

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9389/12**  
**Document Question**

## Key messages

- Candidates should ensure that their answers address the specific questions being asked.
- When reading sources candidates should ensure that they take notice of the overall message of the source in order to understand the argument or point of view of the author. This means that the source should be viewed in its entirety rather than divided into individual sentences or part sentences which, taken alone, can convey different ideas to those which the source read as a whole can provide.
- Candidates should ensure that they look closely at the provenance of each source as they read and consider how far this is useful when analysing the statement given. Candidates should consider the nature (what type of source it is), the origin (who wrote or produced the source), and purpose of sources before commenting on generic reliability or placing in a particular context. However, comments about source evaluation should always be related to answering the question posed.
- Time-keeping is vitally important. Candidates need to make sure they leave enough time to complete answers to both questions.

## General comments

Most candidates know that the **(a)** question requires an identification of similarities **and** differences, and that answers to **(b)** questions require an explanation of how each source either supports or challenges the prompt in the question. Stronger candidates appreciate that they need to support the points they make with quotations or direct paraphrases from the relevant sources.

Responses often made invalid points of comparison. Many of these claimed similarities for points which were not actually similar and differences for points which were not different. If the comparisons cannot be properly validated, they cannot be credited. The focus of the **(a)** question is to identify valid similarities and differences of the content of the sources. Weaker responses often included large sections of contextual knowledge or stock paragraphs of 'evaluation' rather than tackling the focus of the question. Although there are marks in the top level for commenting on the usefulness of the sources, the focus of the question should be on making a developed comparison i.e. identifying similarities and differences.

To achieve higher evaluation marks, it is necessary to explain why the nature, origin or purpose of the source makes it more or less useful when answering the question. One example of where this could be achieved was in **Section C, Source D**. Responses that dealt with this source successfully used their knowledge of the context to comment on the position taken by the British Labour party in these discussions and how it could be used to give weight to the source in relation to the wider question. As such when using these ideas, it is important that candidates explain why this makes the source more or less useful for the question rather than just stating the date or type of source and saying it is unreliable.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A: European Option: The Appointment of Bismarck as Minister President in 1862**

#### **Question 1**

#### **(a) To what extent do Sources A and B agree about the appointment of Bismarck?**

Most responses to this question were able to identify similarities. The differences were more subtle and required candidates to be clear about the exact criticisms each source was making of Bismarck. Therefore, whilst Source A regards Bismarck as a 'reactionary conservative' who is likely

to harm the cause of German unity; Source B portrays him as a dangerous revolutionary who may be in favour of increased unity. Some weaker responses misinterpreted the use of the word 'conservative' while stronger responses were able to identify differences relating to this including who was in danger from the ideas of Bismarck. This question was well attempted, but candidates are encouraged to take account of the whole message of the source rather than only small sections of it.

- (b) 'Bismarck's appointment as Minister President advanced the cause of German unity.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?**

Source A provided a strong challenge to the assertion and many responses were able to use this to discuss the nature of the source and the weight of evidence it could provide. Source D, from Bismarck himself offered support to the question and similarly stronger responses were able to discuss possible reasons why Bismarck was keen to show himself as a supporter of unity when writing his memoirs in the 1890s. Sources B and C needed closer reading and weaker responses did not show this. Source B suggested that Bismarck was a proponent of unity even though the author is against it. Stronger responses were able to discuss reasons that von Gerlach might have had a particular view on both unity and Bismarck. Source C discussed various themes relating to the issue of unity although it did not state outright Bismarck's opinion. Many responses picked up on the ideas of the relationship with Austria and Prussia's place within the German states and used this source effectively. The strongest responses were able to place the authors within the context of the time.

**Section B, the American Option: The outcomes of the Mexican–American War**

**Question 2**

- (a) Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources A and B on the issue of slavery in new Territories.**

Strong responses to this question showed good understanding of the debates concerning the role of Congress in decision making and used the sources to show differences of opinion between Source A and Source B. The strongest responses supported these ideas with direct reference to the sources. There were few responses to this question but most were also able to discuss the similarities shown in each source, i.e. that this was an issue which was causing, and would continue to cause, discord. Weaker responses did not use much contextual knowledge of issues such as the Wilmot Proviso to further their comparison of the sources rather than include extended sections of description.

