromise due to the large swathes of land becoming available to slavery. The 1850 Compromise was sometimes explained as a greater threat as was the result of westward expansion. The concept of 'popular sovereignty' was often discussed in relation to the 1850 Compromise and more commonly with reference to the Kansas-Nebraska Act of 1854. Weaker responses often did not recognise that Texas became a slave state, instead assuming it must be a free state by joining the 'Union' side. Others assessed events outside the time period of the Missouri Compromise such as Bleeding Kansas and the Dred Scott case, or offered some valid description of the various threats, though with limited supporting evidence.

Question 5: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861 – 77

(a) Explain why there was Northern support for Congressional Reconstruction after 1866.

Strong responses focused directly on the context of Congressional Reconstruction, what was achieved through, and the reasons for Northern support. For example, *'There was support as it would improve the lives of the former slaves through the amendments it introduced, and the North wanted this as they were outraged at how poorly they were being treated in the South through the Black Codes. Freedmen were not allowed to carry arms, travel freely, and were often used as unpaid labour. Congressional Reconstruction introduced the 15th Amendment which allowed Black Americans to vote, and the 14th Amendment meant that they were American citizens.'* These responses often also explained that it was a deliberate attempt to 'punish' the South for its attitude to Black rights by imposing a Northern solution on the South, and through the imposition of military rule. Other valid explanations considered the opposition from Congress to Presidential Reconstruction under Johnson and his vetoing of the 14th Amendment. Weaker responses wrote

generally about Reconstruction as a whole, often with lengthy descriptions of Lincoln's and Johnson's approaches to it. Closer attention to the wording and the date given in the question would have prevented such responses.

(b) To what extent were civil liberties limited in the North during the Civil War?

Stronger responses were able to assess the limitations on civil liberties in the North, such as the suspension of *Habeas Corpus*, conscription and martial law. Specific cases such as John Merryman and Clement Vallandigham were sometimes used as evidence, although weaker responses described limiting civil liberties in more general terms. Some responses also understood that the measures tended to be focused on the 'border states', e.g. Maryland. Exceptionally, a few mentioned the imposition of income tax on high earners as an unwarranted federal intrusion. Fewer responses were seen that provided balance, but those that did sometimes argued that the limited erosion of civil rights in the north could be justified in terms of the war, and that Lincoln was temperamentally inclined to see them as necessary but temporary measures. Other responses demonstrated how President Lincoln was allowing elections to take place such as the 1864 Presidential election, and that there was no great censorship of Northern newspapers. Weaker responses sometimes misunderstood the question focus and discussed 'deprivations' in terms of the entire Civil War, often citing the economic impact of the war in terms of shortages. Other responses compared war-time situations in both North and South which was not required in the focus.

Question 6: The Gilded Age and Progressive Era, 1870s to 1920

(a) Explain why electric power was important to rapid industrialisation in this period.

There were many strong responses with good supporting knowledge for explanations as to why electric power was important to rapid industrialisation. Explanations often highlighted the value of the electric light bulb to keep factories working during darkness and linked this to an increased rate of production. Different electrical inventions were often explained such as radios, refrigerators, vacuum cleaners as examples of electric power being harnessed to the growing consumer industries. The invention of the telephone was also a common response, and its value to rapid industrialisation was explained through the importance of enhanced communication. Some excellent responses were seen that made reference to Edison's lab in developing a range of products such as the phonograph and cinematography that were developed as electricity became more popular. Weaker responses were able to identify some of these causes but tended not to explain the impact of the causes and why they were so important to rapid industrialisation.

(b) How significant a consequence of industrialisation after 1870 was the rise of organised labour?

In many responses 'organised labour' was understood to mean the organisation of labour in factories, on production lines and as simply the labour force necessary for industrialisation. Stronger responses were able to define the focus term fully and demonstrated good knowledge of various unions such as Knights of Labour or the American Federation of Labour, and their aims for improving wages and working conditions in industries. These responses recognised the need for labour to organise to protect itself and win these rights by taking on the employers such as Carnegie and Morgan in strikes and confrontations such as the Haymarket Riots and Pullman railroad strike in order to win concessions and improvements. There was very limited mention of farming associations such as the Granger Movement. Balancing arguments were demonstrated through discussion of the impact from growing immigration to America, and the resultant pressures on living conditions in cities, although specific examples were rarely cited. Occasionally, political corruption and the Boss system was explained. Weaker responses talked in general terms about the increase in employment in the period 1870 to 1920 with the growth in factories and descriptions of the Robber Barons and their monopolising of industries. Poor wages, long hours and dangerous working conditions were often described at length as well as the use of child labour.

Section C: International history, 1870 – 1945

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

(a) Explain why US foreign policy became more imperialistic after 1898.

Successful responses to this question demonstrated a clear understanding of the topic, effectively providing explanations and conclusions. These included the Spanish–American War of 1898 which was pivotal as the US victory resulted in an instant empire with the acquisition of former Spanish territories in the Caribbean, and the Pacific or the Philippine–American War. Another common approach was to consider the closing of the frontier which contributed to the Panic of 1893, highlighting to businessmen the necessity of expanding their trading options beyond domestic markets. For example, *...having commercial interests in a place, controlling it imperially would make it easier to control and grow financially*. Other responses were able to explain that America had seen the benefits of having an empire experienced by European powers, or the impact of imperialist Presidents such as Roosevelt. Weaker responses sometimes misunderstood the question, and contained lengthy narratives about the Scramble for Africa, or the American isolationist policy.

(b) To what extent was the Boxer Rebellion a response to European imperialism in the late nineteenth century?

Successful responses to this question were able to provide a balanced response by developing assessment on how far the Boxer Rebellion was a response to European imperialism on one side as opposed to other reasons such as response to other countries such as the US or Japan, or the weakness of the Chinese government. When considering the role of the European powers, responses often considered the impact of the Opium War, or the cultural changes such as Christianity that were brought by the Europeans. When considering the weakness of the Chinese government, responses were often able to link this to European imperialism. For example, *'They lost the Opium Wars to Britain and were forced to sign the Treaty of Tientsin which legalised importation of opium and gave Hong Kong to Britain. The government looked weak and unable to fight against foreign powers to defend their people. Nationalists were angry at this, and therefore wished to overthrow the government and implement change.'* There were plenty of responses that developed assessment on the role of European powers in China as the only reason that caused the rebellion, consequently lacking a balance argument. Weaker responses often provided lengthy narratives or lacked balance, most often able to describe European imperialism, but without considering alternative factors.

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

(a) Explain why the Soviet Union was a member of the League of Nations only from 1934 until 1939.

Some good responses were seen to this question, with many able to access Level 3. The most successful responses were able to recognise reasons why the Soviet Union was not a member before 1934, most commonly through recognising the concerns about the spread of communism which influenced the cautious approach of the Western Powers towards the Soviet Union's involvement in international affairs. Other responses were able to explain that the departure of Japan and Germany left the League of Nations significantly weakened, and thus the Soviet Union was accepted as a member to bolster the standing and credibility of the League of Nations. Explanations of why the Soviet Union left in 1939 were generally less successful, with many responses not recognising that they were expelled from the League, rather than leaving voluntarily. Such responses were able to recognise that it was linked to the Nazi–Soviet Pact and the start of the Second World War but failed to explain that they were expelled due to aggression against Finland. Some responses misunderstood the question, and these responses often wrote narratives about why the Soviet Union would not want to be a part of the League of Nations.

(b) To what extent was the Nazi–Soviet Pact responsible for the outbreak of the Second World War?

Some very good responses were seen to this question, with candidates confident in their understanding of the causes of the Second World War, and able to provide a balanced argument. When considering the role of the Nazi–Soviet Pact, responses recognised the confidence that Hitler gained, often linking this to the invasion of Poland, and the security provided against fighting a war on two fronts. Balance was provided by considering other reasons such as the Anglo-French guarantee to Poland, the failure of appeasement, or Hitler's aggressive foreign policy. Some very good judgements were seen that linked the various factors that had already been considered. For example, *Therefore, rather than the Nazi–Soviet Pact, I believe it was caused by longer-term tensions. Tensions between nations had already been high for about a decade. The policy of*

appeasement, the Great Depression, and Britain's pact with Poland played more of a role in causing tensions to rise and bringing nations to war with one another. Hitler had a plan for aggressive foreign expansion including Poland even before the Nazi–Soviet Pact. The Pact only helped to confirm his plan. Weaker responses failed to attempt a balanced answer or were descriptive rather than analytical. Such responses often described the events of the 1930s extensively but lacked focus on the question through showing how the events led to the outbreak of war.

Question 9: China and Japan, 1912 – 45

(a) Explain why Chiang Kai-shek was placed under arrest by his own generals in 1936.

Some successful responses to this question were seen which demonstrated a clear understanding of the topic, effectively providing both explanations and conclusions. Responses were often centred around Chiang's policy of non-resistance towards Japan's invasion of China which created an impression of weakness in his leadership. Candidates were also confident in their understanding of the frustration caused by Chiang's focus on fighting the communist instead of Japan. Some responses were additionally able to explain the need for a joint front against Japan which Chiang was reluctant to agree to, leading to his arrest in order to force him to accept a joint front. There were a few weaker responses which described the Long March at length, or provided generalised comments about Chiang being a '*weak leader*' without providing support for this statement.

(b) 'The Paris Peace Conference saw Japan accepted as one of the Great Powers.' How far do you agree?

