

GCSE

History B (Modern World)

General Certificate of Secondary Education **J418**

OCR Report to Centres June 2015

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this report.

© OCR 2015

CONTENTS

General Certificate of Secondary Education

History B (Modern World) (J418)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
A010 Controlled Assessment: Historical Enquiry	4
A011 Aspects of international relations and Germany, 1918–1945	7
A012 Aspects of international relations and Russia, 1905-1941	12
A013 Aspects of international relations and The USA, 1919–1941	17
A014 Aspects of international relations and Mao's China c.1930–1976	22
A015 Aspects of international relations and causes and events of the First World War, 1890–1918	26
A016 Aspects of international relations and End of Empire c.1919–1969	31
A017 Aspects of international relations and The USA, Land of freedom? 1945–1975	37
A021 How was British society changed, 1890–1918?	41
A022 How far did British society change, 1939–1975?	43

A010 Controlled Assessment: Historical Enquiry

General Comments:

Nearly all centres successfully adapted to the new requirements for controlled assessment. This was helped by the fact that the changes did not involve a change in approach or in standards. Although the questions were set by OCR instead of by centres, they were similar in type to those used by centres over the last few years, and although centres had to award candidates a mark for each assessment objective separately, the skills and understandings to be assessed did not change. Finally, several moderators commented that the strict adherence to the word limit actually helped candidates focus on producing concise and relevant responses. Few candidates exceeded the word limit and there were fewer long and irrelevant descriptive passages. If a candidate's answer does exceed 2000 words, the rest of the answer should not be assessed.

The overall standard of work was impressive with many candidates demonstrating the ability to support their arguments with analysis and critical use of sources and interpretations. Many answers showed signs of benefiting from careful planning and re-drafting and were concise, focused, well informed and relevant to the question. Moderators are looking for candidates to develop, and support, their own points of view rather than produce bland surveys and summaries often based on passages in text books.

Many centres assessed the work with care and attention. Both the detailed marginal notes and the summative comments were enormously helpful to moderators especially when they directly related to the assessment criteria and to phrases in the band descriptors. Now that marks have to be awarded separately for each assessment objective, it is important to remember that candidates should not adopt a 'tick box' approach. They are not being required simply to show that they can evaluate sources or explain interrelationships. They need to use these abilities as tools to answer the question. Little credit should be given for e.g. evaluation of sources, when it is not used to improve the answer to the question. Although attainment in each assessment objective is awarded separately, candidates should try and integrate the various skills and understandings seamlessly into a response to the question.

Although much of the marking had been carried out carefully, with clear evidence of internal moderation having taken place, there was still a need to adjust marks at the top of the range. As the statements in the Band 5 descriptors make clear, this band is for exceptional work demonstrating a sophisticated understanding, and complex explanation and assessment making effective use of comparisons, interrelationships, the broad context and critical use of sources and interpretations. Moderators found there were fewer adjustments to be made in Bands 3 and 4, and in Bands 1 and 2 marks were sometimes increased.

The best answers were often a product of candidates thinking and planning carefully so that when they came to write their answers they knew exactly what they wanted to say and argue. As has been mentioned above, it is important that candidates develop a point of view and arguments of their own. Those candidates who knew what their answers were going to be were able to respond to the question in their opening paragraphs rather than using these for background surveys which often gained very few marks. For example, when asked how far Tsar Nicholas was responsible for his own downfall, these candidates were able to start with their point of view about the extent of his culpability. They then spent the rest of their answers trying to convince the reader of their views through the use of argument and analysis.

Weaker answers tended to produce descriptions, narratives and even explanations, but failed to confront the question head on until they reached their conclusions which were often lacking substance, development and argument. In other words, the question needs to be answered in every paragraph and not just in the conclusion. Every paragraph should contain supported

argument that is directly responding to some aspect of the question. This means that every paragraph will include evaluation and assessment of e.g. Stresemann or Trotsky or Al Capone, rather than description.

Of course, arguments need to be supported. The best answers did this by using their knowledge and understanding in a relevant and focused way. Indeed, the only reason to bring factual examples into an answer is because it can be used to support an argument. Arguments can be made stronger by making comparisons over time and across periods and situations, by considering how factors were related and the significance of these relationships, and by using criteria to make assessments about significance.

The best answers also made effective use of sources and interpretations to support arguments. Candidates should be reminded that there is no point in 'bolted-on' use and evaluation of sources and interpretations. These should only be used when they add to the strength of the argument being made. They should also be reminded that the usefulness of sources is more important to consider and explain than the reliability of sources. The best candidates used the provenance of sources to help explain why they were so useful and powerful in supporting arguments they were making. Weaker candidates either completely ignored the provenance of sources (often referring to them as e.g. Source 1' or 'Source A', or used them to explain how the source is totally biased and unreliable.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Option A Germany 1918-1945

Question 2 about the impact of Nazi economic policies on the lives of the German people was popular. Most candidates were able to describe the impact, both good and bad, but far fewer assessed the impact throughout their answers. The most successful answers considered how far the impact changed over time and compared the impact on different groups. In response to the question about the importance of Stresemann, the best answers used a range of criteria to assess the impact of what he did. Less good answers described what he did and left any assessment to brief conclusions at the end. Many of the best answers to the question about opposition to the Nazis described a wide range of different types of opposition and compared their effectiveness.

Option B Russia and the USSR 1905-1941

This was the most popular option and there were many good answers assessing how far Tsar Nicholas was responsible for his own downfall and analysing long-term factors and triggers. A common weakness in other answers was to run through factors such as Bloody Sunday and the defeat by Japan without connecting them to his downfall. There were few, but some very good, answers about Trotsky. Many were successful in looking at changes in his importance over time. Many answers to the question about how far Russian people were better off under communist rule tended to describe life under the Tsar and then under the communists without close comparison.

Option C The USA 1919-1941

The question about the 'Roaring Twenties' was popular. Many candidates considered the fortunes of different groups but there could have been more comparisons of their experiences. More could also have been explained about geographical differences and about changes over time. Not many candidates attempted the question about Al Capone but many of those that did made good use of criteria to produce interesting evaluations of his importance. In response to the question about the New Deal candidates were able to explain why different groups and individuals opposed it, but only a few compared their motives and reasons.

The USA 1945-1975: Land of Freedom?

This was the second most popular option and there were many excellent answers including some excellent evaluations of the importance of the events at Little Rock High School and some very good comparisons of the contributions of different American presidents to the development of civil rights. There was a lot to cover in responding to this question but many candidates dealt with the challenge admirably. Few answered the question about the struggle for equality for women.

A011 Aspects of international relations and Germany, 1918–1945

General Comments:

Candidates performed well in Section A, Q1(a) and Q1(b) by utilising effective contextual knowledge to support interpretations of the Source, and at least one explanation for Q1(b). Candidates also performed well on Q2(a) and Q3(a). Relevant points were identified, or developed to enable many candidates to achieve full marks. Candidates performed less well on Q2(b) as explanations were limited by a lack of relevant contextual knowledge. Q3(b) proved more successful, the question was assessed as reasons for why the USA became more involved in the Vietnam War and did not require explanations specific links to policies of the US presidents. Many candidates completed Q2(c) to a high level, explaining a two-sided argument. In contrast, fewer candidates created a clear two-sided explanation for Q3(c). Here the explanations were often implicit, and there was less of a direct focus on the demands of the question.

Candidates did not have enough contextual knowledge to effectively address the demands of the Source in Section B. Q4(b) responses lacked contextual knowledge, where explanations were created these were weak due to a lack of contextual knowledge.

Many of the candidates achieved marks for Q5(a). Fewer candidates had the required knowledge to access Q5(b) and Q5(c), consequently attempts at explanation did not deploy relevant knowledge with precision. For Q6(a) candidates identified a number of relevant points. Candidates did find it difficult to deploy the relevant knowledge to support explanations for Q6(b) and Q6(c).

Candidates answered Q7(a) with relevant supporting knowledge. It was common for candidates to write about the message of the source and not the purpose. Many candidates gave a valid use for Source B. A number of candidates explained why the source is not useful and therefore missed the demands of the question. Specific knowledge on the events in the Source was expressed in a limited way. For 7(c) many candidates described the Source without explanation. Where explanation did occur it was commonly without relevant contextual knowledge.

Many candidates met the demands of Q8(a). Candidates did struggle with the demands of Q8(b) sometimes confusing the event with other putsches from the era. Q8(c) was largely descriptive. Candidates wrote what happened. Many candidates did not make explicit links between what happened and how it signified recovery. Q9(a) proved difficult for candidates to fully meet the demands, making the connection between two events. Q9(b) produced many narrative responses. Many candidates were able to produce at least one explanation for Q9(c) to justify one side of the argument.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Section A – The Cold War, 1945-1975

Question No.

Q1(a) Many candidates answered the question to produce a level 4 response or higher. Kennedy was correctly identified as being embarrassed by the Bay of Pigs fiasco with reference to the Source. Candidates then supported this viewpoint with relevant contextual knowledge on the Bay of Pigs. Sub messages were less common. When candidates expressed sub messages clearly they spoke of the damage Cuba was doing to America and/or Kennedy. Good responses directly stated the view of the cartoonist as a direct, personal attack on Kennedy's failure, with reference to the Source and surrounding context.

Q1(b) Many candidates expressed adequate contextual knowledge surrounding the crisis. There were a number of points identified. Candidates sometimes expressed narrative responses, thereby requiring more emphasis on explanation of a peaceful resolution to qualify as a good response. Good responses would highlight the role of both Kennedy and Khrushchev in the negotiation process, constructing two explanations from the actions taken. Many candidates also stated the fear of nuclear war as a reason for peaceful resolution; this point was not always developed with sophisticated terms such as MAD, deterrent, etc.

Q2(a) Many candidates described events prior to the blockade, these were not rewarded. The same candidates usually described what happened during the blockade of 1948-9. Many candidates achieved a number of marks, the airlift and blocking of supply routes being the most common points of identification.

Q2(b) Many candidates identified the reasons for the disagreements. Most common were the changing leaders, the question of reparations, free elections in Eastern Europe and the US possession of the A bomb. A significant number of candidates explained how these points caused disagreements. Contextual knowledge was not always developed well enough to construct multi-causal responses that demonstrated a thorough understanding of the past, a common error being the use of incorrect leaders, i.e. Khrushchev, or Kennedy, etc.

Q2(c) Most candidates crafted explanations linked to containment. Therefore, candidates skilfully explained how containment was not a means of control, but a means of preventing further soviet control (and therefore maintaining freedoms). Some candidates went on to explain this explicitly, and good responses contrasted the Marshall Plan with the salami tactics used by Stalin to address the question. Many candidates constructed two-sided responses and used relevant contextual knowledge from the period. Good candidates discussed 'dollar imperialism' to justify the economic control implications of the Marshall Plan. Candidates did not explicitly refer to the economic, socio-cultural and political dimensions of the plan explicitly in analysis of the question.

Q3(a) Candidates highlighted the key ways in which the USA fought in the Vietnam War. Most candidates discussed bombing, chemical weapons or search and destroy. Many candidates also went on to develop their point with relevant supporting detail. Candidates who did not perform well highlighted ways in which the opposition fought, or went on to explain causes for US involvement.

Q3(b) The question was assessed as reasons for increased involvement in the Vietnam War. The candidate did not need to specifically relate actions to individual presidents. Many candidates chose to provide long-term reasons for the involvement in the Vietnam War, containment and/or the Domino Theory. When stated, these reasons were explained, in some cases using enough contextual knowledge to demonstrate a thorough understanding of the past. Where candidates related events to specific leaders, candidates spoke of Kennedy, and the need for more advisers, or Johnson and the escalation following the Gulf of Tonkin incident. The contextual knowledge to support these responses was weaker, and sometimes inaccurate. Many candidates did provide multi-causal responses to this question.

Q3(c) Most candidates identified the role of the media, and other factors as reasons for the withdrawal from Vietnam. Crucially, good responses made explicit reference to how events generated by the media, or other factors, specifically caused withdrawal. These candidates made the link between the media images, the protest movement and the mounting pressure on US presidents to bring the boys home. Many candidates did not meet the demands of the question. By identifying reasons for withdrawal, they lacked explicit explanations to state how these factors actually caused the withdrawal of US troops to come about.