- (b) How far do Sources A to D support the assertion that the powers of the federal government were the main issue in disagreements that originated in the Mexican–American War?**

The majority of responses to this question were able to use the sources successfully and looked for examples of support and challenge for the assertion. The big issue here was how much weight the sources could give to whether it was federal powers or the issue of slavery that was most upsetting and dividing people. Many strong responses dealt well with the subtleties that the sources offered on these issues but some weaker ones did struggle with this. Although the ideas of the expansion of slavery run throughout the sources there were some which were clearly more concerned with the exercise of federal power than of the practicalities of expansion. The strongest responses were able to use contextual knowledge of the period to discuss the growing tensions and new decisions that needed to be taken whilst placing the Mexican-American war into this picture.

**Section C, International Option: Britain, the League of Nations and the Manchurian Question**

**Question 3**

- (a) Compare and contrast the views expressed in Sources C and D regarding the role played by Britain in the League of Nations' consideration of the Manchurian question.**

Many responses were able to apply effective contextual knowledge in order to identify similarities and differences between the sources but there were a significant minority which struggled to apply this knowledge accurately. Both sources clearly agreed that Britain held an extremely important and influential position within the League of Nations and that they had (or should have had) some

sense of their moral leadership. The strongest responses supported these ideas with precise contextual knowledge of Britain's place within the league during the 1930s. Many were able to identify the clear differences between the sources, with Simon believing that Britain had acted fairly as part of the discussions over Manchuria, and Attlee believed that a lack of leadership had 'encouraged the Japanese militarists'.

**(b) 'In the period from September 1931 to November 1932, the League of Nations responded appropriately to the problems in Manchuria.' How far do Sources A to D support this view?**

Many responses were able to consider the phrase 'appropriate response' effectively and so could identify support and challenge from the sources, although weaker responses sometimes got distracted into determinism because they saw the league as ultimately failing at the task. Within this context, Source C suggested that Britain took appropriate action and was willing to defend it. Many responses were able to discuss the purpose of this source effectively and suggested that limited weight could be given to it because it was a government defence of the policy. Source A could also be used to support the statement as it showed that the league had every intention of responding with thought and appropriate action. However, many responses also used Source A to suggest that the league, despite intentions, had been unable to respond appropriately because of the actions of Japan and the way that its own structures hampered it. Sources B and D clearly argued that the league had not taken appropriate action and many responses could clearly identify this. The best responses were those which were able to take these ideas and place the sources within a contextual framework which allowed them to be tested. These responses often produced interesting, and thoughtful, answers to the question rather than deciding purely based on perceptions of failure.

# HISTORY

---

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

## Key messages

- In **part (a)** questions, candidates should focus on the key issue of causation, analysing a range of factors to show how they interacted and reaching a judgement regarding their relative significance.
- In **part (b)** questions, candidates should address the question rather than the topic, maintain a balanced approach and ensure that arguments are appropriately supported.
- Some candidates write almost as much for **part (a)** as for **part (b)** despite **part (b)** being worth twice as many marks. Being aware of the mark allocation is encouraged to help apportion time effectively and ensure every selected question can be finished.

## General comments

The majority of candidates answered questions from **Section A** with **Questions 1, 3 and 4** being equally popular. Many candidates were able to demonstrate a good grasp of basic detail and were able to write appropriately about the events they had studied. There was a significant difference between those who were simply able to relate information about the topics they had studied and those who were able to relate specific details to the questions that they were attempting to answer.

The majority of candidates try to write longer answers to **part (b)** questions but there are still a significant number who seem to get the balance of detail between the two types of question confused. On **part (a)** questions, strong candidates are able to offer several relevant factors in writing about the topic. In these responses more judgement about which is the most important factor and how the other factors link to it is to be encouraged.

On **part (b)** questions many candidates are able to offer alternative explanations, but few seem willing to commit themselves to a reasoned choice about which argument they think is stronger. Weaker responses tended to try and write down anything that might be relevant and in doing this lost sight of the question being asked.

## Comments on specific questions

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

#### **Question 1 France, 1789–1814**

##### **(a) Why was there no successful counter-revolution in France between 1789 and 1799?**

Good responses covered the whole period including the failure of the king in the early years, the strength of Republicanism and the effects of the reign of Terror and the success of the Directory in suppressing the counter-revolutionaries. Weaker responses did not make use of the opportunity to assess the failure of counter-revolutionaries across the whole period and often stopped with the execution of the king. A minority of responses discussed the Estates General and the causes of the Revolution with limited understanding of what the question was asking for.

