

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9697/01</p>

<p>Paper 1</p>

General comments

The general standard of the scripts was satisfactory and Examiners were impressed with the quality of some candidates who deserved very high marks. There were comparatively few extremely weak scripts from candidates who were completely unprepared for the examination but this report might help candidates who were disappointed by their results to understand why they might have done better. It also notes those features that characterised the best answers that might help Centres when advising future candidates.

The syllabus and the examination paper each comprise two sections and their questions demand different but complementary qualities. **Section A** includes one source-based question. Comments on candidates' performance and advice on how the question should have been tackled are given below. There was a choice of seven questions in **Section B**, from which candidates were required to answer three in essay form. As well as requiring the diverse knowledge that is appropriate for the different sections in the syllabus, essay questions have some similar characteristics. The most important quality that Examiners reward is relevance. Candidates need to answer the exact question that is asked and should not write generally about the section in the syllabus on which it is based. Higher marks were awarded when candidates selected from their knowledge those elements that could best be used to discuss the question. For example, **Question 2** was based on the section about the French Revolution and candidates needed to select what had been learned to discuss how far Napoleon Bonaparte ensured liberty and equality. Examiners cannot reward material that is not irrelevant, however well-informed it is. Having learned the material in a section, candidates might practise making plans to answer different questions that might be set on that section.

Secondly, Examiners look for the ability to combine arguments and knowledge. At this level, arguments are more important when awarding high marks. They show that problems and historical developments have been understood. But knowledge is important to avoid vagueness and prove arguments. For example, **Question 5** asked about the problems for Europeans in nineteenth-century imperialism. General points could be valid but needed to be supported by examples from European countries and overseas regions. Essay answers should be developed. The time available in the examination allows candidates to spend about 40-45 minutes on each answer in **Section B**. Some weak candidates wrote too briefly to frame coherent and developed answers. Their answers comprised a series of brief points which would have taken much less than 40-45 minutes to write. This advice does not mean that very long answers are automatically given high marks. Long answers can contain irrelevant material or repetition, but they do allow candidates to explain adequately the issues that they are discussing.

Most candidates found the time allowance sufficient; there were very few seriously incomplete scripts. A very small proportion answered fewer than four questions.

Essay answers are organised. They should begin with a brief introduction that indicates the most important points to be discussed and end with a short conclusion that summarises the argument. However, although all of the paragraphs should be relevant, it is unnecessary, indeed inadvisable, to repeat the question throughout the answer, for example in **Question 6**, 'Another reason why the First World War was so important was...Another reason why the First World War was so important was...Another reason why the First World War was so important was...'

The more successful candidates paid attention to the key words or phrases in question. For example, **Question 7** was as follows, with the key phrases underlined: 'The unpopularity of the Versailles settlement was the most important reason why Hitler gained power in 1933.' How far do you agree with this judgement?' Less successful candidates sometimes wrote generally about Hitler's rise but did not explain the importance of the Versailles settlement and did not explain the importance of reasons. The better candidates noted the key instructions in questions. **Questions 2** and **7** asked 'How far...?' The highly rewarded candidates examined the extent to which a claim was true, explained alternative explanations and came to a conclusion about which was more convincing. **Questions 3, 4** and **6** asked 'Why..?' Good

answers to such questions were analytical, explaining a series of reasons. Less creditable responses were limited to descriptions that lacked analysis.

Examiners were encouraged by the number of candidates who could demonstrate their skills and display their knowledge and understanding effectively, applying the points made above.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

Within the specified topic of The Origins of World War I, 1870-1914, the question was about the Sarajevo Crisis in 1914. Candidates were given five sources to consider when examining the hypothesis that 'Serbia was most to blame for the Sarajevo Crisis.' Most candidates dealt with the sources and the hypothesis satisfactorily and some answers were very commendable. Some weak candidates did not compare the extracts and even omitted to come to an overall judgement, merely pointing out different views.

Some agreed with the hypothesis, others disagreed. Candidates could interpret the sources using their content, their provenance (who wrote it?), their intention (why was it written?) and status (was it private writing or meant for publication?). This could be supplemented by candidates' own knowledge of the Sarajevo Crisis.