Section B – A New World? 1948-2005

Question No.

Q4(a) Candidates did not have the relevant knowledge to interpret the cartoon in context. Therefore, candidates commonly took the Source at face value. If the main message was highlighted, candidates did not support with contextual knowledge. Examiners were not looking for extensive contextual knowledge, but needed knowledge of events in Ireland prior to the mainland terror campaign, events that could contextualise the Source and support a valid interpretation of the main message. Such events, e.g. internment were not stated.

Q4(b) Candidates could identify reasons for the failure of terrorism in achieving its aims. Most candidates used Al Qaeda as the example of the terrorist organisation. Candidates did not have the contextual knowledge to accurately support points made hence explanations were not substantiated, demonstrating some knowledge at best and weak explanation if at all.

Q5(a) Many candidates identified key points from the building of the wall and accurately stated its impact on Berliners.

Q5(b) Many candidates did not have the contextual knowledge to access this question; consequently points were limited with no identification of a specific reason for the failure of the Polish government to deal with Solidarity. Good candidates had a clear awareness of Lech Walesa, and the specific reasons for the popularity of the movement. These points were used to explain the failure of the Polish government in dealing with this movement.

Q5(c) Candidates commonly lacked the relevant contextual knowledge to make comparisons between the uprisings that constituted explanations of similarities and differences. Candidates did not achieve full marks because basic points of comparison were identified, e.g. the risings were crushed by Soviet forces, and then did little else to further develop the point. Good candidates had a clear grasp of events, and contrasted the fortunes of Nagy and Dubcek, and the causes for the revolts. Good candidates also explained similarities between the causes. This was not a common type of response for this question.

Q6(a) Most candidates accurately identified a range of points to describe the way Saddam Hussein ruled Iraq. Most candidates stated as a dictator, through fear and other repressive measures.

Q6(b) Good candidates explained two or more points as reasons for why opposition existed to the invasion of Iraq. Many candidates stated the illegality of the invasion, UN opposition, and the fact that WMDs did not exist. Good candidates explained these points with sufficient contextual knowledge to make them distinct and portray a thorough awareness of events. Some candidates did not achieve full marks here because the contextual knowledge was not precise enough to produce a single-causal, or multi-causal explanation.

Q6(c) Candidates did not achieve full marks for Q6(c) because they did not demonstrate sufficient contextual knowledge to go beyond an identification of points to suggest a range of consequences, both relating to international and domestic consequences. Most candidates could not explain one, or two sides of the argument due to insufficient knowledge.

Part 2: Depth Study
Germany 1918-1945

Question No.

Q7(a) Many candidates identified the message of the source. Many candidates used relevant contextual knowledge to support the interpretation of the message. Many candidates spoke of an 'ideal' or 'perfect' family, 'Aryan' was also used. Many candidates went further to discuss the traditional values of the Nazi Party shown in the picture, and developed these statements with reference to the three Ks, the Motherhood Cross, or marriage loans. Good responses made a clear distinction between what the picture shows and what the picture was published for. Good responses therefore directly addressed the question by highlighting the purpose of the source.

Q7(b) Good candidates explain why the source was useful, developed with precise contextual knowledge on Kristallnacht. These responses then made, and developed wider inferences from the source, for example, stating it is useful as it shows the totalitarian nature of the Nazi regime. These responses also demonstrated further contextual knowledge of the period. Most candidates explained a valid reason for why the source was useful. Responses that did not achieve full marks did not demonstrate contextual knowledge about Kristallnacht beyond the contents of the Source.

Q7(c) Many candidates described the source as reason for opposition to the regime with limited contextual knowledge. Candidates also failed to achieve full marks by outlining a basic response for why they agree with the statement, again lacking in precise contextual knowledge to support i.e. what was actually done to limit opposition, with reference to precise terms. Good candidates explained why they agree, and disagree with the source. These candidates explained agreement with reference to the Gestapo and the concentration camps, but also the incentives and role of propaganda. Good responses also agreed with the statement, and deployed contextual knowledge to support the existence of opposition, citing a range of opposition groups and their activities, and also groups not prompted by the source, e.g. the Church, the army, etc. Candidates did not evaluate the source in their interpretation of the question.

Q8(a) Most candidates met the demands of the question well. Candidates identified the Spartacists, some of the events from 1919, often including the role of the Freikorps and the final outcome for Liebknecht and Luxemburg.

Q8(b) Most candidates produced a narrative response, identification of a cause was demonstrated but then followed by what happened, rather than how the point identified caused the Kapp Putsch. Responses that did not meet the demands of the question confused the Kapp Putsch with the Munich Putsch.

Q8(c) Most candidates accurately identified the events of the early years, the destabilising effect of the Treaty of Versailles, the loss of World War One, the seizure of the Ruhr, hyperinflation, etc. Many candidates spoke about the recovery of the Stresemann Years. Good candidates linked the events of these years to the problems of the early years thereby explaining the extent of recovery. Candidates did not achieve full marks if there was a narrative of the Golden Years with no link to the early years. Good candidates also explained the extent to which the Weimar had not recovered, for example, due to the rise of extremism in the early 1930s, and the fragility of proportional representation. Candidates would also highlight the fact that recovery was built on borrowed money.

Q9(a) Most candidates met some demands of the question. Candidates sometimes gave answers that did not precisely identify the connection between the Great Depression and the Nazis political campaigns. Good candidates explicitly linked the events of the Depression to precise Nazi slogans and campaign promises.

Q9(b) Most candidates identified a reason for why Hitler became Chancellor. Good responses went on to explain how this reason helped Hitler to become Chancellor. Candidates did not achieve full marks where there was a narrative of events in the build up to Hitler's appointment, when not developed into a clear identification and explanation for why this made Hitler Chancellor. Some responses did not achieve any credit because they addressed events post January 1933, e.g. the Reichstag fire, and the Enabling Act. These events are not relevant to the time frame stated in the question.

Q9(c) Most candidates identified a reason for success and a reason for failure. Good candidates explained how events made the Munich Putsch both a disaster and a success. The best responses made a judgement on how far events were a success, with a consideration of long and short term implications. Responses did not achieve full marks if the candidate stated the events that were a disaster and those that were successful, without an explanation for how these events helped, or hindered the Nazis in the present climate, or the future.

A012 Aspects of international relations and Russia, 1905-1941

General Comments:

The overall standard of this summer was comparable to previous years, with some very good candidates scoring highly at the top end. There was a greater emphasis on knowledge in this summer's paper, and that did catch out some candidates, who were too descriptive in their style. The majority of candidates selected the Cold War section, and demonstrated good knowledge of the intricacies of the period. Understanding of the structure of 4, 6, 10 questions was generally excellent, which helped to focus the candidates' responses, and enabled them to achieve the higher levels of the mark scheme. Spelling, punctuation and grammar were of a high standard.

With regards the Russia section, candidates again displayed strong factual knowledge of the period and good technique suggesting excellent teaching. There was some difficulty in respect of the new style of questions in the source section, and particular note to the advice below would help in future. The majority of candidates came to the Russian component well prepared, with well crafted, methodical answers. Both questions eight and nine were equally popular.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Cold War

Question 1

- a) Candidates needed to identify the **cartoonist viewpoint**. This is still not being done on a widespread scale, despite this being the question format for a number of exam series. In this respect consider that a cartoonist will most probably be **criticising** someone/something, or **supporting** someone/something. For this source the cartoonist was criticising Kennedy in respect of the Bay of Pigs. This was emphasised in the report last year, and yet many candidates still fail to note this important element.

Contextual knowledge needed to be specific to the Bay of Pigs, and could not discuss later events such as the Cuban Missile Crisis. Long descriptions of the source were unnecessary, for there is more credit given to contextual knowledge in this exam. For this reason, just asserting the message or cartoonist's view will not push the answer beyond Level 2.

- b) Though there were some very good answers to this question, which were able to discuss a number of different reasons as to why the Cuban Missile Crisis ended peacefully, a lot of answers were very descriptive. In this respect the answers tended to describe what happened during the Cuban Missile Crisis, rather than clearly explaining why this created a peaceful solution to the Crisis. Areas that could have been discussed included fear of Mutually Assured Destruction, Kennedy's rejection of aggressive advice and the agreement over the missiles between Kennedy and Khrushchev. The candidates tended to reach an explanation in respect of the agreement over missiles, but were not very clear on other areas.

Question 2

- a) Many candidates displayed a detailed knowledge of the Berlin Blockade. The answer was specifically 'during' the Berlin Blockade, so a number of candidates wasted time discussing why Stalin wanted to carry out the blockade. A limited number of candidates were confused with the building of the Berlin Wall.

- b) This question was approached with varying degrees of success. On the whole candidates were able to explain at least one factor to reach at least L2. Some candidates were confused over the nuclear bomb testing carried out by the USA, believing that the Americans scared the Russians by using the atomic bomb on Japan – this had not happened by the Potsdam conference. A number of candidates confused the Yalta and Potsdam conferences, and so candidates must be reminded to read the question carefully.
- c) There were some detailed answers that demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the Marshall Plan and the American impact on Europe after the Second World War. The best answers looked at the Marshall Plan, and were clear as to how this could be seen to control Europe – gaining dependency on the US currency ('Dollar Imperialism'), or preventing the spread of Communism to maintain Capitalist nations. This needed to be set against other factors, such as the fact that it was designed after Marshall had visited Europe and seen the devastation and thus there were altruistic reasons for helping out people in Europe. One of the key issues was that candidates focussed on the prevention of Communism, and tried to twist this onto both sides of the argument, which was rarely successful. As such, many found it difficult to get past L2. It is worth noting that greater depth is required here, with specific evidence rather than descriptive points. To reach the very top level, a clinching argument is required to push the conclusion forward – many merely repeat the arguments of the essay.

Question 3

- a) Many candidates displayed a detailed knowledge of the fighting methods of the Americans in the Vietnam War. However, some were side-tracked by describing the methods of the Vietcong, which was not the question.
- b) On the whole this was answered well. Most were able to explain Domino Theory and the Gulf of Tonkin incident. It is important to note that with a greater emphasis on knowledge, more depth would have helped – particularly in linking Domino Theory to specific nations, such as Laos and Cambodia. Some candidates also discussed the military-industrial complex, and the failure of the French in Vietnam, which were both acceptable factors and helped to boost candidates to the top of Level 3.
- c) There were some detailed answers that demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the impact of the media and other factors such as the difficulty presented by Vietcong tactics on the withdrawal of US troops from the Vietnam War. However, there was a problem of a number of candidates in not focussing on the withdrawal of troops, and instead explaining why the USA failed in the war. These are different questions, and without specific relation of answers to withdrawal this led a number of answers to remain in L2. In this respect the impact of media had to relate not just to the awareness of the American public to what was happening in Vietnam, but a change in them pressurising the American government to pull out of the Vietnam War. Many did this by relating the media to increasing protests against the War. On the other side, it was not merely enough to describe failures in Vietnam, but to link to the realisation that this created a realisation that the war was unwinnable, and thus the American's decided to pull out their troops. Specific knowledge was generally better on this question, especially in regards to protests, the My Lai massacre and the Tet offensive. To reach the very top level, a clinching argument is required to push the conclusion forward – many merely repeat the arguments of the essay.

New World

Question 4

- a) Candidates needed to identify the cartoonist's viewpoint which was one of criticism of the IRA's campaign of violence but very few were able to achieve this. The contextual knowledge required related to the IRA's activities up to 1971, the date of the cartoon, and not to events after that date. Therefore, candidates using details about the IRA's campaign in mainland Britain, which started in 1974, were not credited. Many candidates used the surface details of the cartoon to try to explain a message but were unsuccessful, as this question requires relevant knowledge to reach beyond Level 2.
- b) Some candidates were able to provide several explanations of why terrorism has often failed, including factors such as divided leadership and a need to compromise, but many showed a lack of detailed knowledge about the aims and activities of the specified terrorist organisations, namely the IRA, PLO and Al Qaeda. It should be noted that Level 1 requires valid reasons to be identified and Level 2 requires a mono-causal explanation. This is a change from previous exam series.