**(b) How far had the ideals of ‘liberty equality and fraternity been established in France by the end of 1792?**

Stronger responses often began with a clear introduction which set out suggestions about changes that had contributed to improvements in equality and a counter argument about how far inequalities remained. For example ‘...*the power of the king had been reduced and an elected assembly now had power. Unfair taxes and the feudal system had been ended but it was mainly the middle class who had gained and the peasants and workers still lived in poverty*’. Weaker responses struggled with how changes in liberty, equality and fraternity might be measured and were often a narrative account about the Revolution, concentrating on the early events like the meeting of the Estate General and the Fall of the Bastille.

**Question 2: The Industrial Revolution, c.1800–c.1890**

**(a) Why did railways develop so rapidly?**

**(b) Assess the reasons why industrialisation brought about so much political change. Refer to any two countries from Britain, France or Germany in your answer.**

There were too few responses to make comment appropriate.

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

**(a) Why did Germany see it as essential to invade Belgium in 1914?**

There were many good responses that offered several reasons for Germany’s actions. The Schlieffen Plan was well understood and the need to avoid a war on two fronts was central to many successful responses. Stronger candidates were fully aware of the strategic significance of Belgium and the advantages for Germany in avoiding the strong defences further south on the Franco-German border, plus the element of surprise, and some even mentioned the possibility of cutting the French off from possible support from Britain. Some weaker responses struggled with the geographical features of the question, particularly the location of Belgium and the importance this might have had for Germany’s decision. A minority of weaker responses got confused about the role of Britain, explaining the invasion of Belgium as a way of getting Britain involved in the war.

**(b) Assess the view that events in the Balkans did not cause the First World War.**

Strong responses were able to demonstrate how the underlying problems in the Balkans culminated in the assassination of Franz Ferdinand which triggered the war, before assessing the importance of these against other causal factors like the ambitions of Germany and the imperialist conflicts that preceded the First World War, e.g. ‘...*in conclusion the Balkans did play a role because of the effects of Balkan nationalism on Great Power rivalry, which was a short term cause of war, but in the long run factors such as Great Power nationalism and the alliance system were vital in influencing the decisions that led to World War One.*’ Weaker responses provided substantial detail of the conflicts in the Balkans in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century but struggled to establish a link to the question.

**Question 4: The Russian Revolution, c.1894–1917**

**(a) Why did the Provisional Government face so much opposition?**

Strong responses were able to provide a detailed analysis of the problems that faced the Provisional Government and draw reasonable conclusions, e.g. ‘...*the main reason was the continuation of the war which went against public opinion ... this was aggravated by the land question and the rise of opposition from the Bolsheviks with Lenin’s slogan ‘peace bread and land’ being increasingly popular.*’ A minority of weaker responses failed to separate the failure of the PG from the fall of the Tsar and some wrote about the overthrow of the Provisional Government rather than its lack of popularity.

- (b) **‘The social and economic policies of the Tsarist Government between 1905 and 1914 brought few benefits to the Russian people.’ How far do you agree?**

There were several good responses to this question but many were not restricted to the ‘economic and social policies’ and included political developments following the 1905 Revolution such as the October Manifesto and role of the Dumas. These features were not relevant to the question focus and stronger responses looked at the work of Stolypin and at the failings of the regime to satisfy the demands for improved conditions for workers and peasants. The strongest responses focused only on these elements. A minority of weaker responses focused generally on the 1905 Revolution and some went beyond the timeframe to 1917.

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

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

- (a) **Why did President Wilson order US troops to intervene in Mexico in 1914–16?**  
(b) **How isolationist was US policy towards Europe in the 1920s?**

There were too few responses to make comment appropriate.

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

- (a) **Why, in 1869–70, was the 15th Amendment to the constitution passed?**  
(b) **‘Cautious in both its political aims and its military strategy.’ How accurately does this describe the leadership of the North in 1861–2?**

There were too few responses to make comment appropriate.

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

- (a) **Why in the period did the US economy fluctuate between periods of crisis and times of rapid growth?**  
(b) **‘In practice little could be done to limit the power of party bosses.’ How far do you agree?**

There were too few responses to make comment appropriate.

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

- (a) **Why were the 1920s such hard times for US farmers?**  
(b) **How far did the New Deal change the relationship between the citizen and the state?**

There were too few responses to make comment appropriate.