A significant number of responses were able to develop some assessment on why Japan was accepted as one of the Great Powers for having cooperated with the allies before and during the war in the Pacific and Far East. Other assessment agreeing with the statement argued that Japan's presence at the Paris Peace Conference in itself was acceptance as a Great Power, as was the inclusion of Japan as one of the four permanent members of the League of Nations Council. Some responses were also aware of the territorial gains that Japan made such as securing control of the former German territory of Shantung on mainland China and some of their Pacific Island territories. Fewer responses were able to provide balance. Whilst there was some knowledge that the Racial Equality Clause was rejected, this was often stated rather than assessed, and very few responses considered that Japan lost the territories it had gained at the Conference. Some strong responses took an alternative, but valid, approach to providing balance through assessment based on Japan having been accepted before the Paris Peace Conference as a result of success in the Russo-Japanese War, or the Anglo-Japanese alliance. Weaker responses often showed a general understanding, but either took a narrative approach, or did not provide specific support for the arguments being made.

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- Candidates should develop a good understanding of the chronology of key events as this will help them to link factors accurately and build effective arguments.
- In **Part (a)** questions the key element is explaining why something happened. Identifying several reasons is an important first step but to reach higher levels of the mark scheme it is necessary to give a clear understanding of the connections between causes to reach a supported conclusion.
- In **Part (b)** questions, responses should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported. A well written but one-sided analysis will not allow the candidate to reach the top Level of the mark scheme.
- Candidates should note and act on any timeframe given in the question. This will enable the response to be focused on the question set.

General comments

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

In **Part (b)** the awareness that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways was a characteristic of strong answers. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Responses which were less successful fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question; relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to lose focus, often by ignoring timeframes given in the question.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Modern Europe 1750 – 1921

Question 1: France, 1774 – 1814

(a) Explain why Turgot's policies faced opposition.

****Cambridge reviewed this choice of question following centre feedback and concluded that a question focused solely on Turgot had the potential to prove challenging to candidates. To ensure that candidates' performance and outcomes were not negatively affected Cambridge introduced a mitigation for this question part. Research showed that candidates score very similar marks on part (a) questions, so examiners were first asked to mark question 1(a), the question on Turgot, according to the mark scheme. Examiners were then asked to look at the mark that the candidate**

scored on their other part (a) question. If the mark on question 1(a) was the higher of the two-part (a) marks, no further action was taken. However, if the mark on the other part (a) question was higher, then examiners changed the mark on question 1(a) to be the same as the mark on their other part (a) question.**

Candidates found this challenging. Many were able to provide some general explanation in terms of his intention to tax the privileged members of the first and second estates and a few strong responses showed more detailed knowledge of the specific measures that Turgot sought to introduce. Weaker responses wrote about the general problems facing the Ancient Regime in the 1770's rather than the measures Turgot tried to introduce to overcome the problems.

(b) 'By avoiding radical policies, the Directory was able to survive for four years.' How far do you agree?

Most responses provided some details of the measures introduced, and methods used, by the Directory government that enabled them to remain in power from 1795–1799. Weaker responses did not identify what was or was not radical about their approach and tended to stick to relatively narrative accounts. Stronger responses showed awareness of, and made use of, the differences between the Directory and the previous 'radical regime of Robespierre and used this to demonstrate avoidance of extremism but also used examples of the directories policies designed to appeal to most of the population. For example: *I agree the with the statement because the Directory's first acts included abolition of the Law of Suspects which Robespierre had used to get rid of any suspected anti revolutionaries without even a trial. Fair trials were reintroduced. They also introduced religious toleration and got rid of the Cult of the Supreme Being which pleased many people in France. However, they did take some radical measures like crushing the potential Jacobin revolt and there were other factors that kept them in power like the support of the army.* Strong responses generally offered a range of other factors that kept the Directory in power other than the avoidance of extremist measures, at the same time demonstrating that on some occasions they took radical action to quell extremism. Some weaker responses wrote predominantly about Napoleon's role in relation of the survival of the Directory and his part in its downfall which did not properly address the question.

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

(a) Explain why the Prussian Union Plan of 1849 was proposed.

Strong responses recognised the importance of the absence of Austria from German affairs at this critical point along with the success of the Zollverein. For example: *in 1834 the Zollverein had created, and the growth of economic cooperation, by 1848, encouraged the development of the idea that political union might also bring benefits. Added to this was the opportunity for Prussia to remove Austria from interference in German affairs while they were distracted by internal revolutions. The adoption of a Kleindeutschland model for increased unity left Austria outside any union of German States and gave Prussia the leading role.* The strongest responses were able to combine the with the role of Frederick William IV and/or General Radowicz to provide a reasoned account linking these key factors in a complex explanation. Other responses were still successful in explaining several factors that contributed to the proposal for the Erfurt Union.

(b) 'France was the cause of the Franco–Prussian War, 1870–71.' How far do you agree?

Most responses wrote effectively about the causes of the Franco-Prussian War and were generally strongest on the role of Bismarck in provoking the war in 1870. Some weaker responses found it difficult to establish the extent of French involvement. For example: *In conclusion I believe Bismarck's efforts to provoke war were clearly international leaving us to believe that he knew the outcomes would be war. We can assume that due to the Prussian victory against Austria that Bismarck believed that defeating the French would lead to the eventual unification of Germany with Prussia as the leader. Contributing to this Prussia's army reforms gave the Prussians confidence which was also not expected by the French.* Arguments about French responsibility were mainly about Napoleon's response to the actions being taken by Bismarck and as a result a number of responses lacked balance. Strong responses understood and explained clearly the complexities of the Hohenzollern Candidature and the Luxemburg Crisis as well as the significance of the Ems Telegram and produced well rounded analysis and in the best cases, well-structured and supported judgements. Weaker responses described, in varying level of detail some of the events surrounding the war, or in few cases wrote about its outcome rather than its causes.

Question 3: The Russian Revolution, 1894 – 1921

(a) Explain why Tsar Nicholas II continued the policy of Russification.

Stronger responses understood the issues involved in controlling and multi- ethnic, multi-faith empire and identified a range of related factors in the adoption of the policy of Russification. Many responses commented on the continuity from the reign of his father Alexander III and on the significance of the Russian Orthodox Church in the process though some weaker responses referred to the 'Catholic' church and did not fully develop the idea of its link to the control by the Tsar of the large peasant population. These weaker responses were often aware of reasons for the policy but failed to explain them fully in relation to why they were key reasons for Russification. For example: *Nicholas wanted to continue the Russification policy of his father to enforce a centralised culture in Russia which would exclude minorities in the rural areas from being an obstacle to Russian culture.*

(b) 'The Bolsheviks were still in power by 1921 because of their use of terror.' How far do you agree?

The strongest responses took this through to 1921 when, following the Kronstadt Rebellion, the policy of War Communism was abandoned and replaced by Lenin's New Economic Policy which gave more economic freedom to the people of Russia. Most responses provided some account of the Bolsheviks action during the period from October 1917 to 1921 with stronger responses making some distinction between those actions that demonstrated the use of terror and other factors that enabled the Bolsheviks to retain power, for example the ending of the war, the quality of the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky and the weaknesses of their opponents in the Civil War. A few weaker responses wrote mostly about the rise to power of the Bolsheviks in 1917 with details of the April Theses and events of the summer and autumn leading up to their seizure of power in the October Revolution.

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

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

(a) Explain why the issue of States' Rights caused problems in the 1850s.

Most responses showed some awareness of the link between slavery and the issue of 'States Rights' which was about the conflict between state government and federal authorities over who had the greater control. Strong responses recognised that most of the problems arose from the Compromise of 1850 and the amendment made, as part of that agreement, to the Fugitive Slave Act. Response which understood this were able to explain how this change led to events like the Boston Slave Riots and the highly contentious Dredd Scott Case. Strong responses also recognised how the issue of States' rights was reflected in the idea of 'popular sovereignty' put forward as a means of determining whether, for future admissions to the Union, a state would be slave or free. This led to the confrontation over the admission of Kansas and the crisis of 'Bleeding Kansas', which some responses noted was effectively a precursor of the Civil War.

(b) 'The Republicans won the 1860 election because of the Lincoln-Douglas debates.' How far do you agree?

Many responses were able to provide some idea of the appeal of Lincoln in terms of both his humble origins and his stance on slavery, which were brought to the public attention by the publicity given to the debates. These responses considered how even though the debates related to a senatorial seat in Illinois they put Lincoln on the national stage and made him an appealing candidate for northern anti-slavery groups of all types. Strong responses also balanced their assessment of these factors with other issues like the division of the Democrats. The strongest responses were able to relate this back to the debates where Douglas expressed support for the Freeport Doctrine which strongly advocated popular sovereignty in relation to decisions on slavery and which many southerners disagree with. This meant that when the Democrats were choosing their candidate for the 1860 election campaign the party split and southern democrats refused to accept Douglas' candidacy, choosing Breckenridge instead. Balanced analysis looking at both these aspects were very effective. Good responses ended with a strong conclusion that linked and prioritised factors, for example: *The debates were a factor in drawing national attention to Lincoln but ultimately was not the main reason he won. The separation of the Democrats gave the Republicans a large advantage as Douglas only won support in the North while southern Democrats supported Breckenridge. Though Lincoln was not an abolitionist but just wanted to prevent the further spread of slavery, this was sufficient to unite all opponents of slavery behind him. The Lincoln Douglas debates helped to consolidate this support for the Republicans for whom slavery was a key issue, whilst the debates divided the Democrats, destroying their chances of victory.*

Question 5: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861 – 77

(a) Explain why military strategies changed during the Civil War.