Question 5

- a) Most candidates were able to provide some relevant knowledge about the building of the Berlin Wall and its impact.
- b) Some candidates were able to explain a number of relevant reasons why the Polish government had problems dealing with Solidarity, such as the level of support for the movement and its good organisation and leadership. However, for weaker candidates, detailed knowledge about Solidarity and the ways in which the Polish government responded to it was lacking and such answers achieved Level 1 marks at best.
- c) There were some good answers that demonstrated detailed knowledge and understanding of the ways in which the Hungarian Uprising and the Prague Spring were both similar and different and these candidates were rewarded with marks at Level 4 or Level 5. However, there were still examples of candidates explaining just one side of the debate, which can only achieve Level 3 marks at best, and of candidates lacking detailed knowledge about both events.

Question 6

- a) There were some good answers which provided several valid factors about the way Saddam Hussein ruled Iraq but there were also many that showed little or no specific knowledge about his actions.
- b) Responses to this question varied greatly. The best answers displayed detailed knowledge and understanding of the global response to the invasion of Iraq, including arguments relating to the failure to find weapons of mass destruction and the lack of a second UN resolution. Weaker answers were general in nature, lacking specific, detailed knowledge why opposition was aroused.
- c) This question required an answer which explained both the internal and international consequences of the Iraq War. The best candidates were able to provide accurate and detailed evidence in support of each side of the debate, such as the negative perception of the USA and Britain in the international arena and the breakdown of law and order inside Iraq. These candidates were rewarded with marks in level 4 or level 5. It is worth pointing out that negative and positive consequences were credited. However, weaker candidates provided general answers, lacking specific knowledge about the consequences of the war and achieving, usually, no more than a mark in Level 1.

Part 2: Depth Study: Russia.

Question 7

Q7 (a) The majority of candidates were able to explain why the poster was published, that the artist wanted to encourage the peasants to join collective farms. Contextual knowledge should have focussed what collectivisation was and why it was needed. To this end, greater depth of 1929 and the failure of the NEP would have created stronger answers.

It is useful to impose on candidates that a purpose question must be attempting to persuade the viewer to think or act in a specific way.

On the whole the majority of candidates achieved at least L4/6.

Q7 (b) This question caused some confusion amongst candidates, who are used to explaining why a source is both useful and not useful. In reality all sources are useful, and it is important to add this to teaching in case another question like this comes up again. Many candidates took the information at face value, and explained that it was useful evidence of what was happening in the USSR at the time. This is simplistic. Better candidates focussed on the use of the source to highlight the manipulative nature of Stalin's rule.,

The key issue was that many who did notice this suggested that this made the source **not useful**, which was incorrect, and thus not given the mark.

Q7 (c) On the whole, the majority of candidates were able to explain why Stalin's policies were both successful and not successful, and had decent knowledge to back up both sides. However, this is a source question, and thus a discussion of the source was imperative to move to top level answers. Very few discussed the provenance of the source, and used this to make a solid conclusion to the question. In this respect, the author was a Communist sympathiser, who had worked in Magnitogorsk, and would thus have had personal experience of what the situation had been like.

Question 8

Q8 (a) Most candidates struggled to achieve full marks on this question, with a number unable to remember specific points of the October Manifesto. Good candidates pointed to such things as the Duma, civil liberties, freedom of speech and the removal of censorship to achieve high marks. It is worth noting that monetary aid was not promised in the October manifesto – it was offered later.

Q8 (b) There were a number of good answers to this question, with candidates clearly understanding the period to explain the impact the Tsar taking control of the army. Most pointed to the personal blame for failures in the war and the impact of the Tsarina and Rasputin taking control in Petrograd. Less successful answers were descriptive in style, merely describing what happened rather than explaining the impact of the Tsar taking control. A few candidates misinterpreted this question and wrote about why it was important for the Tsar to take control of the army in 1915.

Rather than focussing on the factors, some of the best answers explained the impact on the different groups, suggesting how this led to the loss of support of the army, the rich, and the poor.

Q8 (c) Candidates were able to show a two-sided argument for this question, with solid understanding of successes and failures of the Tsar in this period. There were a huge amount of different factors that candidates could have discussed, though a number remained fixed in 1905, which limited the mark on offer. With a greater focus on knowledge this year it would be worth having more specific examples learned from this period.

Successfully, candidates could have discussed the crushing of the 1905 Revolution, the October Manifesto, Stolypin's reforms, foreign investment and agricultural and industrial improvement.

Negatively, the Fundamental Laws, strikes, the influence of Rasputin, poor conditions, the harsh tactics used against protestors and Stolypin's necktie were amongst a number of factors.

Question 9

Q9 (a) This question posed few problems, with most candidates able to achieve high marks.

Q9(b) This was a well-answered question, with most candidates able to achieve at least L3/4, by explaining that Stalin tricked Trotsky into not going to Lenin's funeral and the impact of that. At times more depth in explanation would have helped, but many candidates achieved high marks in this question. Candidates need to be careful in their confusion of the need to win votes – this was not an election process, but a power struggle within the Communist Party.

Q9 (c) The majority of candidates were able to reach a two-sided argument for this question, though many struggled to create enough depth in their answers to reach top marks. The candidates needed to explain how the Purges benefitted the Soviet Union and how they did not, though many lacked specific knowledge to create detailed explanation. In this way, many answers were quite descriptive in style, which impacted on the mark awarded.

On the benefit side, candidates could have discussed the creation of a free work-force, which boosted industrial output and enabled the Soviets to fight off the Germans in WWII; the enforcement of collectivisation that boosted agriculture; and the removal of opposition which consolidated Stalin's position and enabled him to push through reform.

On the negative side, the creation of fear with 20 million sent to Gulag's, Russification, dekulakisation, and the loss of army officers were detrimental to the Soviet Union.

A013 Aspects of international relations and The USA, 1919–1941

General Comments:

Candidates performed well in Section A, Q1(a) and Q1(b) by utilising effective contextual knowledge to support interpretations of the Source, and at least one explanation for Q1(b).

Candidates also performed well on Q2(a) and Q3(a). Relevant points were identified, or developed to enable many candidates to achieve full marks. Candidates performed less well on Q2(b) as explanations were limited by a lack of relevant contextual knowledge, Q3(b) proved more successful, the question was assessed as reasons for why the USA became more involved in the Vietnam War and did not require explanations with specific links to policies of the US presidents. Many candidates completed Q2(c) to a high level, explaining a two-sided argument. In contrast, fewer candidates created a clear two-sided explanation for Q3(c). Here the explanations were often implicit, and there was less of a direct focus on the demands of the question.

Candidates did not have enough contextual knowledge to effectively address the demands of the Source in Section B. Q4(b) responses lacked contextual knowledge, where explanations were created these were weak due to a lack of contextual knowledge.

Many of the candidates achieved marks for Q5(a). Few candidates had the required knowledge to access Q5(b) and Q5(c), consequently attempts at explanation did not deploy relevant knowledge with precision. For Q6(a) candidates identified a number of relevant points. Candidates did find it difficult to deploy the relevant knowledge to support explanations for Q6(b) and Q6(c).

Candidates answered Q7(a) with relevant supporting knowledge. It was common for candidates to write about the message of the source and not the purpose. Many candidates were able to validly interpret Source B. A number of candidates did not go on to look at factors outside of the Source, however, and therefore missed the higher demands of the question. Specific knowledge on the events in the Source was often expressed in a limited way. For 7(c) many candidates validly interpreted the Source, but without relevant contextual knowledge.

Many candidates met the demands of Q8(a). Candidates broadly understood the demands of Q8(b) but sometimes without references to particular industries. Q8(c) was largely descriptive. Candidates frequently described a range of factors without explaining why they led to the boom. Q9(a) proved accessible for candidates. Q9(b) produced many narrative responses of the Ku Klux Klan. Many candidates described valid reasons for the failure of prohibition in Q9(c) but fewer were able to explain why these reasons led to failure.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Section A – The Cold War, 1945-1975

Question No.

Q1(a) Many candidates answered the question to produce a level 4 response or higher. The critical nature of the source was correctly identified focusing on the embarrassment of Kennedy at the Bay of Pigs fiasco with reference to the Source. Candidates then supported this viewpoint with relevant contextual knowledge on the Bay of Pigs. Sub messages were less common. When candidates expressed sub messages clearly they spoke of the damage Cuba was doing to America and/or Kennedy. Good responses directly stated the view of the cartoonist as a direct, personal attack on Kennedy's failure, with reference to the Source and surrounding context. Some candidates misinterpreted the Source as being pertinent to the Cuban Missile Crisis, and these responses were rarely credited above Level 1.

Q1(b) Many candidates expressed adequate contextual knowledge surrounding the crisis. There were a number of points identified. Candidates sometimes expressed narrative responses, thereby requiring more emphasis on explanation of a peaceful resolution to qualify as a good response. Good responses would highlight the role of both Kennedy and Khrushchev in the negotiation process, constructing two explanations from the actions taken. Many candidates also stated the fear of nuclear war as a reason for peaceful resolution; this point was not always developed with sophisticated terms such as MAD, deterrent, etc.

Q2(a) Many candidates described events prior to the Blockade, these were not rewarded. The same candidates usually then described what happened during the Blockade of 1948-9. Many candidates achieved full marks, the airlift and blocking of supply routes being the most common points of identification.

Q2(b) Many candidates identified the reasons for the disagreements. Most common were the changing leaders, the question of reparations, free elections in Eastern Europe and the US possession of the A bomb. A significant number of candidates explained how these points caused disagreements. Contextual knowledge was not always developed well enough to construct multi-causal responses that demonstrated a thorough understanding of the past, a common error being the use of incorrect leaders, i.e. Khrushchev, or Kennedy, etc.

Q2(c) Many candidates crafted explanations linked to containment. Therefore, many candidates skilfully explained how containment was not a means of control, but a means of preventing further soviet control (and therefore maintaining freedoms). Some candidates went on to explain this explicitly, and good responses contrasted the Marshall Plan with the salami tactics used by Stalin to address the question. Some candidates constructed two-sided responses and used relevant contextual knowledge from the period. Good candidates discussed 'dollar imperialism' to justify the economic control implications of the Marshall Plan. Candidates did not explicitly refer to the economic, socio-cultural and political dimensions of the plan explicitly in analysis of the question.

Q3(a) Candidates highlighted the key ways in which the USA fought in the Vietnam War. Most candidates discussed bombing, chemical weapons or search and destroy. Many candidates also went on to develop their point with relevant supporting detail. Candidates who did not perform well highlighted ways in which the opposition fought, or went on to explain causes for US involvement.

Q3(b) The question was assessed as reasons for increased involvement in the Vietnam War. The candidate did not need to specifically relate actions to individual presidents. Many candidates chose to provide long-term reasons for the involvement in the Vietnam War, containment and/or the Domino Theory. When stated, these reasons were explained, in some cases using enough contextual knowledge to demonstrate a thorough understanding of the past. That said, too many candidates still are apt to think an explanation of domino theory or

containment unrelated to the specific context of Vietnam or South East Asia is sufficient. Where candidates related events to specific leaders, candidates spoke of Kennedy, and the need for more advisers, or Johnson and the escalation following the Gulf of Tonkin incident. The contextual knowledge to support these responses was weaker, and sometimes inaccurate, and some candidates erroneously included the need to support the French in their answers. Many candidates did provide multi-causal responses to this question.

Q3(c) Most candidates identified the role of the media, and other factors as reasons for the withdrawal from Vietnam. Crucially, good responses made explicit reference to how events generated by the media, or other factors, specifically caused withdrawal. These candidates made the link between the media images, the protest movement and the mounting pressure on US presidents to bring the boys home. Many candidates did not meet the demands of the question. By identifying reasons for withdrawal, there lacked explicit explanations to state how these factors actually caused the withdrawal of US troops to come about. Candidates clearly know the events and reasons for loss of support for the war, but they must use this knowledge to address the question set, rather than the one they have rehearsed.

Section B – A New World? 1948-2005

Question No.