**Section C: INTERNATIONAL OPTION; International Relations, 1871–1945**

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

- (a) **Why did Kaiser Wilhelm II’s telegram to Paul Kruger in January 1896 cause resentment in Britain?**

The strongest responses focused on the telegram and its impact on Britain explaining that it raised fears of German intervention in supporting the Boers. They were able to set the telegram in a wider context of growing mistrust of German imperialist ambitions and also of the rising significance of public opinion and the expression nationalistic sentiments. Weaker responses produced accounts of the Boer Wars, the discovery of extensive mineral reserves, including diamonds, in the Transvaal, and the failure of the Jameson Raid but did not address the response to the Kruger Telegram.



- (b) **'While it was intended to preserve peace the Alliance System greatly increased the prospect of war.' How far do you agree?**

Stronger responses explained the defensive aspects of the alliances and were aware of the motives of each of the countries in forming the alliances that they did. These responses also linked the alliance system to the more confrontational policies of militarisation and imperialism and a few very good responses were able to draw reasoned conclusions about the balance between preserving peace and promoting war. Weaker responses often just wrote about alliances as one aspect of the causes of the First World War and then wrote about other factors.

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

- (a) **Why were many of the 'successor states' politically unstable during the 1920's?**

Responses that understood the term 'successor states' were generally clear and contained appropriate examples about the problems of these states, for example demonstrating how the number of nationalities in Poland generated so many political parties that in the end dictatorship was established by General Pilsudski in 1926. The strongest responses were able to relate all the problems to the artificiality of the border created under the guidance of Wilson's 14 points. Weaker responses did not demonstrate knowledge of what 'successor states' meant and focussed instead on problems in any European country following the end of the war including Britain, France and Germany.

- (b) **How isolationist was the USA foreign policy during the 1920's?**

This produced some good responses with clear explanation of the motives that prompted active intervention in foreign affairs (largely economic) and the actions and intentions that kept the US isolated from events overseas (largely political). There was understanding that in the aftermath of World War One many Americans felt that they should not be involved any further in European affairs which led to conflict and this was reflected in the congressional rejection of the Versailles settlement. Strong responses identified these choices with the Republican policies of the presidents of the 1920s. At the same time there was recognition that the US was involved because of the debt owed to it by European countries and hence had to intervene in the reparations issues, and that international trade was still a factor in overseas involvement. Most responses produced relevant detail but weaker ones were restricted to narrative with little analysis of motive.

**Question 11: International Relations, c.1933–1939**

- (a) **Why did Mussolini adopt a diplomatic approach to foreign policy in the period from 1923 to 1934?**

Most responses demonstrated some knowledge of Mussolini's foreign policy in the period and focussed on key events like the Corfu crisis, though some failed to note the time limit and went on to the invasion of Abyssinia. There was also a general understanding of his basic aim being to 'make Italy great' and his ambition to achieve a '*Mare Nostrum*' in the Mediterranean. Reference to all these elements was common to most responses but weaker ones went no further than simple description with limited reference to the question. Stronger responses were aware of, and made reference to, the relatively weak position of Italy and its isolation as the only Fascist state in Europe and used these to explain Italy's involvement in the major diplomatic moves of the 1920s in a bid to establish a good reputation both at home and abroad.

- (b) **'Hitler and Mussolini supported Franco in the Spanish Civil War primarily because they wanted to establish a third Fascist state in Europe.' How far do you agree?**

Most responses were heavily weighted on the 'disagree' side of the argument as it is much easier to provide relevant detail to support the argument that the two leaders were only involved out of self-interest and most responses pointed out Hitler's role in initiating the conflict by providing transport for Franco and the role of the Condor legion as well as supplying arms (but at a price that reflected his basic self-interest). There was less confident explanation of the role of Mussolini. On the opposite side there was some general argument about the benefits of having a Fascist state on the southern borders of France and also a few responses were aware of the support for another anti-communist regime but the support side of the argument was generally brief and lacked development even in the stronger responses.

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

- (a) Why did Japanese forces take full control of Manchuria in 1931–32?**
- (b) Compare and contrast Sun Yat-sen and Chiang Kai-shek as leaders of the Kouxintang.**

There were too few responses to make comment appropriate.



# HISTORY

---

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

## **Key messages**

- Candidates are reminded that the task is to make inferences about the historian, and then, using the extract, to explain how these inferences have been made. Therefore, candidates should avoid writing out or paraphrasing the extract.
- Before starting their answer, candidates should spend time reading and thinking about the extract, making notes on what they think are the central points of the interpretation, and how the extract can be used to illustrate these.
- Candidates are advised to work on the extract as a whole, rather than on little parts of it. The historian's interpretation will be valid for the whole extract; different paragraphs will not have different interpretations.
- It is important that candidates keep their answer focused on answering the question. They should not spend time writing lengthy paragraphs about the context, or paraphrasing parts of the extract as this is not needed in their explanation of the interpretation.