Effective responses showed a sound understanding of the different strategies employed as the war progressed. Many concentrated on the changes in the Union side with the reluctance of early generals to take the offensive against the South and how their replacement with Grant and Sherman marked a big strategic shift in northern planning. Stronger responses also demonstrated the shift in southern strategy where Lee initially took the offensive in seeking to seize Washington and end the war quickly. A few weaker responses discussed changes in weapons that affected how battles were fought but did not intrinsically affect the overall strategy of the war and so were not directly relevant to the question.

(b) To what extent had the White South accepted the policies of Reconstruction by 1877?

Strong responses recognised a distinction between principle and practice and used the compromise of 1877 as a good point at which to emphasise this difference. Most responses had some understanding of the three Reconstruction Amendments and were able to identify some of the changes that these involved. Most understood that acceptance of these was an essential requirement of re-admission to the Union. Strong responses also understood, and were able to explain, ways in which many southerners evaded these like the introduction of Black Codes and

sharecropping. Some provided details of the role of President Johnson in watering down their impact. The strongest responses were able to relate the Compromise of 1877 to the North's abandonment of any real attempt to impose the amendments and thus marked the failure of Reconstruction in all practical senses.

Question 6: The Gilded Age and Progressive Era, 1870s to 1920

- (a) Explain why Progressives campaigned for national prohibition in the early twentieth century.**

Most responses described the development of the prohibition movement and were able to identify key figures and organisation in the development of the movement. Stronger responses were also aware of the impact of war in the final move towards acceptance of the Volstead Act. Weaker responses did not establish a clear link between the national prohibition movement and Progressive ideology or even to account for the intentions and actions of successive Progressive presidents. A simple introduction often proved to be a key to successful analysis of reasons for progressive support. For example: *Of all the progressive reforms of the 20th century the 18th Amendment – Prohibition – was the most notorious. The reasons why Progressives wanted prohibition were varied such as anti-German sentiments, the reduction of alcohol related domestic abuse and the development of key pressure groups often also linked to the issue of women's rights.*

- (b) 'The growth of trusts and corporations caused the economic development of the late nineteenth century.' How far do you agree?**

Effective responses were aware of some of the strengths and weaknesses of Trusts and Corporations from the point of view of encouraging economic growth. Positive aspects included the development of new techniques like the Carnegie Trust's development of the use of the Bessemer smelting process to produce the steel necessary for the building the railways. On the other hand, Rockefeller's control of most of the US oil industry, or the Vanderbilt's control of railways reduced competition and led to price fixing and poor conditions for workers, many of whom were immigrants willing to work for low wages. Weaker responses wrote in general terms with little reference to specific examples.

Section C: International history, 1870 – 1945

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

- (a) Explain why Britain developed closer diplomatic relations with France after 1898.**

Responses often focused on the Fashoda Incident that occurred in 1898 however weaker responses did not go very far in explaining why it marked a significant event in the improvement of relations. Stronger responses began by suggesting how it was the subsequent negotiations leading to a settlement of colonial differences that led to improved relations and coupled this with the rising threat of Germany following the accession of Wilhelm II and his quest for 'a place in the sun'. The strongest responses also linked this with British distrust following the Kaiser's intervention in the Boer War, and the expansion of Germany's naval capabilities. They offered an extended explanation of the change in relations from 1898 onwards and the best of these established clear links between the different factors.

- (b) To what extent was New Imperialism based on theories of racial superiority?**

There were many effective answers to this question. Strong responses were able to show several ways in which ideas of racial superiority manifested themselves in the policies adopted by the main colonial powers towards the indigenous populations, though some mistakenly included the Boers in this category. Weaker responses often mentioned slavery and the slave trade as a motive even though this had been banned by European powers by the late 19th Century. Strong responses were aware of range of factors like economic expansion, national prestige and the pressure of public opinion fuelled by the popular press and literature. The strongest responses linked these factors, often demonstrating that the ideas of racial superiority were promoted through the popular media to encourage support for ventures that were essentially for commercial gain or political advantage. For example: *Imperialism as it was an important justification for it, was not the main factor behind it. The economic factors were the basis from which the idea of having territories in*

Africa for their commercial importance was the main motive for the start of New Imperialism. In addition, it was also motivated by political factors. The racial superiority theories were an important justification for further expansion of commercial activities which in turn held boost national prestige. New imperialism was based mainly on commercial and political gains, but racial superiority provided publicly popular justification for it.

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

- (a) Explain why the League of Nations failed to end the conflict that broke out in Manchuria in 1931.**

Most responses were able to demonstrate some understanding of events in Manchuria and the response of the League of Nations to the actions of the Japanese Manchukuo Army. Weaker responses often used examples of the weaknesses of the League that occurred after its failure in Manchuria, and which were not relevant to the question. These included the rise of Hitler and the Italian invasion of Abyssinia which are both chronologically beyond the focus of the question. Stronger responses focused on the effects of the Great Depression on the willingness and capability of League members to respond, the general slowness of any kind of response, the fact that Japan, as a member of the Council could veto any decisions the League made, and the fact that in the end Japan just left the League and members could little about it.

- (b) 'The British policy of appeasement was responsible for the outbreak of war in 1939.' To what extent do you agree?**

Strong responses had a clear understanding of the meaning and application of appeasement, while weaker responses provided a chronological account of the reaction of the British government to successive moves by Hitler to break down the terms of the treaty of Versailles. Most responses concentrated on the effect of appeasement of Germany, and the strongest were able to extend this to the effect on the Soviet Union where successive British concessions to Germany raised fears that they were being encouraged to launch an attack on Communism. Effective responses encapsulated this within a good introduction or a carefully considered conclusion: *Appeasement created an impression of weakness in the western allies with reinforced Hitler's confidence. Nevertheless, he would not have declared war on Poland if he had not been confident in the strength of his recently restored armed forces which was reinforced by the absence of any threat from Soviet intervention because the Nazi-Soviet Pact.* Effective responses were able to incorporate other factors like Hitler's long-term ambitions and the building of a network of alliances with other dictatorships to provide a rounded assessment of the benefits and failings of the policy of appeasement and the extent of which it contributed to the outbreak of war in 1939.

Question 9: China and Japan, 1912 – 45

- (a) Explain why Japan believed it was treated as an inferior power in international negotiations during the period 1919–22.**

Effective responses were able to show how Japanese gains in the Treaties did not match the promises that had been made to them by the western allies. Stronger responses also showed how the Japanese were further insulted by the rejection of the Racial Equality Clause that they proposed for inclusion in the League of Nations Charter. These stronger responses also considered how Japan was discontent with the terms of the Washington Naval Treaties. Weaker responses sometimes considered a range of factors but then summarised them rather than explained how they influenced Japan's response.

- (b) How far does the war against Japan explain the failure of the Kuomintang to limit support for the Communists after 1937?**

Most responses were aware of the Xian incident and the creation of the Second United Front and were able to describe the differing responses of the communists and the nationalists to the invading Japanese forces. An understanding of the differences and the effect they had on the perceptions of the Chinese population, was central to an effective response. Weaker responses often wrote only about this aspect of the question and failed to give much consideration to other factors that led to the growth of support for the communists. This included the success of the Yen'an Soviet and the building of the personal following for Mao due to his exploits in leading the

Long March. Stronger responses also recognised the social and economic failure of the KMT to deliver the reform that was expected of them as a feature alienating many potential supporters.

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- Candidates should develop a good understanding of the chronology of key events as this will help them to link factors accurately and build effective arguments.
- In **Part (a)** questions the key element is explaining why something happened. Identifying several reasons is an important first step but to reach higher levels of the mark scheme it is necessary to give a clear understanding of the connections between causes to reach a supported conclusion.
- In **Part (b)** questions, responses should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported. A well written but one-sided analysis will not allow the candidate to reach the top Level of the mark scheme.
- Candidates should note and act on any timeframe given in the question. This will enable the response to be focused on the question set.

General comments

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

In **Part (b)** the awareness that historical issues can be interpreted in many different, and, often, contradictory ways was a characteristic of strong answers. Other responses provided arguments which considered one interpretation of the issue. Responses which were less successful fell into one of two categories – narrative/descriptive accounts of the topic with only implicit reference to the actual question; relevant arguments based on factual support which was limited in range and depth. The weakest responses were often the result of confusion over the requirements of the question; they were characterised by factual inaccuracy and/or chronological confusion, assertions based on inadequate factual support or a tendency to lose focus, often by ignoring timeframes given in the question.

Comments on specific questions

Section A Section A: Modern Europe 1750 – 1921

Question 1: France, 1774 – 1814

(a) Explain why the storming of the Bastille happened.

Responses demonstrated a sound general understanding of the topic, and stronger responses maintained a consistent focus. Weaker responses were characterised by the description of the key features of the period leading up to the Revolution like the poor harvests and disastrous royal finances, but this question has a very specific focus on the causes of one pivotal event and that required a scrutiny of events immediately before it happened. The most effective responses demonstrated this by focusing on key factors like the king's decision to move troops closer to Paris,

the immediate concerns of the Parisians and the importance of the Bastille as a symbol of the absolutism of the Ancient Regime. For example: *When the poor Parisians heard that the king was gathering troops outside Paris, they feared he would use them to crush the assembly and prevent reforms. Out of fear they decided to arm themselves and targeted the Bastille for its weapons... food shortages and high prices had produced a pool of protesters ready to use violence to achieve their hoped-for goal of improvements in their lives...people had grown resentful of being ignored by the elite and the king and saw the Bastille as a symbol of royal tyranny. Thus, the attack was caused by resentment of the powers of the monarch.*

(b) 'Napoleon was able to maintain his power by using propaganda.' How far do you agree?