Q4(a) Candidates did not have the relevant knowledge to interpret the cartoon in context. Therefore, candidates commonly took the Source at face value. If the main message was highlighted, candidates did not support with contextual knowledge. Examiners were not looking for extensive contextual knowledge, but needed knowledge of events in Ireland prior to the mainland terror campaign, events that could contextualise the Source and support a valid interpretation of the main message. Such events, e.g. internment were not stated.

Q4(b) Candidates could identify reasons for the failure of terrorism in achieving its aims. Most candidates used Al Qaeda or the PLO as the example of the terrorist organisation. Candidates did not have the contextual knowledge to accurately support points made hence explanations were not substantiated, demonstrating some knowledge at best and weak explanation if at all.

Q5(a) Many candidates identified key points from the building of the wall and accurately stated its impact on Berliners. Some were confused with the Berlin Blockade.

Q5(b) Many candidates did not have the contextual knowledge to access this question; consequently points were limited with no identification of a specific reason for the failure of the Polish government to deal with Solidarity. Good candidates had a clear awareness of Lech Walesa, and the specific reasons for the popularity of the movement. These points were used to explain the failure of the Polish government in dealing with this movement.

Q5(c) Candidates commonly lacked the relevant contextual knowledge to make comparisons between the uprisings that constituted explanations of similarities and differences. Candidates did not achieve full marks because basic points of comparison were identified, e.g. the risings were crushed by Soviet forces, and then did little else to further develop the point. Good candidates had a clear grasp of events, and contrasted the fortunes of Nagy and Dubcek, and the causes for the revolts. Good candidates also explained similarities between the causes. This was not a common type of response for this question.

Q6(a) Most candidates accurately identified a range of points to describe the way Saddam Hussein ruled Iraq. Most candidates stated as a dictator, through fear and other repressive measures.

Q6(b) Good candidates explained two or more points as reasons for why opposition existed to the invasion of Iraq. Many candidates stated the illegality of the invasion, UN opposition, and the fact that WMDs did not exist. Good candidates explained these points with sufficient contextual knowledge to make them distinct and portray a thorough awareness of events. Some candidates did not achieve full marks here because the contextual knowledge was not precise enough to produce a single-causal, or multi-causal explanation.

Q6(c) Candidates did not achieve full marks for Q6(c) because they did not demonstrate sufficient contextual knowledge to go beyond an identification of points to suggest a range of consequences, both relating to international and domestic consequences. Most candidates could not explain one, or two sides of the argument due to insufficient knowledge.

Part 2: Depth Study

The USA 1919-1941

Question No.

Q7(a) Most candidates successfully interpreted the Source, focusing on the negative impact of Hoover's policies or other criticism of Hoover. Common supporting contextual knowledge was based around areas where Hoover was criticised – such as continued belief in 'rugged individualism' though fewer candidates placed the source in direct context of 1932, which was necessary to achieve Level 3. Many candidates who did place the source in direct context of 1932 also went on to identify the purpose of the Source and so reach Level 4.

Q7(b) The vast majority of candidates were able to make relevant inferences from the Source to show why Roosevelt's campaign methods were a success and most also presented relevant contextual knowledge to show other factors, though in many cases this was limited to a short critique of Hoover's failings and so could not access the top of Level 3. Answers that provided a valid evaluation of the Source were relatively rare – although there many examples of 'stock' evaluation – and this was essential in order to access the top level.

Q7(c) Almost all candidates identified a valid message from the Source. Although this was most frequently based on the daunting challenge Roosevelt faced rather than an expression of confidence that he could overcome the problems (needed for the top level). Most candidates then went on to support their answer with contextual knowledge, though in many cases this knowledge was not credited as it was based on the actions Roosevelt took in office, which the cartoonist could not have known and so was invalid. The strongest answers contained contextual knowledge that focused instead of developing the severity of the problems facing Roosevelt.

Q8(a) Most candidates met the demands of the question well, describing Republican policies such as low taxation, with the impact of those policies receiving an additional mark for development. 'Rugged individualism' – being a mindset rather than a policy – was not credited.

Q8(b) Most candidates were able to identify problems facing specific industries, with those who were then able to show the impact of those problems reaching Level 2 and Level 3. The most common industry focussed on was farming, with some candidates also looking at coal mining and/or textiles. Answers without specific and valid reference to a particular industry were not meeting the full demands of the question and so could not reach Level 2. Better candidates could explain why the substitution of oil or electricity would affect the coal industry in terms of changes to transport and heating sources.

Q8(c) Most candidates accurately identified valid reasons for both the First World War and other factors and so reached Level 2. Many candidates described these factors in detail, but did not go on to explain why the factors helped create the boom in 1920s America. This was especially the case for the First World War, where candidates could identify immediate benefits but failed to consider them in the context of the 1920s boom. Some candidates were able to produce a range of explanations for each 'side' of the argument with the strongest answers able to present a valid judgment about the relative importance of the factors and present a 'clinching argument' that would then secure full marks.

Q9(a) Most candidates answered this question well, meeting its demands. Common responses focused on segregation, workplace discrimination and the violence of the Ku Klux Klan. Some candidates presented material that was not directly relevant to the 1920s, or more general comments about poverty which could have been true of all minorities, and these were not credited.

Q9(b) Most candidates identified a reason for why people joined the Ku Klux Klan, and this was most commonly pinned to racism. Candidates who could then develop these identified reasons with what the Ku Klux Klan offered were reaching explanation and so accessed Level 2 (or Level 3 for multiple explanations). Some candidates' answers were restricted to a description of the Klan and/or its activities and it was difficult to credit these responses.

Q9(c) Most candidates were able to offer specific reasons why prohibition failed, most commonly around issues of organised crime and smuggling. Most answers were accessing the top of Level 2. Many candidates, however, did not then go on to meet the full demands of the question and show why the factors they had described (often in great detail) led to the failure of prohibition and this was especially the case for the stated factor of corruption. Some candidates clearly did not understand the term. Many candidates demonstrated good knowledge of the topic but did not go on to explain how their factors led to prohibition's failure and so access Level 3 and higher.

A014 Aspects of international relations and Mao's China c.1930–1976

General Comments:

On the whole most candidates seemed to find this paper accessible. The majority were able to answer the questions with a reasonable degree of knowledge. There were very few rubric errors. Most candidates answered questions on the Inter-War core section and certainly knowledge was better in this area than on the New World.

It would appear that some students were unaware of the changes to the cartoon questions. Students must be reminded not to just describe the surface details of the cartoon but of the importance of contextual knowledge for all source questions. Candidates must try to ascertain the cartoonist viewpoint i.e. what exactly is the cartoonist supporting or being critical about. A lack of contextual knowledge means that answers fail to proceed beyond Level 2.

The other area for development is Level 5 on the 10 mark questions. Initially candidates need to have balanced well developed arguments and in order to access Level 5 students need to weigh up the different factors and/or arguments in order to develop a clinching argument. It is not sufficient to merely summarise the points already made.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Section A Interwar

Question 1

- a) Candidates needed to identify the cartoonist viewpoint and some candidates were successful in doing so. Although, this is still not being done on a widespread scale, despite this being the question format for a number of exam series. The contextual knowledge required for this question was the Corfu Crisis, sometimes detailed knowledge of the event was lacking. Candidates often used the surface details of the cartoon in order to try and ascertain a main message, this approach was unsuccessful. It should be noted that this question is now knowledge driven, without this answers will not progress beyond level 2.
- b) There were some good answers here that were able to explain several successes in the 1920s. Humanitarian successes were often either neglected or explained less successfully; answers often became just a list of things that the League did. It should also be noted that anachronistic reasons for success should not be used to answer this question i.e. the lack of Depression meant the League was successful.

Question 2

- a) Many candidates displayed a detailed knowledge of the Treaty of Saint-Germain with most candidates achieving at least 2 marks.
- b) This question was approached with varying degrees of success. Candidates could often explain the role of Lloyd George as either a 'balancing act' or the 'middle man' between Wilson and Clemenceau, however his role of Prime Minister of Britain was less well executed. Weaker candidates focussed on the aims of Lloyd George. Candidates need to read the question carefully rather than answering a question they have previously answered.

- c) There were some detailed answers that demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the Treaty of Versailles. Often it was the terms that were used to explain whether it was too harsh or not. The best answers looked at the Treaty from the perspective of different countries and people and some concluded that the French would disagree as it was not harsh enough. Some candidates did not focus on the wording of the question and produced very generalised answers about harshness. This led to implications of harshness rather than clear explanations. Occasionally the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was used as justification for it being too harsh, but this must be supported by contextual knowledge in order to be credit worthy.

Question 3

- a) Many candidates were able to identify ways in which Germany's position was strengthened in 1935. However there were some candidates who used evidence from beyond 1935.
- b) The majority of candidates were able to identify at least two reasons why Britain followed a policy of appeasement. Some successfully explained reasons, however sometimes either vague notions of Britain's lack of readiness for war or the financial impact of World War One were used less successfully. Some of the best answers used the example of maintaining Hitler as an ally against Communism.
- c) The majority of answers focussed on just the two factors in the question and therefore did not waste valuable time explaining irrelevant factors. Knowledge of the invasion of the Rhineland was stronger than the Munich Agreement, with sometimes candidates not really understanding the significance of events at Munich. Occasionally the events were described, however candidates failed to link the events to the outbreak of World War 2. There were some strong answers that linked the Munich Agreement with the Nazi-Soviet Pact and therefore concluded this was more important as it ultimately led to the invasion of Poland.

Section B – A New World? 1948-2005

Question 4

- a) Candidates did not have the relevant knowledge to interpret the cartoon in context. Therefore, candidates commonly took the Source at face value. If the main message was highlighted, candidates did not support with contextual knowledge. Examiners were not looking for extensive contextual knowledge, but needed knowledge of events in Ireland prior to the mainland terror campaign, events that could contextualise the Source and support a valid interpretation of the main message. Such events, e.g. internment were not stated.
- b) Candidates could identify reasons for the failure of terrorism in achieving its aims. Most candidates used Al Qaeda as the example of the terrorist organisation. Candidates did not have the contextual knowledge to accurately support points made hence explanations were not substantiated, demonstrating some knowledge at best and weak explanation if at all.

Question 5

- a) Many candidates identified key points from the building of the wall and accurately stated its impact on Berliners.
- b) Many candidates did not have the contextual knowledge to access this question; consequently points were limited with no identification of a specific reason for the failure of the Polish government to deal with Solidarity. Good candidates had a clear awareness of Lech Walesa, and the specific reasons for the popularity of the movement. These points were used to explain the failure of the Polish government in dealing with this movement.

- c) Candidates commonly lacked the relevant contextual knowledge to make comparisons between the uprisings that constituted explanations of similarities and differences. Candidates did not achieve full marks because basic points of comparison were identified, e.g. the risings were crushed by Soviet forces, and then did little else to further develop the point. Good candidates had a clear grasp of events, and contrasted the fortunes of Nagy and Dubcek, and the causes for the revolts. Good candidates also explained similarities between the causes. This was not a common type of response for this question.

Question 6

- a) Most candidates accurately identified a range of points to describe the way Saddam Hussein ruled Iraq. Most candidates stated as a dictator, through fear and other repressive measures.
- b) Good candidates explained two or more points as reasons for why opposition existed to the invasion of Iraq. Many candidates stated the illegality of the invasion, UN opposition, and the fact that WMDs did not exist. Good candidates explained these points with sufficient contextual knowledge to make them distinct and portray a thorough awareness of events. Some candidates did not achieve full marks here because the contextual knowledge was not precise enough to produce a single-causal, or multi-causal explanation.
- c) Candidates did not achieve full marks for Q6(c) because they did not demonstrate sufficient contextual knowledge to go beyond an identification of points to suggest a range of consequences, both relating to international and domestic consequences. Most candidates could not explain one, or two sides of the argument due to insufficient knowledge.