The most successful candidates grouped the sources, according to the extent to which they agreed or disagreed with the hypothesis. They made cross-references or comparisons. Good answers came to an overall judgement about the hypothesis. Weaker answers tended to deal sequentially with the extracts. (For example 'Source A agrees, Source B disagrees, Source C agrees, Source D disagrees, Source E agrees.') This made it more difficult for the reader to follow a cohesive argument.

Most of the answers were at least satisfactory and some candidates wrote very successfully. These went beyond basic paraphrases or summaries to comment on, and interpret, the extracts. They considered the sources in the context of the hypothesis about blame for the Sarajevo Crisis. Weaker candidates were sometimes confused about reliability and usefulness. Candidates can assume that all of the sources in any examination paper are useful - Examiners would never include sources that were irrelevant or not useful - although they might have different degrees of reliability.

Credit was given when candidates appreciated that Source A could be used to support or contradict the claim that Serbia was mostly responsible. It was reliable as the view of an extreme group that was immediately to blame for the assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand. However, candidates were given credit when they pointed out that the group was a minority and might not have represented the opinions of the majority of Serbs. This needed to be substantiated by cross-references with other sources. Source C claimed that all Serbians were very anti-Austrian whilst the Serbian diplomat in Source E denied this.

Source B contained two views, that of the German Ambassador to Austria and that of the Kaiser. Better candidates noted the difference in tone, the former urging Austria to avoid harsh measures whilst the latter would prefer Austria to act immediately and vigorously against Serbia. Although they differ, each view can be regarded as reliable of opinions in Germany. Some Germans wished to defuse the Crisis whilst others saw it as an opportunity to solve immediately the problems with Serbia of Austria, Germany's ally. Many of the comments on Source C were creditable and some candidates used their own knowledge to support claims of long-standing animosities between Austria and Serbia. There were some effective comparisons of Source C and other extracts.

Source D would point to Austria as the main culprit in the turmoil that followed the Sarajevo assassination and there was a broad agreement with Source E. Some candidates made useful contrasts between these extracts and Source C, which claimed that Serbians, including political groups and an official newspaper, were guilty of promoting anti-Austrian feeling. They compared their reliability by referring to their own knowledge of developments in the Balkans before 1914.

Section B**Question 2**

The key issue was the extent to which Napoleon Bonaparte ensured liberty and equality in his domestic government of France. Examiners were pleased with the general quality of the answers. Most of the candidates wrote relevantly. The few who went outside the terms of the question usually wrote too much about foreign policy without linking it to the key issue. Some candidates used the question as the basis of a comparison of Napoleon and previous rulers of France, for example arguing that he did more to promote liberty and equality than Louis XVI or that he did less than the radical leaders of the Revolution. This was an acceptable approach as long as the focus was on Napoleon. The most successful answers discussed the policies that might appear to have promoted liberty and equality and those that refuted the claim. They came to a clear conclusion about the balance of the argument. Many candidates were well informed about the provisions of Napoleon's Code and they also dealt with the Concordat. Some argued that the Code and the Concordat represented genuine attempts to safeguard liberty and equality whilst others argued that Napoleon's priority was to safeguard his own power and that concessions were mostly illusory. Both judgements were acceptable as long as they were supported by appropriate knowledge because historians themselves disagree. Some candidates needed to pay more attention to the structure of government under Napoleon. A few candidates deserved credit because they pointed out briefly that no European country in the early nineteenth century gave complete liberty and equality to its citizens and that Napoleon should be judged by the standards of his time. Some moderate candidates wrote acceptable descriptions of Napoleon's policies but considered the key issue itself very briefly, either in introductions or conclusions. This could not be given as high credit as the answers that focused throughout on the issues of liberty and equality.

Question 3

The key issue was the reasons why industrialisation had important political effects on Europe during the nineteenth century. The standard of the answers was variable because some candidates neglected to address the key issue and limited their answers to general accounts of the development of industrialisation. The more successful candidates concentrated on explaining and assessing the political impact and used examples from at least two of Britain, France and Germany to support their arguments. For example, they considered the links between industrialisation and the rising middle classes. These became more prosperous and were able to influence governments to adopt policies that favoured the bourgeoisie. In Britain, they gained the vote when the franchise was extended from 1832. Free trade policies became more favoured than protection, which was more of an advantage to agriculture and traditional industries. The urban working class became larger and there were arguments about the wisdom of giving the votes to its members but the franchise had become almost universal for men by the end of the nineteenth century. In France, the middle classes had a more difficult task to win political influence but, by the middle of the century, French governments were forced to recognise their importance. The political effects of the lower classes can be seen in successive revolutions in 1830 and 1848. Traditional groups such as the Junkers remained pre-eminent in Germany for most of the nineteenth century. However, Bismarck was forced to adopt social policies to avoid alienating the lower classes. Some candidates gained credit by examining the development and importance of new political ideas that reflected changes in industry, especially Socialism and Marxism. Less successful candidates recorded some of the main developments in the Industrial Revolution but were unsure about their impact.