Most responses showed good understanding of what Napoleon did once he had control in France though a few wrote more about how he succeeded in taking control rather than how he maintained his power. A challenge for some responses was producing a balanced analysis. Whilst balance does not mean the same amount on each alternative it does require similar depth in detail and many responses included quite limited analysis of the use of propaganda. For weaker responses this was usually how he publicised his own success with the army to win support. More effective responses were able to write more meaningfully about the creation of his image by both censorship of the press and use of public portraiture and triumphal architecture, though only a few mentioned his involving the Pope in his very public coronation. Most responses were confident discussing the alternative view that it was the domestic policies that he introduced that won him the approval of the French people and the strongest of this produced balanced analysis and attempted an overall judgement.

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

(a) Explain why the Prussian revolutionaries of 1848 failed.

Strong responses were able to focus on the situation in Prussia and successfully explained how a range of factors such as the division between different classes in their objectives and the role of King Frederick William IV encouraged failure. Weaker responses often did not recognise the focus was on Prussia in 1848 and wrote about the failure of the Frankfurt Parliament. A few of these were able to move beyond the parliament and consider general reasons for failure of the revolutions in Germany and these were slightly more successful.

(b) 'The Zollverein was the most important factor in the growth of German nationalism in the period from 1834 to 1850.' How far do you agree?

Most responses showed good understanding of the Zollverein and how it worked and were able to describe this with varying degrees of accuracy. Better responses were able to explain how the Zollverein helped to generate nationalistic feelings among the wider population of Germany and to suggest other factors that had a role in this. These were well balanced and successful answers and the stronger responses produced reasoned judgements on the relative importance of the Zollverein. The strongest responses were aware of both the economic success of the Zollverein and the contribution of other factors, for example: *it created a growing Middle Class who were able to accumulate increased wealth from the opportunity to trade offered by the reduction of customs barriers and the spread of a railway network across state borders. These people thought only a united Germany could further enhance their prosperity... The Zollverein also isolated Austria which was not allowed to join. However, there were other factors ... Metternich's harsh controls aroused resentment and contributed to the rise of nationalism...the establishment of the Frankfurt Parliament, though a failure, opened people's eyes to the possibility of a more united Germany.* A few weaker responses focused on the role of Bismarck who was not a significant political figure until the 1860's so well outside the time frame for this question.

Question 3: The Russian Revolution, 1894 – 1921

(a) Explain why the Constituent Assembly was dissolved in January 1918.

Strong responses knew what the Constituent Assembly was, who dissolved it and why it lasted only one day, and these produced well balanced answers. The strongest of these linked together different factors to create reasoned explanation. Some responses struggled to get beyond the main explained factor that the Bolsheviks were not prepared to share power while some weaker

responses confused the Constituent Assembly with the Provisional Government and wrote about Lenin's April theses as a cause for the failure of the Constituent Assembly.

- (b) **'Nicholas II's decision in 1915 to take personal command of the army caused him to lose power in February 1917.' How far do you agree?**

There were some quite unbalanced responses in which the Tsar's decision to take control of the army was set against other relevant factors, but the more perceptive responses recognised that his decision did not just have a direct effect on the performance of the army and the view of Nicholas as a leader, but also had consequences in terms of the effect of leaving Alexandra in charge of the government. Some responses looked back to the 1905 Revolution, and this was acceptable if it was considered as long-term cause. Indeed, some effective responses did differentiate between long term difficulties and the triggering effects of Nicholas' decision, in completing their analysis.

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

There were few responses in this section so the possibility for comment is limited.

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

- (a) **Explain why it took a decade for the independent Republic of Texas to join the Union.**

Most responses focused on the issue of slavery and the effect on the Missouri compromise to provide at least one valid explanation. Stronger responses also considered the implication of the balance in Congress given the size of Texas and its practical effect on the slave/free balance with some also considering the reluctance of successive presidents to admit Texas because of these controversial issues. Some weaker responses wrote about the war against Mexico and events like the Alamo.

- (b) **To what extent was Lincoln's victory in the 1860 election the result of the growing belief in the 'slave power'?**

Most responses had a good idea of other factors that helped Lincoln in his campaign like the Lincoln-Douglas debates and the division of the Democrats. There were some good explanations of 'slave power conspiracy' in stronger responses. For example: *The growing belief in slave power grew from the 1850 Compromise that strengthened the Fugitive Slave Act. Now the authorities in free states could be forced to help capture escaped slaves and return them to their master or face big fines or jail. This increased opposition to slavery and support for a candidate was seen as the anti-slavery choice. Another reason for growing fear of a slave power conspiracy was the Dred Scott Judgment...* These responses also included other factors and provided for a successful assessment of relative importance of a range of factors in Lincoln's victory.

Question 5: Civil War and Reconstruction, 1861 – 77

- (a) **Explain why the governments of both the North and the South attempted to limit civil liberties between 1861 and 1865.**

Most responses offered relevant ideas though many were more confident on the reasons that applied to the North's decision with less clarity about the motives of the South. The possibilities highlighted included the suspension of Habeas Corpus and the introduction of conscription. Some responses provided detailed explanation of why Habeas Corpus was suspended in the North especially relating to the level of opposition to the war in the early years but were often less clear about why the same restrictions were imposed in the South.

- (b) **How significant was the impact of the constitutional amendments of 1865–70?**

Most responses were clear about what the three 'Reconstruction' Amendments were for and were able to describe them. Weaker responses then added description of what happened in the South with little direct reference to the amendments. Stronger responses were able to draw comparison between the intention of the legislation and the practical issues in its application. Many of these were aware of the ways that southern states found to circumvent the intentions of the legislation, though some responses confused the Black Codes with Jim Crow Laws – the latter term only

applies to racially discriminatory laws passed between 1877 and the 1950's. Only a few stronger responses were able to fully explain the significance of the compromise of 1877.

Question 6: The Gilded Age and Progressive Era, 1870s to 1920

(a) Explain why Progressive presidents changed the laws governing business.

Weaker responses interpreted this as meaning only the anti-trust laws that were passed in this period and so produced quite limited responses. Stronger responses showed awareness of a wider context. For example: *Overall problems arose with the rapid growth of business. These included abuse of the market and of government, poor quality of products and conflict between business owners and workers. All three(sic) Progressive presidents introduced new laws with more restrictions on size of business and quality of products as well as laws to give more protection to workers.* These stronger responses often included examples of laws that affected workers' rights and conditions and the quality of goods, especially legislation applying to food and drugs. The strongest responses covered a range of these possibilities and were able to link the different changes to the intentions of the various Progressive presidents.

(b) 'The expansion of railroads caused the rapid industrialisation of the late nineteenth century.' How far do you agree?

Strong responses were aware that the railways themselves were part of the industrialisation process in that they created an increase in demand for workers to build the railways and thus encouraged immigration. Also, they greatly expanded the demand for steel to create the rails and led to the growth of companies building the rolling stock. Pullman was a regularly quoted example of a company whose growth was part of the railway boom. Strong responses also recognised that other factors worked with the railways to build industrialisation. The invention of the lightbulb was a very popular example of the development of new technologies, because it allowed factories to work on a 24-hour shift system, but there were other good examples of technological innovation. Some responses also demonstrated how railways allowed business to reach wider markets and sources of raw materials.

Section C: International history, 1870 – 1945

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

(a) Explain why increasing contact with foreign powers led to significant changes within Japan in the late nineteenth century.

Most responses provided some comment on the effect of Commodore Perry's expedition to Japan and the strongest of these were able to build on this to demonstrate how the Meiji restoration triggered a modernisation and militarisation programme largely based on adopting the practices of the European powers like Britain and Germany. Weaker responses included reference to the Anglo-Japanese Treaty of 1902 and the Russo-Japanese War of 1904–5 which was outside the scope of the question.

(b) 'It was popular support that encouraged European governments to pursue imperialist policies.' How far do you agree?

Candidates had good knowledge of a range of factors that were involved in the 'Scramble for Africa' in the late 19th century and were able to write in some detail about some of them. The challenge that was encountered by some responses was establishing a degree of balance between popular support and other factors, with commentary on the former often quite limited. Stronger responses recognised the significance of the rising importance of the press and some of the strongest even distinguished between different countries, specifically France, Germany and Great Britain. These also often made interesting links, for example suggesting that government deliberately used the press to stir up public opinion and gain support by emphasising issues of national prestige and imperial rivalry using examples like jingoism. The most successful responses linked factors in their overall judgements. For example: *To sum up economic reasons and individual efforts were all vital in European pursuit of imperial policy. Among the reasons, economic factors were the most vital. They fostered the greed of entrepreneurs like Cecil Rhodes in the search for gold, diamonds and other valuable resources. So, not only in Britain, but in countries like Germany and France, individuals and firms would put pressure on the press to mould pro-*

imperialism to force the state to engage in expansionist policies. Therefore, without the economic value in having colonies, individual and popular support would not have driven government to participate in the Scramble for Africa.