Part 2: Depth Study

China c.1930-1976

Question 7

- a) Most candidates were able to comment on the interpretation that Russia and China had a good relationship under Stalin and some showed an awareness that this relationship changed under Khrushchev and beyond. The interpretation was supported by contextual knowledge. There were very few candidates who commented on the relationship and provided a sound evaluation of the source.
- b) Many candidates were able to identify either the main message or a secondary message, but then they failed to support this with the relevant contextual knowledge that was vital to achieve the higher levels of response. Some just described the surface features of the cartoon.
- c) The majority of candidates saw usefulness of the source as a comment on bad relations before 1971, using the Korean and Vietnam Wars as examples of this and an improvement in 1971, stating Ping-Pong diplomacy and Kissinger's visit as evidence. An alternative answer would have been to comment on the utility of this source in terms of a comparison between an American and a Chinese perspective, however there were few of these. Often candidates only commented on one side and on occasions there was little evidence of contextual knowledge.

Question 8

- a) Many candidates displayed a detailed knowledge of the tactics used by the Red Army. Most were able to identify two or three tactics, with guerrilla warfare being the most quoted example.
- b) Whilst some candidates could identify ways in which the CCP were strengthened by the Second World War, often they failed to explain the impact this had on the party. There was some confusion of events in the Second World War and Civil War.
- c) There were some detailed, well-explained answers that showed why the Long March was a either a success and / or failure. Success was often seen in terms of spreading communist propaganda to the peasants, with failure explained using the number of deaths. Few candidates were able to support their explanations with a clinching argument. Time would be well spent understanding the features of a clinching argument rather than just summarising earlier points in the conclusion.

Question 9

- a) Most candidates who attempted this question achieved high marks recognising the key features of the Cultural Revolution and the reasons behind it.
- b) Often candidates were able to explain the impact of the Cultural Revolution on China's education system and the subsequent problems. There was occasionally confusion between the Cultural Revolution and the Great Leap forward.
- c) This question was answered with varying success. The best answers looked at the reasons behind the Hundred Flowers Movement and then used this to explain either success or failure. This was especially true when analysing the motivations of Mao. Some candidates just described the events and failed to explain failure. A balanced argument with a clinching argument was needed for full marks. This was hardly ever seen.

A015 Aspects of international relations and causes and events of the First World War, 1890–1918

General Comments:

Overall, the level of performance across the cohort seemed to be slightly lower than in previous years. The best candidates were still achieving high level responses but there seemed to be more in the lower levels. In particular, in the cartoon questions, where the driving force has become the use of relevant contextual knowledge to achieve above Level 2. Also, in part (b) questions requiring explanations, Level 2 has changed from identification of reasons to a single-causal explanation, with Level 1 now being for identification.

There are still problems with many candidates failing to reach the top level in ‘purpose’ questions. The purpose of a source relates to the intended impact of that source either to effect change or to alter peoples’ approach. A similar problem is encountered in part (c) 10 mark questions where, to access level 5, a clinching concluding argument must be provided. A repetition or summary of what has been said earlier in the answer does not qualify for this.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question 1

- a) Candidates needed to identify the cartoonist viewpoint. This is still not being done on a widespread scale, despite this being the question format for a number of exam series. The contextual knowledge required for this question was the Corfu Crisis, sometimes detailed knowledge of the event was lacking. Candidates often used the surface details of the cartoon in order to try and ascertain a main message, this approach was unsuccessful. It should be noted that this question is now knowledge driven, without this answers will not progress beyond level 2.
- b) There were some good answers there that were able explain several successes in the 1920s. Humanitarian successes were often either neglected or explained less successfully; answers often became just a list of things that the League did. It should also be noted that anachronistic reasons for success should not be used to answer this question i.e. the lack of Depression meant the League was successful.

Question 2

- a) Many candidates displayed a detailed knowledge of the Treaty of Saint-Germain with most candidates achieving at least 2 marks.
- b) This question was approached with varying degrees of success. Candidate could often explain the role of Lloyd George as either a ‘balancing act’ or the ‘middle man’ between Wilson and Clemenceau, however his role of Prime Minister of Britain was less well executed. Weaker candidates focussed on the aims of Lloyd George. Candidates need to read the question carefully rather than answering a question they have previously answered.

- c) There were some detailed answers that demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the Treaty of Versailles. Often it was the terms that were used to explain whether it was too harsh or not. The best answers looked at the Treaty from the perspective of different countries and people and some concluded that the French would disagree as it was not harsh enough. Some candidates did not focus on the wording of the question and produced very generalised answers about harshness. This led to implications of harshness rather than clear explanations. Occasionally the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was used as justification for it being too harsh, but this must be supported by contextual knowledge in order to be credit worthy.

Question 3

- a) This question caused problems for many candidates who did not focus on the year 1935. Events and issues before or after 1935 were not relevant, such as the re-militarisation of the Rhineland or the Anschluss.
- b) There were some good answers to this question which demonstrated sound knowledge of why Britain followed a policy of appeasement in a multi-causal response, including the need for time to prepare for war, the memories of what WW1 had been like and the need for a buffer against Communism. Weaker candidates tended to describe the events rather than answering the question posed.
- c) Many candidates managed to explain the importance of both factors in bringing about WW2 and were able to be credited in Level 4. Weaker answers again tended to describe the events themselves rather than addressing their results and consequences and these achieved level 2 at best.

Question 4

- a) Candidates needed to identify the **cartoonist viewpoint**. This is still not being done on a widespread scale, despite this being the question format for a number of exam series. In this respect consider that a cartoonist will most probably be **criticising** someone/something, or **supporting** someone/something. For this source the cartoonist was criticising Kennedy in respect of the Bay of Pigs. This was emphasised in the report last year, and yet many candidates still fail to note this important element.

Contextual knowledge needed to be specific to the Bay of Pigs, and could not discuss later events such as the Cuban Missile Crisis. Long descriptions of the source were unnecessary, for there is more credit given to contextual knowledge. For this reason, just asserting the message or cartoonist's view will not push the answer beyond Level 2.

- b) Though there were some very good answers to this question, which were able to discuss a number of different reasons as to why the Cuban Missile Crisis ended peacefully, a lot of answers were very descriptive. In this respect the answers tended to describe what happened during the Cuban Missile Crisis, rather than clearly explaining why this created a peaceful solution to the Crisis. Areas that could have been discussed included fear of Mutually Assured Destruction, Kennedy's rejection of aggressive advice and the agreement over the missiles between Kennedy and Khrushchev. The candidates tended to reach an explanation in respect of the agreement over missiles, but were not very clear on other areas.

Question 5

- a) Many candidates displayed a detailed knowledge of the Berlin Blockade. The answer was specifically 'during' the Berlin Blockade, so a number of candidates wasted time discussing why Stalin wanted to carry out the blockade. A limited number of candidates were confused with the building of the Berlin Wall.
- b) This question was approached with varying degrees of success. On the whole candidates were able to explain at least one factor to reach at least L2. Some candidates were confused

over the nuclear bomb testing carried out by the USA, believing that the Americans scared the Russians by using the atomic bomb on Japan – this had not happened by the Potsdam conference. A number of candidates confused the Yalta and Potsdam conferences, and so candidates must be reminded to read the question carefully.

- c) There were some detailed answers that demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the Marshall Plan and the American impact on Europe after the Second World War. The best answers looked at the Marshall Plan, and were clear as to how this could be seen to control Europe – gaining dependency on the US currency ('Dollar Imperialism'), or preventing the spread of Communism to maintain Capitalist nations. This needed to be set against other factors, such as the fact that it was designed after Marshall had visited Europe and seen the devastation and thus there were altruistic reasons for helping out people in Europe. One of the key issues was that candidates focussed on the prevention of Communism, and tried to twist this onto both sides of the argument, which was rarely successful. As such, many found it difficult to get past L2. It is worth noting that greater depth is required here, with specific evidence rather than descriptive points. To reach the very top level, a clinching argument is required to push the conclusion forward – many merely repeat the arguments of the essay.

Question 6

- a) Many candidates displayed a detailed knowledge of the fighting methods of the Americans in the Vietnam War. However, some were side-tracked by describing the methods of the Vietcong, which was not the question.
- b) On the whole this was answered well. Most were able to explain Domino Theory and the Gulf of Tonkin incident. It is important to note that with a greater emphasis on knowledge, more depth would have helped – particularly in linking Domino Theory to specific nations, such as Laos and Cambodia. Some candidates also discussed the military-industrial complex, and the failure of the French in Vietnam, which were both acceptable factors and helped to boost candidates to the top of Level 3.
- c) There were some detailed answers that demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the impact of the media and other factors such as the difficulty presented by Vietcong tactics on the withdrawal of US troops from the Vietnam War. However, there was a problem of a number of candidates in not focussing on the withdrawal of troops, and instead explaining why the USA failed in the war. These are different questions, and without specific relation of answers to withdrawal this led a number of answers to remain in L2. In this respect the impact of media had to relate not just to the awareness of the American public to what was happening in Vietnam, but a change in them pressurising the American government to pull out of the Vietnam War. Many did this by relating the media to increasing protests against the War. On the other side, it was not merely enough to describe failures in Vietnam, but to link to the realisation that this created a realisation that the war was unwinnable, and thus the American's decided to pull out their troops. Specific knowledge was generally better on this question, especially in regards to protests, the My Lai massacre and the Tet offensive. To reach the very top level, a clinching argument is required to push the conclusion forward – many merely repeat the arguments of the essay.

Question 7

- a) Candidates needed to identify the cartoonist's viewpoint which was one of criticism of The IRA's campaign of violence but very few were able to achieve this. The contextual knowledge required related to the IRA's activities up to 1971, the date of the cartoon, and not to events after that date. Therefore, candidates using details about the IRA's campaign in mainland Britain, which started in 1974, were not credited. Many candidates used the surface details of the cartoon to try to explain a message but were unsuccessful, as this question requires relevant knowledge to reach beyond Level 2.
- b) Some candidates were able to provide several explanations of why terrorism has often failed, including factors such as divided leadership and a need to compromise, but many

showed a lack of detailed knowledge about the aims and activities of the specified terrorist organisations, namely the IRA, PLO and Al Qaeda. It should be noted that Level 1 requires valid reasons to be identified and Level 2 requires a mono-causal explanation. This is a change from previous exam series.

Question 8

- a) Most candidates were able to provide some relevant knowledge about the building of the Berlin Wall and its impact.
- b) Some candidates were able to explain a number of relevant reasons why the Polish government had problems dealing with Solidarity, such as the level of support for the movement and its good organisation and leadership. However, for weaker candidates, detailed knowledge about Solidarity and the ways in which the Polish government responded to it was lacking and such answers achieved Level 1 marks at best.
- c) There were some good answers that demonstrated detailed knowledge and understanding of the ways in which the Hungarian Uprising and the Prague Spring were both similar and different and these candidates were rewarded with marks at Level 4 or Level 5. However, there were still examples of candidates explaining just one side of the debate, which can only achieve Level 3 marks at best, and of candidates lacking detailed knowledge about both events.

Question 9

- a) There were some good answers which provided several valid factors about the way Saddam Hussein ruled Iraq but there were also many that showed little or no specific knowledge about his actions.
- b) Responses to this question varied greatly. The best answers displayed detailed knowledge and understanding of the global response to the invasion of Iraq, including arguments relating to the failure to find weapons of mass destruction and the lack of a second UN resolution. Weaker answers were general in nature, lacking specific, detailed knowledge of why opposition was aroused.
- c) This question required an answer which explained both the internal and international consequences of the Iraq War. The best candidates were able to provide accurate and detailed evidence in support of each side of the debate, such as the negative perception of the USA and Britain in the international arena and the breakdown of law and order inside Iraq. These candidates were rewarded with marks in level 4 or level 5. It is worth pointing out that negative and positive consequences were credited. However, weaker candidates provided only general answers, lacking relevant and detailed contextual knowledge.