Question 4

The key issue was a comparison of the success of Bismarck and the failure of the revolutionaries in 1848-49 in unifying Germany. The highest marks were awarded to answers that were reasonably balanced between the success of Bismarck and the failure of the earlier revolutionaries. Answers in the middle mark bands were sometimes convincing about Bismarck but lightweight when explaining the events of 1848-49 in Germany; their comparisons were therefore less effective. The least satisfactory answers usually described events during Bismarck's ministry to the unification of Germany but did not explain the reasons for his success and ignored earlier developments. Among relevant points that candidates considered were the political advantages that Bismarck enjoyed. He was supported (although not always enthusiastically) by William I whereas the earlier attitude of Frederick William IV was equivocal. Bismarck's authoritarian attitude and his willingness and ability to override objections in Prussia, for example from the Liberals, were a contrast to the divisions and uncertainties of 1848-49. He was able to use Prussia's strong economy and army (although some candidates mistakenly claimed that he himself developed the Zollverein and the Prussian army). The revolutionaries of 1848-49 had to deal with a comparatively strong Austria whereas Germany was able to outwit a declining Austria. As the minister of a universally-recognised monarchy,

Bismarck could use his considerable talent in diplomacy to win allies for Prussia and outwit its enemies whereas the earlier revolutionaries did not have that advantage.

Question 5

The key issue was the problems facing Europeans in imperial expansion during the later nineteenth century. There were two elements in the best answers. First, they focused on the key issue of problems and secondly they included appropriate examples of problems. The extent of imperial expansion was wide and Examiners did not expect comprehensive examples but points in the arguments needed factual support. Candidates varied in the examples that they provided and this was acceptable. Some concentrated on Africa, others on Asia or the Pacific region; all were equally valid. Less worthwhile answers sometimes related the course of imperialism but paid little attention to the ensuing problems. Others made claims but these were vague because they were not substantiated by examples. Among the relevant problems that were discussed were the international tensions that arose from imperial rivalries. Although the first major international war that was partly caused by imperialism did not break out until 1914, earlier years saw crises that threatened peace, for example at Fashoda and Morocco. Another problem was that governments sometimes could not control developments in remote regions and were involved unwillingly in tensions that their nationals, but not the governments themselves, had created. There were economic problems. Some colonies never produced a profit but represented a loss for their colonial powers. Public opinion could cause problems, sometimes pushing politicians such as Bismarck further than they would wish to go in promoting overseas expansion and sometimes being critical when there were failures overseas. The overall standard of the answers was satisfactory.

Question 6

The key issue was an analysis of the reasons for the importance of World War I in the downfall of the Romanov regime and the victory of the Bolsheviks. The question asked 'Why..?' and Examiners rewarded most highly the answers that provided a series of reasons, especially those that indicated which were the more important. Examiners were pleased to read some well-informed and relevant answers that were balanced between the impact of World War I on the Romanov regime and its contribution to the victory of the Bolsheviks. Moderate answers tended to be unbalanced, usually because they were heavily weighted towards the first part of the question, the fall of Nicholas II. Some candidates ended their answers with the February Revolution and assumed that the Bolsheviks then came to power. Their answers would have been improved if they had explained how and why continuing the war was an important factor in discrediting the Provisional Government and winning support for Lenin and the Bolsheviks. He was willing to take the bold step of supporting 'Peace', Russia's withdrawal from the war, as well as advocating the provision of 'Land' and 'Bread'. The failed campaigns of 1917 were a major reason for the downfall of Kerensky and the seizure of power by Lenin and his followers. Other factors, such as the Romanovs' inefficient administration, Nicholas II's personal inadequacies and the role of the soviets when the Provisional Government was in charge could then be put in context.