## **General comments**

The most successful answers identified and explained the historian's interpretation in the extract. Successful comprehension of the extract is in part determined by the candidate's knowledge of the historiography and the historical context, as well as their awareness of examination technique. Candidates also need an understanding of how historians work, and the nature and status of claims they make. It is important to be aware of the fact that academic historians write on the basis of a consideration of the whole of the available evidence. The incompleteness of the evidence is the fundamental cause of the variety of interpretations of the same events, but these interpretations would not be historical if there was no reasoned consideration of the evidence on which to base them. Many otherwise good answers were undermined by attempts to evaluate the historian's conclusions, generally on the grounds that they did not consider something or omitted to use certain evidence.

Successful responses showed understanding of the interpretation by identifying and illustrating from the extract all the important elements of the interpretation. Less successful answers used the extract to illustrate what they saw as the interpretation, but there were some errors or inconsistencies in the argument. Some of these responses detected elements of the main interpretation, but undermined this valid material with other, contradictory arguments. This mainly occurred by not treating the extract as a whole and the consequent assertion that the extract contains multiple, usually contradictory, interpretations. Therefore, candidates should avoid working through the extract paragraph by paragraph and ascribing to each paragraph different interpretations.

Many candidates included references to specific historians in their answers, which, when appropriate, can be a useful way of throwing additional light on the historian's interpretation. For this to be successful, candidates must first have properly understood the extract itself, and second must understand the views of the historian to whom they are referring. Many candidates seemed to have had difficulties with this approach.

### **Comments on specific questions**

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

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

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that Hitler's anti-Semitic ideas were potentially genocidal from the start of his career, and that once in power his policies were genocidal in intent. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. At the highest level candidates were able to make the point about the continuity of Hitler's genocidal ideas up to 1939. Some candidates treated the extract as if it were simply about Hitler's anti-Semitism, which was insufficient. Whilst the extract was undoubtedly about anti-Semitism, it was making a specific point about the nature of the threat to the Jews posed by Hitler and the Nazis. Where candidates used a historiographical 'label', this was almost always intentionalism. Indeed, nothing else would make any sense. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Holocaust with no reference to the extract.

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

The central argument of the historian who wrote this extract is that the unstable international situation in 1945 made conflict almost certain, but the particular nature of the Cold War was determined by the competing interests and ideologies of the USA and the USSR. The best answers recognised these aspects of the interpretation and illustrated them using material from the extract. In practice, candidates were much more comfortable explaining the competitive conflict between the superpowers than the more theoretical argument about the inherent instability of international political systems. They were able to give sound explanations of the historian's post-revisionist approach, but few could tease out the specific significance given in the interpretation to the international system as an enabling factor, and the USA-USSR relationship as the trigger, for the Cold War. Any attempts to argue that the historian's approach was anything other than post-revisionist were bound to be flawed. The weakest answers simply paraphrased points in the extract, or wrote about the Cold War with no reference to the extract.

# HISTORY

---

**Paper 9389/42**  
**Depth Study**

## **Key messages**

- A sustained and clear focus on the actual question asked is the key to accessing the higher levels of the mark scheme.
- Answers must be analytical throughout and attempt to address all aspects of the question.
- Analysis must be supported by relevant and accurate factual information and this knowledge should be in depth.
- Candidates must take note of the chronological timeframe of the question.
- Questions will require a balanced response that argues a case.
- Factual narrative answers will not access the higher level of the mark scheme.

## **General comments**

Higher quality answers were clearly analytical in approach and had a well-argued case that was supported with good levels of relevant subject knowledge and then reached a logical final judgement. A good example of this was **Question 4**, where candidates had to assess the importance of economic recovery in keeping the Nazis in power after 1933 and then evaluate economic recovery alongside other factors such as propaganda, terror, lack of opposition and foreign policy successes.

Lack of subject knowledge sometimes hampered candidates and this was illustrated in **Question 5** where candidates knew about the Brown v. The Board of Education, 1954 case but little else in some cases.