Depth Study – WW1

Question 10

- a) Only a few candidates were able to recognise the purpose of this source which was to make British people aware of the threat posed by Germany in 1890. However, many candidates were able to ascertain the message of the cartoon which was that Germany was posing a threat. Relevant contextual knowledge was then usually used to support this, such as comments about the Kaiser's desire for empire or the arms race. However, a considerable number of candidates used knowledge about issues after 1890 which was not relevant, for example, the Moroccan Crises and the naval race associated with the 'Dreadnoughts'. The key to achieving the top level in this type of question is to recognise that the purpose of a source is its intended impact either to change things or, as in this case, to alter peoples' approach.
- b) As this was a German cartoon, the cartoonist's viewpoint was supporting what the Kaiser was doing in Morocco. The majority of candidates were not successful in recognising this

but they were able to identify the main message that the Kaiser was being aggressive in the Moroccan Crisis. Such answers were usually supported by relevant knowledge, for example, the sending of the gunboat, 'Panther' to Agadir. Therefore many candidates were able to achieve Level 4.

- c) The important factor in this question was that candidates had to provide knowledge about both the role of the naval race and of other factors, such as the imperial rivalry and the alliance systems, in causing tension in order to progress beyond Level 2. The quality of the evaluation in relation to the source, as well as the quality of the contextual knowledge then determined whether the answer was awarded Level 3 or Level 4. Many candidates were successful in accessing these two levels although weaker ones who only dealt with either the naval race or other factors were stuck in Level 2.

Question 11

- a) There were many good answers to this question with sound knowledge about the Battle of Jutland. A large number of candidates achieved 4 marks.
- b) Good candidates were able to explain a variety of reasons why the Russians were defeated on the Eastern Front using sound knowledge to support their arguments. Level 3 was, therefore, accessible for a multi-causal answer. However, quite a few candidates showed little specific knowledge or understanding of events on this Front and only produced a weak, general answer which achieved L1 marks at best.
- c) The best answers showed sound knowledge and understanding of the importance of both factors in bringing about Germany's defeat in 1918 and these candidates achieved marks at Level 4 or Level 5. A small number of these candidates also went on to link the two factors together explaining how the situation inside Germany was, at least partly due to the effects of the blockade and the failure of the U-boat campaign. Weaker candidates produced very general answers lacking specific details and coherent arguments.

Question 12

- a) Description of the use of new technology was the key issue in this question. Many candidates just provided a list of the new developments without addressing the issue of use. Such answers could not be credited with more than 1 mark for a general point. Many candidates, though, did achieve 4 marks.
- b) The best answers included multi-causal explanations of the consequences of the USA's entry into the War, usually focusing on the positive effects it had on the British and French and the negative impact it had on Germany. Level 3 was, therefore, achieved. Weaker responses tended to identify reasons without explanation or to provide a general statement lacking specific support.
- c) To answer this question effectively, Haig's aims at the Battle of the Somme needed to be clearly identified and then his success and failure in achieving them explained. Many candidates did not set out these aims and, consequently, their answers failed to explain success and failure and became basic responses marked at Level 1 or Level 2. Better candidates were successful in explaining both sides of this debate focusing on issues such as relieving pressure on Verdun and the failure to break the stalemate on the Western Front. Such answers were awarded Level 4 or Level 5.

A016 Aspects of international relations and End of Empire c.1919–1969

General Comments:

There were some excellent responses to the source-based questions where candidates were able to identify the purpose of the writer/artist and the main thrust of the message being conveyed. Ideas were supported by appropriate and well-detailed contextual knowledge. Others did not have an adequate level of knowledge to support conclusions. The least successful responses were those that simply repeated information or detail from the sources. In answering the source-based questions it is not necessary to give lengthy descriptions or paraphrases of the sources. These alone will receive very little credit.

On the short answer questions i.e. 11a) and 12a) many candidates had sufficient knowledge to identify relevant points and to gain additional credit for supporting detail. It was not necessary to write at length in order to gain the maximum 4 marks.

On the 6 mark questions i.e. 11b) and 12b) the best responses were those that explained in detail a number of different reasons. The less successful ones were those that simply stated a reason without any explanation. Candidates need to have well-detailed historical knowledge of the appropriate topic/event to achieve high marks on these questions.

On the longer 10 mark questions i.e. 11c) and 12c) the best candidates showed sound knowledge, clear analysis and the ability to consider and judge alternative explanations. When candidates did not achieve higher marks it was because they only focused on one aspect of the question, or provided description rather than explanation.

In all the questions on this paper the quantity and quality of historical knowledge is what distinguishes the good answers, and in the case of some of the candidates this was clearly apparent.

A number of the sources and questions contain dates. It is important that candidates pay careful attention to such dates in order to avoid irrelevant or inappropriate references in their answers.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No.10 (a).

All the sources were linked to the Mau Mau rebellion and the British responses to it between 1950 and 1960. In all three source questions candidates were required to use both the source and their knowledge to explain their answers. The new wording at the beginning of Part 2 needs to be emphasised to candidates. This stresses the importance of the interpretation and evaluation of the sources based upon knowledge. Without this sound basis of knowledge candidates will not score highly on Q10.

In the case of Q10 (a) most candidates were able to appreciate that Kenyatta was trying to distinguish himself/the KAU from the Mau Mau. Only some were able to apply relevant knowledge of Mau Mau activities prior to July 1952 to support the message of the speech. It is important to stress to candidates the need to consider any date incorporated in the source to ensure that contextual detail provided is relevant. The best responses were from those candidates who, in addition to providing appropriate contextual knowledge were also able to appreciate that the intended impact of the speech was to persuade Kenyans not to support the Mau Mau. A substantial number of candidates copied out or paraphrased most of the speech.

Question No.10 (b).

Nearly all were able to identify at least one of the cartoonist's messages in order to produce a valid interpretation. There was confusion in the minds of some candidates over the nationality of the troops but the majority were able to conclude that it was the British who were trying to track down the Mau Mau and having little success. Candidates who were then able to explain the lack of success with some supporting historical knowledge were able to achieve higher marks. More successful candidates were able to recognise the brutality of the British response as indicated by the wording on the animal and to use their knowledge of interrogation, internment and torture used by the British at the time. The very best candidates recognised, in addition, that cartoonist was not only simply telling people that the British were brutal but was using the cartoon as a method of criticising the British for their approach.

Question No.10 (c).

To access the higher marks on this question candidates needed to judge the effectiveness of the methods used rather than to simply describe them. There were some good responses in which candidates recognised that the brutal methods did have some success in cutting off supplies, recruits and support to such an extent that the situation seemed to be under control by 1956. The best candidates were also aware that by the end of the decade the terrorist activity was spreading again and prisoners had to be released. A substantial number of candidates spent a lot of time describing the brutality but not offering any opinion as to whether it was effective or not. Only very rarely did a candidate appreciate the importance of the source in supporting the argument as it was written by a British Commissioner critical of British methods.

Question No.11 (a).

Most candidates were able to name countries which were part of the British Empire in 1919. It was also possible to gain marks by referring to land area or population figures.

Question No.11 (b).

Candidates needed to read this question carefully to make sure that they confined their answer to the given time period. There were many good answers that explained the role of Gandhi in promoting nationalism. Some candidates explained the importance of factors such as the increase in literacy, the rise of political groups or the effects of events such as the Amritsar massacre. In all cases the higher marks could be accessed by supporting factors with specific historical detail.

Question No.11 (c).

There were a number of very good responses in which candidates were aware of a range of factors both in Britain and in other parts of the world. There was considerable knowledge of the stance of governments of the time on imperialism and of external factors such as American attitudes and the Suez crisis. There was some misinterpretation of the role of the Atlantic Charter as some candidates argued that it forbade the retention of colonies such as India when, in fact, existing colonies were specifically excluded. A number of good responses discussed in detail the attitudes of both Labour and Conservative governments. It was important that any knowledge was directed towards answering the question about why these factors might have brought about the end of the Empire. Some candidates described the factors without specifically linking them to the question asked.

Question No.12 (a).

Most candidates gained marks by referring to the Government of India act and providing additional detail on its provisions. The Rowlett Act and the subsequent use of force at Amritsar were known by many as was the role of the princes and the Viceroy.

Question No.12 (b)

Candidates were very well informed on the details of what happened at Amritsar and the question gave rise to some lengthy descriptions. Successful responses focused clearly on the importance of the event rather than the narrative. Good candidates were aware that it led to Gandhi setting up the Non-cooperation movement and the re-birth of Congress into a mass movement. Only a few were also aware that it led to a change in the British methods of control. There was no reference to the Hunter Commission or the re-training of soldiers in the use of minimum force. A number of candidates were aware of sympathy for Dwyer in the U.K. but did not use this as part of an argument about importance. Those who were able to explain more than one reason were able to access the highest marks.

Question No.12 (c).

There were some excellent responses to this question. Good candidates had extensive and detailed knowledge, particularly of Gandhi, and were able to assess the work and influence of both individuals. It was pleasing to see the best of the candidates engaging in some very effective and balanced comparative evaluation which enabled them to achieve maximum marks. Whilst the work and achievements of Jinnah were less well known the majority of candidates knew something about the activities of Gandhi and his ideas on satyagraha and non violence. However in order to gain higher marks candidates needed to explain what was important about the activities and ideas. It was necessary to provide explanations relating to both individuals in order to get the better marks.

Section A Interwar

Question 1

- a) Candidates needed to identify the cartoonist viewpoint and some candidates were successful in doing so. Although, this is still not being done on a widespread scale, despite this being the question format for a number of exam series. The contextual knowledge required for this question was the Corfu Crisis, sometimes detailed knowledge of the event was lacking. Candidates often used the surface details of the cartoon in order to try and ascertain a main message, this approach was unsuccessful. It should be noted that this question is now knowledge driven, without this answers will not progress beyond level 2.
- b) There were some good answers here that were to able explain several successes in the 1920s. Humanitarian successes were often either neglected or explained less successfully; answers often became just a list of things that the League did. It should also be noted that anachronistic reasons for success should not be used to answer this question i.e. the lack of Depression meant the League was successful.

Question 2

- a) Many candidates displayed a detailed knowledge of the Treaty of Saint-Germain with most candidates achieving at least 2 marks.
- b) This question was approached with varying degrees of success. Candidates could often explain the role of Lloyd George as either a 'balancing act' or the 'middle man' between Wilson and Clemenceau, however his role of Prime Minister of Britain was less well executed. Weaker candidates focussed on the aims of Lloyd George. Candidates need to read the question carefully rather than answering a question they have previously answered.
- c) There were some detailed answers that demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the Treaty of Versailles. Often it was the terms that were used to explain whether it was too harsh or not. The best answers looked at the Treaty from the perspective of different countries and people and some concluded that the French would disagree as it was not harsh enough. Some candidates did not focus on the wording of the question and produced very generalised answers about harshness. This led to implications of harshness rather than

clear explanations. Occasionally the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was used as justification for it being too harsh, but this must be supported by contextual knowledge in order to be credit worthy.

Question 3

- a) Many candidates were able to identify ways in which Germany's position was strengthening in 1935. However there were some candidates who used evidence from beyond 1935.
- b) The majority of candidates were able to identify at least two reasons why Britain followed a policy of appeasement. Some successfully explained reasons, however sometimes either vague notions of Britain's lack of readiness for war or the financial impact of World War One were used less successfully. Some of the best answers used the example of maintaining Hitler as an ally against Communism.
- c) The majority of answers focused on just the two factors in the question and therefore did not waste valuable time explaining irrelevant factors. Knowledge of the invasion of the Rhineland was stronger than the Munich Agreement, with sometimes candidates not really understanding the significance of events at Munich. Occasionally the events were described, however candidates failed to link the events to the outbreak of World War 2. There were some strong answers that linked the Munich Agreement with the Nazi-Soviet Pact and therefore concluded this was more important as it ultimately led to the invasion of Poland.

Section A – The Cold War, 1945-1975

Question No.

Q1(a) Many candidates answered the question to produce a level 4 response or higher. Kennedy was correctly identified as being embarrassed by the Bay of Pigs fiasco with reference to the Source. Candidates then supported this viewpoint with relevant contextual knowledge on the Bay of Pigs. Sub messages were less common. When candidates expressed sub messages clearly they spoke of the damage Cuba was doing to America and/or Kennedy. Good responses directly stated the view of the cartoonist as a direct, personal attack on Kennedy's failure, with reference to the Source and surrounding context.