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

(a) Explain why the World Disarmament Conference (1932–34) was a failure.

Most responses had a good understanding of the background to this in terms of the origins of the planning in the Treaty of Versailles and the formation of the League and were also aware of the international situation in the early 1930's that made it increasingly difficult to reach any agreement on disarmament. Candidates were often able to cite several factors with supporting explanation often focusing on the Manchurian Crisis and the rise and intentions of Hitler as well as the longer-term effects of the Great Depression. For example: *The World Disarmament Conference 1932–34 was widely regarded as a failure as it made no progress towards widespread reduction amendments this was because of the great depression in creating political and economic instability and the rise of dictatorships with expansionist ambitions. No countries felt safe enough to undertake voluntary disarmament and so the Conference ended in failure after the withdrawal of key players like Japan and Germany.* A few weaker responses wrote about events like the Abyssinian Crisis and the Spanish Civil war as significant factors, but these events happened after the end of the Conference and therefore were not relevant to the focus.

(b) 'Germany became involved in the Spanish Civil War to test its new military equipment.' How far do you agree?

Most responses were able to provide useful details of Hitler's motives and attempted to explain the ways in which the Spanish Civil War allowed him to try out new weapons and techniques of warfare on a limited scale. Sometimes this part of the essay was quite brief which raised issues of balance in the overall response. Most responses were able to offer a selection of other reasons for Hitler's action ranging from desire to establish an additional Fascist state to distraction of Mussolini from interference in Hitler's plans Anschluss with Austria.

Question 9: China and Japan, 1912 – 45

(a) Explain why the attempt to establish parliamentary democracy in Japan failed.

Some weaker responses gave a general description of events in the early 1930s that marked the end of democracy and the rise of military dictatorship which did not fully answer the question. Stronger responses used relevant details to support the argument and the strongest also included longer term issues like the basic weakness of the system and its failure to establish a strong international position for Japan. These issues were linked to the more immediate causes and the resulting analysis was thorough and effective. For example: *To conclude the failure of parliamentary democracy in Japan comes from anti-western public opinion, the strength of militarism and the effects of the economic crisis caused by the Great Depression. These three factors are all connected to challenges to Japan's power and international prestige. The democratic government was blamed for a decline in prestige but the military's success in Manchuria increased their prestige leading to nationalists' support for a military takeover.*

(b) To what extent does dissatisfaction with the outcome of the First World War explain the May the Fourth Movement?

Stronger responses had good knowledge of the outcome of negotiations at Versailles from the point of view of the Chinese population and were aware of the issue of Shandong province and of Japan's Twenty-One demands. These responses were able to set this against other causes of discontent stemming from the collapse of imperial control and the rise of the warlords as the dominant force in Chinese government. They were mostly able to produce detailed and balanced accounts of the May Fourth Movement. The strongest responses were more aware of the basis of the movement as a student and intellectual response to what was perceived as Chinese submission to western powers.

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- The question asks what can be learnt from the extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it. This means responses should identify what the historian thinks about the issue of who or what is to blame. They must then explain, using details of the extract, how they were able to identify this. This means material selected from the extract should illustrate how the historian indicates blameworthiness.
- The process of selection is important: some material in the extract will be directly relevant, some less so, and some not at all. This is the main reason why simply working through the extract, summarising what it says, is an inefficient way to structure a response.
- Most responses attempt to identify the historian's approach by attaching an historiographical 'label' to it – structuralist, revisionist, traditional and so on. This is entirely legitimate and can help to indicate who or what is blamed. However, it is not sufficient in itself, since the interpretation is specific to what the historian argues in the extract in question, and details of the extract still have to be used to explain exactly how blame is signalled.
- The extract needs to be read carefully, and the claims made within it need to be properly understood. It is not uncommon for answers to use claims made by the historian about the beliefs and attitudes of characters in the extract as if they were the views of the historian him/herself. This can produce conclusions about the interpretation that are the opposite of what the historian argues. The rhetorical tricks that writers sometimes use need to be considered – for example stating a case to be able to reject it – so that they are not mistaken for the historian's own views.

General comments

Most responses understood that the extract contains within it an interpretation and tried to identify it. The more successful of these possessed two qualities that, to a greater or lesser degree, the less successful responses did not. First, their identification of the historian's argument was more accurate. Second, their answers were more properly focused on the process of explanation. Rather than summarise the extract or take each of its paragraphs in turn and commenting on them individually, these more successful responses read the extract as a whole and then offered explanation about the issue of who or what is blamed within it. This was done throughout the response while less successful responses tended to only identify and explain the view in their introductions or conclusions.

Most responses included mention of historiographical 'labels' that identify the historian's approach and while this is entirely appropriate, responses should specifically be driven by the content of the extract rather than try and fit that content to a particular view which several weaker responses did.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: The origins of the First World War

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he does not blame Britain's entente policy which, **(i)** despite disadvantages, is seen as the best policy at the time, and **(ii)** in any case made no difference to Germany in 1914. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. However, most responses were undermined by taking the views of critics of the entente as the views of the historian, or by taking the disadvantages of the entente

admitted by the historian as evidence that his/her judgment on the entente overall was unfavourable. Few candidates saw the argument as being a refutation of the idea that Britain had any responsibility for causing war in 1914, not least for the view that whatever course Britain adopted would have made no difference to Germany. Weaker responses simply 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 s/he blames Hitler **(i)** for wanting at any given time to take the most extreme measures against the Jews that he could, and **(ii)** for planning a war that he knew would bring genocide. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. The historian's approach was clearly intentionalist, in that it contained ample evidence of Hitler wanting to do harm to the Jews. Most responses were able to use the extract to show this but were not able to identify the specific nature of the interpretation. In particular, the assumption that the historian was arguing that Hitler planned from the start to exterminate the Jews was almost universal, despite the extract pointing out that as late as 1939, with the Reichstag speech, Hitler was still probably pursuing an emigration policy. It seemed that intentionalism had to mean intent to exterminate from the start, whatever the extract actually said. Weaker responses simply paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

Section C: The origins and development of the Cold War

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he blames both Stalin and the West for the Cold War, **(i)** Stalin for being a revolutionary expansionist, and **(ii)** the West because they could have stopped him but did not. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. The historian's argument was that Stalin was undoubtedly a 'bad guy', but that the West knew this and for their own purposes let him get away with it, instead of resisting, until it was too late. Some responses failed to spot that the historian blamed both sides, but still managed to put together plausible explanations on blaming one side or the other. Most saw that both were blamed, but often found it hard to tease out exactly what was blameworthy in relation to causing the Cold War. So, for example, the point at which reference was made to Stalin being a 'bad guy' was often used to try and blame him, rather than as evidence against the West, which was the historian's argument. Weaker responses simply paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

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

Key messages

- The question asks what can be learnt from the extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it. This means responses should identify what the historian thinks about the issue of who or what is to blame. They must then explain, using details of the extract, how they were able to identify this. This means material selected from the extract should illustrate how the historian indicates blameworthiness.
- The process of selection is important: some material in the extract will be directly relevant, some less so, and some not at all. This is the main reason why simply working through the extract, summarising what it says, is an inefficient way to structure a response.
- Most responses attempt to identify the historian's approach by attaching an historiographical 'label' to it – structuralist, revisionist, traditional and so on. This is entirely legitimate and can help to indicate who or what is blamed. However, it is not sufficient in itself, since the interpretation is specific to what the historian argues in the extract in question, and details of the extract still have to be used to explain exactly how blame is signalled.
- The extract needs to be read carefully, and the claims made within it need to be properly understood. It is not uncommon for answers to use claims made by the historian about the beliefs and attitudes of characters in the extract as if they were the views of the historian him/herself. This can produce conclusions about the interpretation that are the opposite of what the historian argues. The rhetorical tricks that writers sometimes use need to be considered – for example stating a case to be able to reject it – so that they are not mistaken for the historian's own views.

General comments

Most responses understood that the extract contains within it an interpretation and tried to identify it. The more successful of these possessed two qualities that, to a greater or lesser degree, the less successful responses did not. First, their identification of the historian's argument was more accurate. Second, their answers were more properly focused on the process of explanation. Rather than summarise the extract or take each of its paragraphs in turn and commenting on them individually, these more successful responses read the extract as a whole and then offered explanation about the issue of who or what is blamed within it. This was done throughout the response while less successful responses tended to only identify and explain the view in their introductions or conclusions.