Question 7

The key issue was the reasons why Hitler came to power in Germany, with a particular assessment of the Treaty of Versailles. In order to reach a satisfactory mark, candidates needed to demonstrate a basic understanding of the Treaty of Versailles and explain why it was resented by most Germans. This could then be supplemented by other reasons why Hitler came to power. The most successful candidates explained why some reasons for his rise were more important than others. The quality of most answers was sound. They explained the most important elements of the Versailles settlement, for example the 'War Guilt' clause, reparations, the disarmament of the military, the cession of some territories and the prohibition of Anschluss with Austria. Some candidates deserved high marks because they complemented their understanding of Versailles with good knowledge of the circumstances of Hitler's accession to power. Less successful candidates were sometimes vague about Versailles. Alternatively, others explained Hitler's rise very generally. A few candidates went beyond the terms of the question to describe his policies after he had gained power. The end-point in the question was 1933. For example, concentration camps and an aggressive foreign policy followed his accession although Hitler adopted anti-Semitic policies and promised more vigorous foreign policies before he achieved power.

Question 8

The key issue was the comparison of the policies in governing Russia of Nicholas II and Stalin (to 1939). The standard of most answers was at least satisfactory and Examiners read some excellent comparisons of Nicholas II and Stalin. Examiners looked for answers that gave approximately equal attention to each. A few candidates wrote disappointing answers because they were knowledgeable about one but not about the other. Their essays lacked the comparative element that was important to the question. Some answers deserved high credit because they were wide-ranging. For example, they dealt with the men's leadership qualities, their aims, and the extent to which they used force. A few compared effectively their ideologies. It was relevant to discuss economic policies and some referred to their attitudes to religion. A few examined their foreign policies but this was not a major omission in answers that focused on domestic affairs.

HISTORY

<p>Paper 9697/03</p>

<p>Paper 3</p>

General comments

The number of candidates showed a slight increase on last year. Overall, the performance was satisfactory. The vast majority of candidates attempted and completed the four questions required for the examination. Very few candidates contravened the rubric and answered both **Questions 3** and **4**. The examination paper produced a wide range of responses. The most successful candidates attempted **Question 1** first.

Those candidates who produced a short plan before answering tended to order their answers in a more logical coherent way. Some candidates underachieved because they did not always back up some excellent analytical points with detailed supporting factual knowledge. The most popular questions were, in order, **Question 2**, **Question 5** and **Question 3**. The least popular questions were **Questions 7** and **8**.

Comments on specific questions

Section A

Question 1

This question required candidates to study five sources on the respective roles of the General Assembly and the Security Council. Most candidates were able to note that Source A made direct references to the role of the General Assembly. These were made in paragraphs 1 and 2. In paragraph 2 it stated that the power of the General Assembly depended, at least in part, on the 'wisdom and judgement' of these decisions. However, in paragraph 3 it does state that, under the UN Charter, it was the Security Council which was given the main responsibility for maintaining peace. Several candidates referred to the provenance of the source. Many stated that as it was produced by the President of the UN General Assembly, that person might highlight the value of the General Assembly. Secondly, the source was written in March, 1946 which limited the source's value as evidence of the respective roles from 1946 onwards.

In assessing Source B, candidates noted that this source highlighted the importance of the role of the Security Council in maintaining international peace. However, it did state that the power of the Security Council was partly dependent on its use of the veto. Again, like Source A, many candidates referred to the provenance of the Source. The author being from a country which was not a permanent member of the Security Council and the fact it was written in 1946, limited its utility as a source.

In Source C candidates stated that the General Assembly did possess an important role in maintaining international peace. The source set out clearly how and when the General Assembly could use its powers. As it was a General Assembly Resolution of 1950 it possessed utility. Some candidates also used contextual information about the outbreak and early months of the Korean War to explain their answers.

In assessing Source D candidates mentioned that the General Assembly's role in maintaining international peace was linked directly with problems in the Security Council and the use, by that body, of its veto. It stated that the Uniting for Peace Resolution was used several times in the 1950s but makes no reference to the use of the Resolution after that date even though the source was written in 2003. Also, many candidates referred to the provenance of the source and stated that to gauge its usefulness it required cross-referencing with other source evidence.

Finally, in assessing Source E many candidates stated that this source criticised the Security Council's use of the veto and claimed that the Uniting for Peace Resolution gave the General Assembly power if it wished to use it. Also, like source D, many candidates referred to the provenance of the source as a way of assessing the relative value of the evidence compared to other sources.