Q1(b) Many candidates expressed adequate contextual knowledge surrounding the crisis. There were a number of points identified. Candidates sometimes expressed narrative responses, thereby requiring more emphasis on explanation of a peaceful resolution to qualify as a good response. Good responses would highlight the role of both Kennedy and Khrushchev in the negotiation process, constructing two explanations from the actions taken. Many candidates also stated the fear of nuclear war as a reason for peaceful resolution; this point was not always developed with sophisticated terms such as MAD, deterrent, etc.

Q2(a) Many candidates described events prior to the blockade, these were not rewarded. The same candidates usually described what happened during the blockade of 1948-9. Many candidates achieved a number of marks, the airlift and blocking of supply routes being the most common points of identification.

Q2(b) Many candidates identified the reasons for the disagreements. Most common were the changing leaders, the question of reparations, free elections in Eastern Europe and the US possession of the A bomb. A significant number of candidates explained how these points caused disagreements. Contextual knowledge was not always developed well enough to construct multi-causal responses that demonstrated a thorough understanding of the past, a common error being the use of incorrect leaders, i.e. Khrushchev, or Kennedy, etc.

Q2(c) Most candidates crafted explanations linked to containment. Therefore, candidates skilfully explained how containment was not a means of control, but a means of preventing further soviet control (and therefore maintaining freedoms). Some candidates went on to explain this explicitly, and good responses contrasted the Marshall Plan with the salami tactics used by Stalin to address the question. Many candidates constructed two-sided responses and used relevant contextual knowledge from the period. Good candidates discussed 'dollar imperialism' to justify the economic control implications of the Marshall Plan. Candidates did not explicitly refer to the economic, socio-cultural and political dimensions of the plan explicitly in analysis of the question.

Q3(a) Candidates highlighted the key ways in which the USA fought in the Vietnam War. Most candidates discussed bombing, chemical weapons or search and destroy. Many candidates also went on to develop their point with relevant supporting detail. Candidates who did not perform well highlighted ways in which the opposition fought, or went on to explain causes for US involvement.

Q3(b) The question was assessed as reasons for increased involvement in the Vietnam War. The candidates did not need to specifically relate actions to individual presidents. Many candidates chose to provide long-term reasons for the involvement in the Vietnam War, containment and/or the Domino Theory. When stated, these reasons were explained, in some cases using enough contextual knowledge to demonstrate a thorough understanding of the past. Where candidates related events to specific leaders, candidates spoke of Kennedy, and the need for more advisers, or Johnson and the escalation following the Gulf of Tonkin incident. The contextual knowledge to support these responses was weaker, and sometimes inaccurate. Many candidates did provide multi-causal responses to this question.

Q3(c) Most candidates identified the role of the media, and other factors as reasons for the withdrawal from Vietnam. Crucially, good responses made explicit reference to how events generated by the media, or other factors, specifically caused withdrawal. These candidates made the link between the media images, the protest movement and the mounting pressure on US presidents to bring the boys home. Many candidates did not meet the demands of the question. By identifying reasons for withdrawal, there lacked explicit explanations to state how these factors actually caused the withdrawal of US troops to come about.

Section B – A New World? 1948-2005

Question No.

Q4(a) Candidates did not have the relevant knowledge to interpret the cartoon in context. Therefore, candidates commonly took the Source at face value. If the main message was highlighted, candidates did not support with contextual knowledge. Examiners were not looking for extensive contextual knowledge, but needed knowledge of events in Ireland prior to the mainland terror campaign, events that could contextualise the Source and support a valid interpretation of the main message. Such events, e.g. internment were not stated.

Q4(b) Candidates could identify reasons for the failure of terrorism in achieving its aims. Most candidates used Al Qaeda as the example of the terrorist organisation. Candidates did not have the contextual knowledge to accurately support points made hence explanations were not substantiated, demonstrating some knowledge at best and weak explanation if at all.

Q5(a) Many candidates identified key points from the building of the wall and accurately stated its impact on Berliners.

Q5(b) Many candidates did not have the contextual knowledge to access this question; consequently points were limited with no identification of a specific reason for the failure of the Polish government to deal with Solidarity. Good candidates had a clear awareness of Lech Walesa, and the specific reasons for the popularity of the movement. These points were used to explain the failure of the Polish government in dealing with this movement.

Q5(c) Candidates commonly lacked the relevant contextual knowledge to make comparisons between the uprisings that constituted explanations of similarities and differences. Candidates did not achieve full marks because basic points of comparison were identified, e.g. the risings were crushed by Soviet forces, and then did little else to further develop the point. Good candidates had a clear grasp of events, and contrasted the fortunes of Nagy and Dubcek, and the causes for the revolts. Good candidates also explained similarities between the causes. This was not a common type of response for this question.

Q6(a) Most candidates accurately identified a range of points to describe the way Saddam Hussein ruled Iraq. Most candidates stated as a dictator, through fear and other repressive measures.

Q6(b) Good candidates explained two or more points as reasons for why opposition existed to the invasion of Iraq. Many candidates stated the illegality of the invasion, UN opposition, and the fact that WMDs did not exist. Good candidates explained these points with sufficient contextual knowledge to make them distinct and portray a thorough awareness of events. Some candidates did not achieve full marks here because the contextual knowledge was not precise enough to produce a single-causal, or multi-causal explanation.

Q6(c) Candidates did not achieve full marks for Q6(c) because they did not demonstrate sufficient contextual knowledge to go beyond an identification of points to suggest a range of consequences, both relating to international and domestic consequences. Most candidates could not explain one, or two sides of the argument due to insufficient knowledge.

A017 Aspects of international relations and The USA, Land of freedom? 1945–1975

General Comments:

Overall, the level of performance across the cohort seemed to be slightly lower than in previous years. The best candidates were still achieving high level responses but there seemed to be more in the lower levels.

In particular, in the cartoon questions, where the driving force has become the use of relevant contextual knowledge to achieve above Level 2. Also, in part (b) questions requiring explanations, Level 2 has changed from identification of reasons to a single-causal explanation, with Level 1 now being for identification.

There are still problems with many candidates failing to reach the top level in ‘purpose’ questions. The purpose of a source relates to the intended impact of that source either to effect change or to alter peoples’ approach. A similar problem is encountered in part (c) 10 mark questions where, to access level 5, a clinching concluding argument must be provided. A repetition or summary of what has been said earlier in the answer does not qualify for this.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No.

Question 1

- a) Candidates needed to identify the cartoonist viewpoint. This is still not being done on a widespread scale, despite this being the question format for a number of exam series. The contextual knowledge required for this question was the Corfu Crisis, sometimes detailed knowledge of the event was lacking. Candidates often used the surface details of the cartoon in order to try and ascertain a main message, this approach was unsuccessful. It should be noted that this question is now knowledge driven, without this answers will not progress beyond level 2.
- b) There were some good answers here that were able explain several successes in the 1920s. Humanitarian successes were often either neglected or explained less successfully; answers often became just a list of things that the League did. It should also be noted that anachronistic reasons for success should not be used to answer this question i.e. the lack of Depression meant the League was successful.

Question 2

- a) Many candidates displayed a detailed knowledge of the Treaty of Saint-Germain with most candidates achieving at least 2 marks.
- b) This question was approached with varying degrees of success. Candidate could often explain the role of Lloyd George as either a ‘balancing act’ or the ‘middle man’ between Wilson and Clemenceau, however his role of Prime Minister of Britain was less well executed. Weaker candidates focussed on the aims of Lloyd George. Candidates need to read the question carefully rather than answering a question they have previously answered.
- c) There were some detailed answers that demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the Treaty of Versailles. Often it was the terms that were used to explain whether it was too harsh or not. The best answers looked at the Treaty from the perspective of different countries and people and some concluded that the French would disagree as it was not harsh enough.

Some candidates did not focus on the wording of the question and produced very generalised answers about harshness. This led to implications of harshness rather than clear explanations. Occasionally the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk was used as justification for it being too harsh, but this must be supported by contextual knowledge in order to be credit worthy.

Question 3

- a) This question caused problems for many candidates who did not focus on the year 1935. Events and issues before or after 1935 were not relevant, such as the re-militarisation of the Rhineland or the Anschluss.
- b) There were some good answers to this question which demonstrated sound knowledge of why Britain followed a policy of appeasement in a multi-causal response, including the need for time to prepare for war, the memories of what WW1 had been like and the need for a buffer against Communism. Weaker candidates tended to describe the events rather than answering the question posed.
- c) Many candidates managed to explain the importance of both factors in bringing about WW2 and were able to be credited in Level 4. Weaker answers again tended to describe the events themselves rather than addressing their results and consequences and these achieved level 2 at best.

Question 4

- a) Candidates needed to identify the cartoonist's viewpoint which was one of criticism of the IRA's campaign of violence but very few were able to achieve this. The contextual knowledge required related to the IRA's activities up to 1971, the date of the cartoon, and not to events after that date. Therefore, candidates using details about the IRA's campaign in mainland Britain, which started in 1974, were not credited. Many candidates used the surface details of the cartoon to try to explain a message but were unsuccessful, as this question requires relevant knowledge to reach beyond Level 2.
- b) Some candidates were able to provide several explanations of why terrorism has often failed, including factors such as divided leadership and a need to compromise, but many showed a lack of detailed knowledge about the aims and activities of the specified terrorist organisations, namely the IRA, PLO and Al Qaeda. It should be noted that Level 1 requires valid reasons to be identified and Level 2 requires a mono-causal explanation. This is a change from previous exam series.

Question 5

- a) Most candidates were able to provide some relevant knowledge about the building of the Berlin Wall and its impact.
- b) Some candidates were able to explain a number of relevant reasons why the Polish government had problems dealing with Solidarity, such as the level of support for the movement and its good organisation and leadership. However, for weaker candidates, detailed knowledge about Solidarity and the ways in which the Polish government responded to it was lacking and such answers achieved Level 1 marks at best.
- c) There were some good answers that demonstrated detailed knowledge and understanding of the ways in which the Hungarian Uprising and the Prague Spring were both similar and different and these candidates were rewarded with marks at Level 4 or Level 5. However, there were still examples of candidates explaining just one side of the debate, which can only achieve Level 3 marks at best, and of candidates lacking detailed knowledge about both events.

Question 6

- a) There were some good answers which provided several valid factors about the way Saddam Hussein ruled Iraq but there were also many that showed little or no specific knowledge about his actions.

- b) Responses to this question varied greatly. The best answers displayed detailed knowledge and understanding of the global response to the invasion of Iraq, including arguments relating to the failure to find weapons of mass destruction and the lack of a second UN resolution. Weaker answers were general in nature, lacking specific, detailed knowledge of why opposition was aroused.
- c) This question required an answer which explained both the internal and international consequences of the Iraq War. The best candidates were able to provide accurate and detailed evidence in support of each side of the debate, such as the negative perception of the USA and Britain in the international arena and the breakdown of law and order inside Iraq. These candidates were rewarded with marks in level 4 or level 5. It is worth pointing out that negative and positive consequences were credited. However, weaker candidates provided only general answers, lacking relevant and detailed contextual knowledge and were given marks at Level 1 or Level 2.

Depth Study – Land of Freedom

Question 7

- a) This question required an awareness that McCarthyism was successful due to events both inside and outside America. If only one of these angles was addressed, the candidate could not get beyond Level 2. However, there were many good responses showing sound knowledge of the impact of events like the acquisition of the A-bomb by the USSR and the increasing threat of Communism around the world (ie the Korean War) balanced by explanations based around the work of the HUAC and cases such as the Rosenbergs and Alger Hiss. These types of answers achieved Level 3 or Level 4 marks depending on the quality of the evaluation and of the contextual knowledge.
- b) Many candidates were able to appreciate that the message of this cartoon was to mock or humiliate McCarthy but only a few progressed to the purpose which was to turn public opinion against him. Despite this, Level 3 was achieved by many candidates who provided sound contextual support for a correct message. This support was usually based around McCarthy's attacks on the army in 1954. Weak responses tended to describe the surface features of the cartoon and some candidates misinterpreted it, believing the message to be illustrating the on-going inequality faced by women in American society.