Most responses included mention of historiographical 'labels' that identify the historian's approach and while this is entirely appropriate, responses should specifically be driven by the content of the extract rather than try and fit that content to a particular view which several weaker responses did.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: The origins of the First World War

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he blames Poincaré for pursuing a policy that left France with no choice but to go to war in 1914, even though he did not want war and sought only France's security. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Many responses saw that Poincaré did not want war but found it hard to support from the extract exactly what it was that his policy was seeking, and instead got stuck on details, such as viewing his inflexibility as blameworthy. Few responses could explain the

mechanism by which France found itself committed to war in 1914, and explanations tended to resort to blaming instead the alliance system in general. Some weaker responses saw Russia as being blamed while the weakest responses 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 s/he blames **(i)** the German people for knowing that the invasion of Russia involved the mass murder of the Jews, but not disapproving of this, and **(ii)** the German authorities as the mass murder was the consequence of official policy. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. A lot of responses understood that the mass murder quickly became public knowledge but did not detect the historian's disapproval of the fact that this went unopposed. As the extract did not directly address Holocaust causation, some candidates struggled to detect an interpretation, and missed the implied intentionalism in the portrayal of the actions of the authorities, with the historian pointing out how there was central direction behind the anti-Jewish measures, and that they were not simply 'single events'. The weakest responses paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

Section C: The origins and development of the Cold War

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he blames Truman **(i)** for shortcomings in his personality, and **(ii)** his incompetent actions, for worsening relations with the Soviet Union. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Despite the fact that the extract mentions other people, notably Roosevelt, Harriman and Stalin, the focus of the interpretation is on Truman's inadequacy, so whatever is said about others, even if it amounts to blame, could not be seen as the main message. Likewise, some responses recognised that the approach was revisionist, and therefore set about trying to illustrate the blame placed on the USA rather than focusing specifically on Truman. Nonetheless, the extract offered plenty of relevant examples that could be used to support the interpretation and the stronger responses were effective at doing so. Weaker responses did not make an explicit distinction between the faults in Truman's personality and the shortcomings of his actions, while the weakest responses 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 what can be learnt from the extract about the interpretation and approach of the historian who wrote it. This means responses should identify what the historian thinks about the issue of who or what is to blame. They must then explain, using details of the extract, how they were able to identify this. This means material selected from the extract should illustrate how the historian indicates blameworthiness.
- The process of selection is important: some material in the extract will be directly relevant, some less so, and some not at all. This is the main reason why simply working through the extract, summarising what it says, is an inefficient way to structure a response.
- Most responses attempt to identify the historian's approach by attaching an historiographical 'label' to it – structuralist, revisionist, traditional and so on. This is entirely legitimate and can help to indicate who or what is blamed. However, it is not sufficient in itself, since the interpretation is specific to what the historian argues in the extract in question, and details of the extract still have to be used to explain exactly how blame is signalled.
- The extract needs to be read carefully, and the claims made within it need to be properly understood. It is not uncommon for answers to use claims made by the historian about the beliefs and attitudes of characters in the extract as if they were the views of the historian him/herself. This can produce conclusions about the interpretation that are the opposite of what the historian argues. The rhetorical tricks that writers sometimes use need to be considered – for example stating a case to be able to reject it – so that they are not mistaken for the historian's own views.

General comments

Most responses understood that the extract contains within it an interpretation and tried to identify it. The more successful of these possessed two qualities that, to a greater or lesser degree, the less successful responses did not. First, their identification of the historian's argument was more accurate. Second, their answers were more properly focused on the process of explanation. Rather than summarise the extract or take each of its paragraphs in turn and commenting on them individually, these more successful responses read the extract as a whole and then offered explanation about the issue of who or what is blamed within it. This was done throughout the response while less successful responses tended to only identify and explain the view in their introductions or conclusions.

Most responses included mention of historiographical 'labels' that identify the historian's approach and while this is entirely appropriate, responses should specifically be driven by the content of the extract rather than try and fit that content to a particular view which several weaker responses did.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: The origins of the First World War

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he blames Germany **(i)** for pursuing an aggressive world policy to maintain its traditional elites, and **(ii)** for having no option but war when this policy failed. Stronger responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Many responses understood the historian's argument about nationalistic distraction strategies being used to shore up the position of traditional elites but did not link this properly to an interpretation about the causes of war. The second half of the interpretation was often not dealt with. Weaker

responses generally summarised the extract, including some explanation of a sub-message, but little awareness of an overarching argument being made by the historian. The weakest responses 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 s/he blames bystanders for **(i)** not being more sympathetic to the fate of the Jews, and **(ii)** not doing more to help. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Many explicitly referred to the extract as being about ‘bystanders’ and showed awareness of this area of Holocaust historiography. It was also common for responses explicitly to argue that the extract was not about Holocaust causation, and that it would therefore be impossible to ‘label’ it in the normal fashion. Weaker responses tended to summarise what the extract said and struggled to locate the historian’s opinions. A good example was over the evidence in the extract stating that the Allies *could* have done more. This is more or less explicit, but still leaves it open to candidates to note that the historian believes that they *should* have done more (using a fact to infer an opinion). Stronger responses did not rely on such fine distinctions but were able to use clear pointers to signal blame, such as suggesting that the historian disapproved of/disagreed with/condemned the Allies behaviour, with explanation of how the extract did this. The weakest responses paraphrased points in the extract or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

Section C: The origins and development of the Cold War

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that s/he blames the United States **(i)** for its hostility to the Left in postwar Europe, and **(ii)** for unnecessarily seeing the USSR as a threat. The strongest responses recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. Some responses had trouble disentangling the Left from the USSR, and despite seeing that the USA was being criticised, struggled to explain how. More commonly, what the extract said about the USA wrongly assuming that the USSR could control and direct the Left, and thereby confirming its conventional view of the Soviets as being a threat, was properly understood and explained, and could be used to support the idea that the historian was a revisionist. Weaker responses thought the Left and the Soviet Union were being blamed, and the weakest responses paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

HISTORY

Paper 9489/41
Depth Study

Key messages

- The best responses invariably managed to tailor their knowledge to the specific demands of the question. For example, see the comments on **Questions 1** and **2** below. It is important that candidates answer the question set. This was not always the case with responses to **Question 5**, for instance.
- Providing a balanced response remains crucial for success. Candidates generally understand that alternative arguments need to be used and this was seen in **Question 8**, for example.
- Good chronological knowledge is vital when questions specify a particular time period. See comments on **Question 7** for further exemplification.
- Using the question to determine what criteria will be used to make judgements in good practice. This was seen in the best responses to **Question 9**.
- Candidates should be able to respond effectively to command words such as assess, analyse and evaluate to gain marks for AO2 in particular.

General comments

Most candidates understood the rubric and answered two questions from the same section. There was a general understanding that responses should be structured into paragraphs, employing introductions and conclusions and should aim for balanced analysis. Better responses attempted to compare the relative significance of different factors throughout their essays and attempted to produce a clear line of reasoning. Others left their overall judgements to the conclusion. The level of supporting detail is important for AO1 marks, although it remains the case that the more successful responses carefully select which information is relevant to the specific enquiry. These responses directly address the wording of the question and so avoid a more generic response.

Comments on specific questions

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

1 Assess the reasons for Mussolini's appointment as prime minister in 1922.

The focus was on how Mussolini became Prime Minister and the strongest responses made clear that they understood this and concentrated their knowledge on answering this question specifically. Other responses tended to discuss how Mussolini gained popularity without tailoring the material employed to the precise demands of the question. It was valid to discuss Italy's problems in the post-war period and most did so. Particularly astute candidates were able to assess the role of the king and élite groups in Italian society, including the Roman Catholic Church. Precise knowledge on the March on Rome was often proffered in an analytical, rather than descriptive way to develop the argument. Other interesting areas of debate related to Mussolini's skills and ideological flexibility. Knowledge of a range of factors was expected for the higher levels, alongside comparative analysis of the importance of different reasons. Those who fell short of the higher levels tended to offer a narrow range of explanations and lacked detailed supporting material, for example of the economic challenges facing Italy or the unrealised expectations of the post-war treaties.

2 Evaluate the extent to which the Five Year Plans achieved Stalin's objectives.

The strongest responses set out Stalin's objectives as criteria early on. This allowed them to answer the question directly and access the higher levels, particularly for AO2 marks. Those that did consider aims often focused on the need to industrialise for the security of the Soviet Union and there was also discussion of the creation of a truly socialist, proletarian society and of Stalin securing his legacy. Other responses tended to

discuss whether industrialisation was a success or failure without explicit reference to objectives and so were not as analytical in character. The question specifically related to the Five-Year Plans and the most successful responses focused on industrialisation and so ensured that their knowledge of the plans and their outcomes was specifically linked to the question set. At times, some responses covered areas such as living standards and the failure to provide sufficient consumer goods, without being able to link this material to objectives. Similarly, responses which focused on collectivisation were less able to employ this knowledge effectively. When the question specifically relates to industrialisation, as this one did, candidates must make the link to collectivisation very clear and should try to make this the focus of their response.

3 'The Christian churches in Germany accepted Nazi rule with little complaint.' Discuss this view.

The most successful responses understood that a balanced approach to this question was required and were able to provide examples of both acquiescence and opposition from within the ranks of German Christians. Knowledgeable candidates understood that the reference to churches meant that both Catholic and Protestant (or Lutheran) elements could be dealt with separately. There was valid commentary on the Concordat and the formation of the Reich Church, for instance. Some candidates did confuse the details of the German and Italian Concordats. Discussion of the counter argument tended to focus on individuals such as Niemöller, Bonhoeffer and von Galen. There was also some interesting debate on the level of acceptance of the German Faith Movement. A slightly less successful approach ignored the plural in the question and treated the Christian Church as one entity. Less successful responses focused on the persecution of minority groups or foreign policy instead.

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

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

Section B: The USA, 1944–92

5 'Truman's victory in 1948 was a totally unexpected result.' Discuss this view.

Many candidates demonstrated sound knowledge of the 1948 election and tended to frame their responses around why Truman won, before going on to explain why this may or may not have been a surprise. The focus was usually on Truman himself and his record as president. Sound knowledge of his management of the closing stages of the war, his economic policies such as the Fair Deal and his policies towards desegregation were employed to explain that it should have been no surprise that he triumphed. Some responses were less confident about domestic policy and instead placed their focus on Truman's Cold War stance, discussing Marshall Aid and Containment, for example. This was still a valid approach. Knowledge of the split within the Democrat ranks was used to argue that Truman's victory was a surprise. Fewer answers focused on Dewey's culpability, but there was an argument put forward by some that he was over-confident, and that Truman was able to out-perform him in the campaign with his whistle-stop tour. Although most responses were able to provide a range of factors, some were hindered by sufficient depth of knowledge and tended to make assertions without detailed support.