Having a balanced answer is very important. **Question 10** highlighted this, where candidates had to examine the successes and failures of the SALT Treaties and then come to a reasoned overall judgement. This latter judgement is crucial to accessing top level marks. It was also important in this question to know what the treaties actually said and attempted to do.

## **Comments on specific questions.**

### **Depth Study 1: Europe of the Dictators, 1918–41.**

#### **1 ‘War Communism did nothing but lose the Bolsheviks support.’ How far do you agree?**

This question required an in-depth analysis of War Communism and its benefits and drawbacks for the Bolsheviks. Some candidates attempted to talk about other factors in keeping the Bolsheviks in power, but this was not the focus of this particular question title. It was also important to have a balanced argument and then a reasoned final judgement. Answers tended to be rather one-sided and usually saying that War Communism was a disaster for the Bolsheviks. Higher quality answers looked across the whole-time span from 1918 to 1921 and gave a nuanced and balanced assessment, avoiding going on to the New Economic Policy.

**2 'The Corporate State was the most successful of Mussolini's economic policies.' How far do you agree?**

This was a popular question for some centres and candidates could generally explain the idea of the Corporate State, although some were slightly uncritical of it. Some candidates provided a very positive interpretation of the successes of Mussolini's economic policies. There was a tendency to list the various battles and then to be rather uncritical in evaluating them. Narrative passages predominated in some answers. The key feature of weaker responses was a lack of evaluation.

**3 Analyse the reasons why there were so few limitations to Stalin's power.**

There was sometimes a misunderstanding in responses that wanted to write about Stalin's rise to power, rather than his hold on power once in office. Several candidates found this question difficult and did not get beyond the 1920s. There was some description of the Collectivisation and Five-Year Plans and some talked at length about the Great Terror. Better quality responses focused on limitations and why these were not always successful in controlling the power of Stalin. This question needed a balanced evaluation of powers, limitations and why and how far Stalin's power was in fact unlimited.

**4 'Economic recovery was the principal reason for the Nazis remaining in power after 1933.' How far do you agree?**

This was a popular question and often answered well. Candidates looked at economic recovery and then assessed other factors such as propaganda, foreign policy successes, terror, the One-Party State and the lack of a credible opposition. Some answers were a little cursory on the economy and wanted to look at other factors. These tended to include indoctrination of the youth, popularity of Hitler and anti-Semitism. The very good quality answers evaluated the economic recovery and then prioritised it against other factors and gave a reasoned and substantiated judgement.

**Depth Study 2: The History of the USA, 1945–90**

Too few of these responses were seen to be able to give meaningful feedback.

**Depth Study 3: International History, 1945–91**

**9 Assess the reasons why the USA became directly involved in the Korean War when the USSR did not.**

This question was a popular one and candidates had a good understanding of why the USA became directly involved in the Korean War. Candidates were less good in assessing the reasons. This meant analysing and prioritising them. The higher quality answers looked at both the USA and the USSR and were able to explain the motivations and actions of both. Candidates who did well on this question clearly had very good subject knowledge and understanding.

**10 'The SALT Treaties achieved nothing significant.' How far do you agree?**

The biggest failing here was where candidates had a lack of knowledge about the SALT Treaties and were therefore unable to engage with the question asked. Some judgements were really just assertions as there was no factual support. Better quality answers looked at 'nothing significant' and were prepared to debate this with evidence. There was still a tendency to present a case on each side of the argument but not to come to an overall conclusion that reached a clear verdict.

**11 'China under Deng Xiaoping was fundamentally different from China under Mao Zedong.' How far do you agree?**

This question was not very popular. Where it was attempted, candidates sometimes lacked subject knowledge to be able to compare China under each leader. The best answers distinguished between political and economic policy to identify similarities and differences. These answers were well crafted and had excellent factual knowledge and analysis. The vast majority of candidates chose to identify economic points of difference and political points of similarity.

**12 Compare and contrast the policies pursued by Presidents Nasser and Sadat regarding Egypt's relations with Israel.**

Candidates were generally better on Nasser than Sadat. This meant that the essays were somewhat unbalanced in their approach. Those who dealt with Sadat tended to view him as more successful than Nasser in his relations with Israel. This answer was not attempted very often, and several candidates lacked the depth of subject knowledge and also the requisite analysis to be able to reach a reasoned and well supported overall judgement.

**Depth Study 4: African History, 1945–91**

Too few responses were seen to be able to make a meaningful comment.

**Depth Study 5: Southeast Asian History, 1945–90s**

Too few responses were seen to be able to make a meaningful comment.