Question 8

- a) There were many good answers to this question, illustrating sound knowledge about the Black Panther movement. A large number of candidates scored 4 marks.
- b) Many candidates were able to provide at least two explanations as to why Malcolm X was important to African Americans. These were usually based around his inspirational leadership and his belief that they should be proud of their history and colour. Answers like these were rewarded with Level 3 marks. However, there were a number of candidates who just identified reasons without explanation and others who had no idea who Malcolm X was and what he did.
- c) This question required an answer that explained both the progress made by African Americans in fighting inequality by 1975 and the on-going discrimination and inequality that they still faced. Candidates who managed this achieved Level 4 or Level 5 marks. However, if only one side of this debate was attempted, Level 3 was the maximum attainable. In addition, a significant number of candidates merely described events, such as the Brown v Topeka case, the Montgomery bus boycott or the Civil Rights and Voting Acts, without explaining their significance. These answers achieved a maximum of Level 2.

Question 9

- a) This question was quite well answered as many of the examples of discrimination against Hispanics mirror those suffered by African Americans. Many candidates, therefore, scored between 2 and 4 marks.

b) Knowledge about the 1965 Immigration Act was mixed. The best candidates were able to provide two or more explained reasons why this Act was important, particularly about the abolition of quotas and the greater opportunities for Hispanic immigrants. However, a number of candidates had little or no knowledge about this piece of legislation and its consequences.

c)

The best answers provided complex explanations either supporting or opposing the statement and excellent knowledge was displayed about the progress made by women, and/or about that of Native Americans, in achieving or not achieving civil rights. Such answers were marked at Level 4 or Level 5. Some candidates, though, evidently had little specific knowledge about the progress made by either group and produced superficial and generalised answers which could only achieve Level 1 or Level 2 marks at best.

A021 How was British society changed, 1890–1918?

General Comments:

Overall

In order to cover the entire period the line of investigation chosen for this paper was the living and working conditions of people 1890-1918 and the extent to which government action improved these conditions. In practical terms this meant that the range of sources ranged beyond the three traditional topic areas. It also meant that the concluding question was assessed principally on the relevant deployment of candidates' own knowledge and not on the use of the sources in the paper.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question 1

This question proved relatively straightforward for the majority of candidates. Relatively few achieved lower than Level 3 (4-5 marks) as they were able to identify the message which Booth was trying to convey and give some sense of how he achieved this and the reasons why. Many candidates reached Level 4 although it was often difficult for examiners to judge whether candidates had really identified Booth's purpose in the sense of making a clear statement of the change or changes he was trying to bring about and how those changes would have helped the poorest in society. It was the clarity of this statement which usually determined whether the mark received within the Level 4 range. There were many strong answers which received Level 5, however, by making this intended change clear, and explaining how and why Booth tried to achieve his aims.

Question 2

Candidates found it difficult to see beyond the evidence bias in each source to see how such sources could be useful to historians. It was satisfying to see a large proportion of the entry reach L3 by identifying this bias. Clearly the attack on the Tories in Source B had political purpose as did the use of the heart rending narrative in Source C, albeit to favour Labour. At this point many candidates, having identified the obvious bias, simply concluded that the sources were not useful. There were some very good Level 4 and Level 5 answers which explored why the parties would trouble to publish this biased material. These responses were rewarded for seeing the value of a biased source to the historian. Good responses made telling inferences to explain how the two sources were useful example of how parties campaigned, of how pensions had become a political issue or of how seriously the parties took the issue of poverty in old age. However, they were disappointingly rare especially when in a significant number of cases candidates correctly identified that Source B, for instance, was an example of the Liberal party making use of pensions as a political weapon and then concluding that the source was therefore not useful. Candidates clearly still need to practice thinking about utility of sources in terms of what a source is useful for rather than 'is it true?'

Question 3

Question 3 produced generally better answers than question 2. Most candidates were focused on the central point of the question of why the two differed. There was a wide range of responses. At Level 2 candidates simply pointed out that the two sources were produced by different parties. Many answers developed this effectively to explain how each source attempted to promote or discredit the National Insurance Act and gained a top mark in Level 3. Candidates were required to indicate purpose or awareness of specific audience or context to reach Level 4 or 5 and many did this very effectively. On the whole Source D was tackled better than Source E. The context of opposition to National Insurance was well known and was deployed effectively

in explaining how the Liberals were trying to shift working class attitudes, particularly those of the trades unions. Source E proved more difficult. Many candidates correctly saw the purpose of E in undermining the Act and getting all or some of it amended or repealed. It was noticeable how some candidates struggled with the concept of the Conservatives trying to appeal to the working class because their concept of the Conservatives as the party of the rich and only the rich was clearly immovable despite the evidence of Source E. This conviction tended to lead to some confused and contradictory evaluation of Source E.

Question 4

The basic premise was that the cartoonist was criticising Lloyd George for urging full commitment to the war effort (keeping the home fires burning) while it was clearly difficult or impossible to do so when conditions were hard at home (shortages of coal and matches). There were many good responses which quickly and succinctly spelled this out and set it in the context of war. However, many candidates were clearly not expecting to see a source from the wartime period and were thrown by it. There were many attempts to twist the source round to be a comment on Liberal welfare reforms. In other cases candidates understood the wartime context but were unable to see the main message (the criticism of Lloyd George) but they were able to see sub-messages (eg shortages were biting hard).

Question 5

Question 5 produced a very wide range of responses and for a range of reasons. Where candidates were aware that the parameters of the final question had changed there were usually few problems. Most candidates had strong contextual knowledge and used it well to explain how particular government measures should be seen as improvements in the lives of people or not. The most common approach used for top level answers was to take a series of measures such as School Meals, the Children Act, Labour Exchanges, Old Age Pensions, National Insurance, votes for women and explain how each of these improved lives. These responses then used relevant sources to extend explanations or emphasise the points made. The counter argument usually consisted of the shortcomings of these various measures, again supported by relevant use of relevant sources. Unfortunately, a very large proportion of the candidates seemed unaware of the changes to this paper and responded on a source by source basis in the style of the pre-strengthened questions. Such answers were limited to Level 2, although many responses did manage to raise their answers higher through an incidental use of their contextual knowledge which had been stimulated by the sources.

A022 How far did British society change, 1939–1975?

General Comments:

The main differences for this paper are:

- the paper must test the whole period 1939-75
- there are now only 5 questions instead of 6
- question 5 is assessed principally on the relevant deployment of candidates' own knowledge and not on the use of the sources in the paper
- only some of the sources are directly useful to the question being asked in Question 5.

In Questions 1-4, candidates seemed well prepared for the topic of immigration and responded effectively to most of the sources in this session's paper. Effective answers focused closely on answering the question and supporting the answer with reference to the sources and/or use of contextual knowledge. Contextual knowledge continues to be rewarded only where it is relevant and where it is being used to answer the questions set, and it is pleasing to see many candidates tightly focusing on answering the question set, rather than working through a formulaic approach.

The paper tested the whole period 1939-75 and it was encouraging to see that this did not trouble the majority of candidates, although there was a worrying minority who lacked contextual knowledge about immigration during the Second World War. The most able candidates were able to show their understanding of immigration across the whole time period in Question 5, drawing out comparisons between the war, the post-war era, and the 1960s-1970s.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Question No. 1

The question asked why the two sources disagreed. The vast majority of candidates were able to explain the ways in which the sources differed, Source A being very positive towards immigrants and Source B very negative, and supported their points with content from the sources. They were thus able to reach Level 3 and score 5 marks. Some candidates were able to explain why the sources differed given the context in which they were produced. Many pointed out that by 1955 there were much higher levels of immigration than in 1944 and resentment/prejudice had become more typical by this date. Far fewer candidates were able to explain that Source A was made during the Second World War when immigrants from the West Indies were generally treated well as part of a united front against Nazi Germany. In fact, a number believed that Source A was produced post-war and tried to explain the positive attitude in terms of encouraging immigrants over to work in the NHS and rebuild Britain after the war. Candidates who set the sources in context in a valid and developed way were awarded with Level 4. Some candidates did attempt to explain why the sources differed because they were written 11 years apart, but failed to develop their explanations beyond that basic point – these responses were placed in Level 2. The very best candidates were able to point out that the sources were different not only because of the different context but because their purposes differed as well, Source A trying to persuade the public to accept immigrants as they were vital for the war effort, and the right-wing MP in Source B trying to stop immigration by making immigrants seem like a threat. These candidates reached Level 5.

Question No. 2

Candidates generally achieved far more highly on this question, which asked how useful Source C was about immigrants in Britain in the 1960s. Few candidates restricted themselves to using only surface detail of the source (Level 2). An impressive number of candidates made supported inferences from the content of the source about a variety of issues – discrimination, the colour bar, the contribution of immigrants and changing attitudes towards immigrants. These were awarded Level 4, resulting in most candidates achieving 6 or 7 out of 8 on this question. Candidates who focused less tightly on the question and argued that the source was or was not useful because it was reliable / unreliable and were able to support this with relevant detail from their contextual knowledge of the period were awarded Level 3. Only a few candidates were able to make an inference about the publication of the article itself and thus reach Level 5, although the responses which did fall into this category were notably well thought-out; some argued that the fact that this newspaper's decision to report the story in a positive light was very revealing about changing attitudes towards immigrants. Some candidates were able to recognise that the story could be seen as a publicity stunt by the bus company trying to restore its image after the protest; unfortunately, some then argued that this was not useful to historians at all!

Question No. 3

This question produced a variety of answers and a wider spread of marks. Only a minority of candidates believed the source was supportive of Powell or thought the photograph/graffiti was aimed at black people or immigrants. Most but not all candidates recognised the relevance of 1968 and explained the publication of the source in the context of Enoch Powell's 'Rivers of Blood' speech and/or racial tensions in that year. Many were able to go further and discuss the repercussions for Powell – his sacking by Heath and the dock workers marching in support of him. Responses which set the source in context but failed to explain the message or purpose of the source were placed in Level 2 and many candidates did not progress beyond that. Those who recognised that the paper was sending an anti-Powell message by choosing to publish the photograph (and who set this in the context of 1968) were rewarded at Level 3. Candidates at Level 4 and 5 expressed the purpose of the source in terms of its intended impact – to change people's minds about Powell or to ease racial tensions by uniting black and white people against Powell. The very best candidates at Level 5 recognised that the photograph – published in the dockland area of London – had a very specific audience and was therefore published to persuade the dock workers to change their minds about Powell, given their support for him.

Question No. 4

This question proved to be accessible for most candidates, with high numbers of responses being rewarded at Level 4 for recognising the main message of the cartoon – that employers were still getting away with racial discrimination. Candidates who set this within the context of the continuing discrimination of the 1970s (indeed, many were able to link the cartoon to the ineffectiveness of the 1968 Race Relations Act) rather than seeing the cartoon as being from any point 1939-75, achieved 7 marks within that level. An encouraging number of candidates were also able to set out the cartoonist's own viewpoint on this matter, ie that this continuing discrimination was not right or fair, and were awarded Level 5 and the top mark of 8. Candidates who explained a valid sub-message – most typically that there was still racism in general – were awarded with Level 3 and scored 4 or 5 marks. Only a tiny minority of candidates simply described the source or misinterpreted it completely.

Question No. 5

Where candidates were aware that the parameters of the final question had changed there were usually few problems. Most candidates in this category had strong contextual knowledge and used it well to explain how immigrants made a valuable contribution or not. The most common approach used for top level answers was to explain contributions thematically (some of the most common examples were help during the Second World War; contributions to post-war recovery and the establishment of the NHS/transport systems; and cultural enrichment). These responses then used relevant sources to extend explanations or emphasise the points made. The counter argument usually consisted of explaining how the reaction of some British citizens to immigration resulted in racial tension and violence, and explanations of how the discrimination and prejudice that immigrants faced throughout the period hampered their ability to make a full contribution. This was again supported by relevant use of relevant sources. The very best of the candidates developed a 'clinching argument' in their overall judgement and also gave examples covering the whole of the period 1939-75. Some candidates responded on a source by source basis. Such answers were limited to Level 2, although many responses did manage to raise their answers higher through an incidental use of their contextual knowledge which had been stimulated by the sources.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2015