6 Assess the reasons for opposition to the growth of feminism in the 1960s and 1970s.

The most successful responses were able to assess the importance of opposition to feminism in this question and showed understanding of its nature and the reasons that it developed. These responses tended to focus on Phyllis Schlafly. Some valid arguments were also made about the link between opposition and Christianity. However, less successful responses tended to make assertions about groups in the USA wanting to maintain traditional values, without providing specific examples. Some responses described feminism and the reasons for its growth but tended to assert that opponents disagreed with this, without being able to provide detailed support necessary for higher levels.

7 Evaluate the impact of changes in living standards in the 1980s and early 1990s.

The question referred to living standards and more successful answers tended to understand that some discussion of economic policies and their impact would help maintain the correct focus. A good understanding of what Reaganomics entailed was a common feature of successful responses, with candidates being able to discuss the implications of tax cuts and showing awareness of the growing inequality in US society during the 1980s. Sometimes these explanations were hampered by limited supporting detail. Less focused answers tended to concentrate on social, rather than economic, developments and explored issues such as AIDS or growing drug use. A lack of chronological awareness

tended to be a major stumbling block for some candidates and there was a good deal of discussion of the 1940s and 1950s, or the 1970s.

8 'US policy towards rebuilding the economy of Japan after 1945 was motivated principally by humanitarian concerns.' Assess this view.

Many responses to this question were well focused on the question. Candidates understood that a balanced response was called for and were able to weigh up the stated factor against alternatives. To agree with the proposition, many discussed the use of atom bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, rather than the sustained use of conventional bombs on other Japanese cities from 1942. A common argument was that the USA was prepared to support Japan for reasons other than humanitarian concerns, with the Cold War context and economic imperatives being the most regularly employed. Good analysis of Japan as an Asian bulwark against the spread of communism in the region and references to containment and Marshall Aid were used. It should be noted that the latter applied specifically to Europe. Less successful responses grasped the purpose of the question and supplied some analysis but the depth of supporting material used was relatively limited.

Section C: International history, 1945–92

9 Analyse how far US–Soviet attempts to control nuclear weapons were successful in the period 1963–91.

Although this question was answered by relatively few candidates, the best responses were built on solid foundations by considering what 'successful' and 'control' might mean. Invariably, those candidates who set out their criteria from the outset were able to use their knowledge about attempts at arms reduction to answer the question directly. Weaker responses, despite having reasonably good knowledge, were less able to address the issue of success and so were unable to access the higher levels of AO2.

10 Assess the reasons why Sino–Soviet relations improved in the 1970s and 1980s.

Relatively few responses were seen to this question. More successful responses made use of arguments such as the Sino–Soviet Split and the legacy of Vietnam as reasons for improved relations, with examples such as Ping-Pong diplomacy provided to exemplify it.

11 Evaluate the effect of Cold War tensions on the civil war in Angola.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

12 'Saddam Hussein's personal ambitions were the main cause of the Iran–Iraq War.' Discuss.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

HISTORY

Paper 9489/42
Depth Study

Key messages

- The best responses invariably managed to tailor their knowledge to the specific demands of the question. For example, see the comments on **Questions 2** and **5** below. It is important that candidates answer the question set. This was not always the case with responses to **Question 3**, for example.
- Providing a balanced response remains crucial for success. Candidates generally understand that alternative arguments need to be used and this was seen in **Questions 7** and **12**, for example.
- Good chronological knowledge is vital when questions specify a particular time period. See comments on **Question 9** for further exemplification.
- Using the question to determine what criteria will be used to make judgements in good practice. This was seen in the best responses to **Question 1**.
- Candidates should be able to respond effectively to command words such as assess, analyse and evaluate to gain marks for AO2 in particular.

General comments

Most candidates understood the rubric and answered two questions from the same section. There was a general understanding that responses should be structured into paragraphs, employing introductions and conclusions and that they should aim for balanced analysis. Better responses attempted to compare the relative significance of different factors throughout their essays and attempted to produce a clear line of reasoning. Others left their overall judgements to the conclusion. The level of supporting detail is important for AO1 marks, although it remains the case the more successful responses carefully select which information is relevant to the specific enquiry. **Questions 1** and **2** exemplify this point – some candidates attempted to explain how successful Mussolini's economic policies were, without linking their arguments to problems. In **Question 2**, many candidates attempted a similar approach, leaving the idea of 'benefits' to the conclusion.

Comments on specific questions

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

1 'Mussolini failed to solve the economic problems facing Italy.' Discuss.

The best responses to this question grasped that high quality analysis depended upon the identification of problems as criteria with which to judge the success of Mussolini's economic policies, and then went on to do so. Others did take care to set out the economic challenges facing Italy, without closely linking the examples provided in the essay to them. In some responses, relatively good knowledge of policies was shown, without any reference to the problems that they were trying to solve. As a result, AO1 marks often surpassed those awarded for AO2. Perceptive comments on issues such as the North-South divide, under-development of industry and agriculture, poor industrial relations and the effects of the Great Depression were common in the stronger answers and helped candidates to respond effectively. There were also interesting debates about how far Mussolini actually caused problems, rather than solving them, through rearmament or foreign policy, for example. Candidates uniformly used the battles as examples of policy, as well as Mussolini's responses to the Great Depression and drive for Autarky. It should be noted that the Battle for Births is not generally considered as an economic policy.

2 Assess the extent to which workers benefited from the economic changes in the USSR from 1924 to 41.

Responses that performed best on this question discussed the impact of Stalin's economic policies on 'ordinary' members of society, rather than analysing how successful such policies were. The reference to 'workers' in the question allowed candidates to introduce those engaged in agriculture as well as industry into their arguments and most responses tended to cover both, although those who focused purely on the proletariat could also perform well. As always, balance was important and successful answers were able to balance the potential benefits against negative developments. Commentary sometimes included the 'Red Specialists' and the access to better education and training for some of the working class. Women's roles were also cited as examples of positive changes, as was improved healthcare. The Stakhanovite Movement also featured on a regular basis although responses did not always link this to the question effectively. Responses were perhaps stronger on the negatives, with poor living and working conditions, unrealistic demands placed on workers through the Five Year Plans and the often catastrophic impact of Collectivisation evident in better responses. Some also understood that Stalin's policies provided few consumer items for workers, although knowledgeable candidates were able to introduce the 'Three Good Years' to counter this somewhat. Those responses which introduced statistics on production levels and wanted to answer a question of the relative success of Stalin's policies were less likely to score highly.

3 Evaluate the effectiveness of the Nazi regime's responses to the Great Depression.

The best responses considered the use of the word 'regime' in the question and understood that the focus should be on the period from 1933 and on economic policies. These responses also endeavoured to discuss the effectiveness of such policies. Nazi attempts at job creation through public works schemes were supported with accurate knowledge of employment statistics. Balance was achieved by those candidates who looked more carefully at these policies and commented on the nature of the employment provided, for instance through the RAD. There was also discussion of 'invisible unemployment' and other methods used by the regime to massage the unemployment statistics. Valid discussion of Schacht's deficit financing and use of Mefo Bills was also included and linked to perceptive comments about the longer-term implications for Germany's economy and how the short-term benefits began to disappear by the late 1930s. Those who ignored the word regime and sought to base their answer in the period 1929 – 32 were likely to see some material deemed irrelevant to the question. There was also an attempt by some to include foreign policy and persecution of minorities as responses to the Great Depression, although most examples given were declared Nazi policies prior to 1929.

4 Assess the view that women's roles and status did not change significantly in Britain in the period 1919–39.

Relatively few responses to this question were seen in comparison to the others in **Section A**. Of those that did answer it, better arguments differentiated between different classes of women and examined political, social and economic factors. For instance, there was some discussion of how the social developments associated with 'flappers' had very limited impact on working class and older women. Balance was crucial and was reached by comparing the impact of the 1918 and 1928 Representation of the Peoples Acts, with the low numbers of women elected to Parliament in these years. Some responses were hampered by the range and depth of examples and of supporting material provided.

Section B: The USA, 1944–92

5 Analyse the effectiveness of the NAACP in promoting civil rights in the late 1940s and 1950s.

The question required sustained focus on the NAACP's activities and those whose knowledge was strong enough were able to do so. Weaker responses listed various civil rights activities at the time, which sometimes lacked relevance, particularly when drifting into the 1960s. Better responses concentrated on the NAACP's legal challenges to segregation, with impressive knowledge of cases won by Thurgood Marshall such as *Sweatt v Painter* and *Brown v Board of Education*. The NAACP's role in the Montgomery Bus Boycott was also valid and was included in many responses. Stronger answers tended to make clear judgements about actual effectiveness and to directly engage with the question. These answers tended to discuss how much actual change the *Brown* ruling brought about and incorporated southern states' responses in their analysis to support their point. Responses which were less balanced in their approach were less likely to reach the higher levels of AO2.

6 Evaluate the reasons why post-war economic doctrines lost influence in the 1960s and 1970s.

Stronger answers were clear what was meant by 'post-war economic doctrines' and were able to explain why change was necessary. These responses showed a grasp of doctrines such as Keynesianism and Bretton-Woods and so were able to link economic developments in the 1960s to them. There was often sound knowledge of economic challenges facing the USA at this time, exemplified through discussions of the costs of the Vietnam War and the Great Society programmes, the oil crises and inflation for example. Often this was not explicitly linked to the dominant economic orthodoxies of the time, and this tended to hamper candidates' AO2 marks.

7 'Too little, too late.' Evaluate this view of the response of the US authorities to the outbreak of the AIDS epidemic.

This was a question which provoked some interesting and valid debates. As usual, the best responses were well balanced and offered clear analysis. Some candidates argued that given the novelty of the disease and the fact that it initially affected a community which was deliberately outside the mainstream of American society it was hardly surprising that little was done initially. Others felt that AIDS was deliberately ignored because it affected a community disliked by the New Right and Reaganomics was all about cutting back on public spending on the poor and programmes like Medicare and Medicaid. Strong responses thought about how to deal with both 'little' and 'late' aspects of the question, some arguing that one was correct and not the other.

Question 8

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

Section C: International history, 1945–92

9 Assess the impact of the death of Stalin on US–Soviet relations.

The best responses kept the focus on the immediate period after Stalin's death and gave examples up to and including the Berlin Crisis. Good knowledge of Cold War developments in the 1950s was required. There were sometimes good contrasts drawn between the foreign policy approaches of Stalin and Khrushchev and on their respective management of Eastern Europe with sound comment on Hungary and the Middle East. Some answers got drawn into descriptions of events prior to Stalin's death, which were not relevant to the focus of this question. Many began with the starting point of 'peaceful coexistence' before producing analysis on how much of the difference between the two was superficial and how many continuities there were. The further away from 1953 that responses reached, the less convincing was the analysis, particularly when the focus shifted to events in the 1970s and even 1980s.

10 Analyse the extent to which the Korean War was responsible for Sino–US hostility in the 1950s and 1960s.

This question led to some valid and thoughtful analysis. Some candidates argued successfully that the war just made a bad relationship worse, by addressing the fundamental ideological differences, the support that the US had given to the Nationalists in the past and the Taiwan issue. There was often good depth of knowledge relating to the role played by each side in the Korean War. Some responses also grasped the importance of covering both decades and included the Vietnam War and other involvements by both China and the US in other parts of Southeast Asia.

11 'Kenyatta's leadership was the main reason Kenya was able to gain its independence.' Discuss.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

12 Assess how far President Nasser was responsible for causing the Six-Day War (1967).

There was some good knowledge in many responses to this question. The need for balance was uniformly understood and Nasser's role was examined, often in some depth, before being compared to the actions of the Israelis and other nations in the region, as well as the level of responsibility of the Superpowers. Examples provided to support the proposition included Nasser's role as leader of the Arab nations, his inflammatory speeches over Tiran and Akaba for instance and military build-up. As well as Israeli responses, there was discussion of the Palestinian and Soviet roles among others. AO1 marks often outstripped those awarded for AO2, as the assessment of 'how far' Nasser should be blamed was sometimes implicit and

judgements were left to the conclusion and then were rather superficial in nature. The strongest responses set out the argument from the beginning and provided a consistent line of reasoning throughout the response.

HISTORY

Paper 9489/43
Depth Study

Key messages

- The best responses invariably managed to adapt their knowledge to the specific demands of the question. For example, see the comments on **Questions 2 and 10** below. It is important that candidates answer the question set. Please see the comments on **Question 3** below.
- Providing a balanced response remains crucial for success. Candidates generally understand that alternative arguments need to be used and this was seen in **Questions 1 and 9**, for example.
- Good chronological knowledge is vital when questions specify a particular time period.
- Using the question to determine what criteria will be used to make judgements in good practice. This was seen in the best responses to **Questions 1 and 12**.
- Candidates should be able to respond effectively to command words such as assess, analyse and evaluate to gain marks for AO2 in particular.

General comments

Most candidates understood the rubric and answered two questions from the same section. There was a general understanding that responses should be structured into paragraphs, employing introductions and conclusions and that they should aim for balanced analysis. Better responses attempted to compare the relative significance of different factors throughout their essays and attempted to produce a clear line of reasoning. Others left their overall judgements to the conclusion. The level of supporting detail is important for AO1 marks, although it remains the case the more successful responses carefully select which information is relevant to the specific enquiry. **Question 9** related to the end of the Cold War and some responses were not explicit enough in how the collapse of the Soviet system led to this. **Question 10** specifically related to the outbreak of the Korean War and material relating to how and why, for instance, the USA became involved did not directly answer that question.

Comments on specific questions

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

1 Analyse the effectiveness of Mussolini's policies on women and young people.

The best responses set out Mussolini's aims as criteria to allow judgements on effectiveness to be made. In relation to women, this often related to increasing the birth rate and appeasing conservatives and the Catholic church. The objectives suggested for children were typically linked to indoctrination through education and youth groups. Detailed knowledge of the policies and their outcomes was seen in many responses and allowed access to the higher levels for both AO1 and AO2. Some candidates got a little sidetracked by descriptions of the battles and found it more difficult to draw clear conclusions.

2 Assess the reasons for Stalin's policy of 'building socialism in one country'.

A range of responses were provided to this question, with some showing a strong degree of knowledge and analytical ability. Many candidates focused on the initial development of the policy and argued that Stalin utilised it to attract support from younger, less ideologically committed party members to undermine Trotsky and his platform of Permanent Revolution. Some responses placed their focus in the 1930s and suggested that the policy was to calm fears of worldwide revolution by neutering the Comintern to gain support for Collective Security. Other arguments were based on the need to industrialise and collectivise agriculture to cement his own position. There was a tendency among some candidates using this approach to drift into

detailed narrative of how these policies were carried out. Less successful responses were unsure about the policy of Socialism in One Country, and this made analysis more challenging.

3 Analyse the reasons for the Nazi persecution of Jews and other minorities.

Most responses placed their focus very firmly on the persecution of Jews; however, fewer responses were able to discuss 'other minorities' in any meaningful depth. There was a range of explanations given for Nazi antisemitism, most notably racial beliefs, Social Darwinism and the supposed supremacy of the Aryan race. Many responses argued that Jews were made scapegoats for Germany's problems, most often the defeat in World War One, but also the Great Depression. Fewer answers made the link between Judaism and communism which the Nazis used to gather support for their policies, although some strong analysis highlighted how Jews were simultaneously accused of controlling capitalism and plotting its downfall. A few answers chose to use knowledge drawn from the Holocaust study for Paper 3, but this was not a successful approach as it led to discussion of events after 1941. The most successful responses fully grasped the implication of the reference to 'other minorities' and were able to add analysis of the persecution of Roma, Sinti, asocials, homosexuals and Jehovah's Witnesses.

4 'The National Governments had more successes than failures between 1931 and 1939.' Discuss.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

Section B: The USA, 1944–92

5 'Eisenhower's election victories are best explained by economic prosperity.' Discuss this view.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

6 Assess how far there was greater acceptance of gay rights in the 1960s and 1970s.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

7 Evaluate the consequences of ongoing budget deficits in the 1980s and early 1990s.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

8 'Opposition to communist ideology was the main reason for US involvement in the Korean War.' Discuss this view.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

Section C: International history, 1945–92

9 'Gorbachev's commitment to peaceful change was the main reason for the end of the Cold War.' Discuss.

The best responses fully understood the nature of the question – which was why the Cold War ended, rather than why the Soviet Union collapsed. A good range of arguments were put forward by many respondents, balancing agreement with the statement with alternatives. Candidates were usually familiar with Gorbachev's 'New Thinking' and uniformly discussed the policies of Glasnost and Perestroika. Slightly fewer raised the implications of the Sinatra Doctrine for Soviet Control of Eastern Europe. There was also discussion of the state of the Soviet economy and arguments that Gorbachev was impelled to carry out radical policies, given the situation. The role of Reagan was also explored, particularly his increased arms spending. Some of the strongest responses took the time to discuss the summits and treaties which signalled the cooling of tensions between the superpowers.

10 Discuss the extent to which North Korea was responsible for the outbreak of war in 1950.

This question referred specifically to the 'outbreak' of the Korean War and the best responses stuck to this. Some less successful responses included material which was less relevant to the escalation of the war and US involvement. Most understood the role that was played by North Korea and were able to balance Kim's responsibility with Stalin's. There were also some good arguments about China's involvement in the outbreak, rather than later involvement. Fewer answers explored South Korea's role and those that did understood that there was a desire for unification on both sides of the border. Strongest analysis of the role

of the US grasped the importance of Korea being excluded from Atchison's Defensive Perimeter and the implications for Soviet thinking. Some responses did fall into narrative passages detailing the course of the war and this approach is inevitably less likely to be rewarded with high AO2 marks.

11 Assess how far African nations were able to adopt non-alignment during the Cold War.

There were too few responses for meaningful comment.

12 'US policies had limited impact on the Middle East during the Cold War.' Evaluate this view.

Successful responses to this question kept their focus on the impact of US policies and aimed for balance by debating this point. Identifying what US aims were in the region at different points was a useful way of setting criteria. A range of examples was provided, covering the whole period at times, and candidates usually found it more straightforward to argue that US policies did have an impact, pointing to support for Israel and involvement in the Suez Crisis, for instance. Strong analysis concluded that US policies were more successful in limiting Soviet expansion in the Middle East than in keeping peace.