

HISTORY (US)

Paper 0416/11
Paper 11

Key messages

Candidates should read the questions very carefully in order to give themselves the opportunity to write focused, balanced and relevant answers. Any given dates in a question should be closely noted to help ensure that answers include only relevant material.

Part **(a)** questions require recall and description. Part **(b)** questions require recall and explanation, and part **(c)** questions require recall, explanation and analysis. In part **(c)** questions the most effective responses argue both for and against the focus of the question and also reach a valid judgement. A valid judgement will go beyond repeating what has already been stated in the response by addressing 'how far', 'how important', 'how successful' or 'to what extent', depending on the actual question set.

General comments

Many candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge of both the Core and the Depth Study for which they had been prepared. These candidates used their knowledge to good effect in writing well-developed explanations and arguments in answers to their chosen questions. Some candidates, whilst demonstrating sound and detailed factual knowledge, found it difficult to use their knowledge effectively to answer the actual question set. Parts **(b)** and **(c)** of the questions require understanding and explanation. Some candidates were able to identify numerous factors/reasons when answering their chosen questions, but were unable to develop these identified points into explanations. Candidates need to focus upon using their factual knowledge to explain events, rather than deploying a purely narrative approach. In part **(c)** answers candidates demonstrated that they were aware of how to structure balanced answers. Candidates need to ensure that they use their factual knowledge to substantiate the arguments they make; some candidates set out a clear argument and then needed to support this argument with relevant factual knowledge.

There were a number of rubric errors but on the whole, candidates used the time allocated effectively, with the majority completing the paper. A small number of candidates wrote over one page in response to a part **(a)** question; this appeared to impact upon the time then available to answer the remaining questions on the paper.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Question 1

- (a)** There were some detailed responses to this question, with candidates identifying the difficulties relating to minorities, the discontent of the people regarding Magyar being the official language, taxation and the members of the Hungarian Diet being mostly Magyar. Some candidates answered this question in very general terms only; points made need to be specific to the era and country given in the question.
- (b)** Explanations given in response to this question focused primarily on liberal beliefs that the new Pope shared their ideas for Italian independence. Candidates were able to identify a number of relevant points; these points needed to be developed into explanations.
- (c)** Responses to this question focused mainly on the success of the 1848 revolution in France in extending the franchise and creating the National Workshops; explanations of failure were focused

upon the discontent of certain groups with having to pay taxes to fund the National Workshop scheme, when they themselves received no benefit from the scheme. A number of candidates described the events of the actual revolution, rather than analysing its success and failure.

Question 2

- (a) Some candidates identified that Charles Albert's decision gave the Austrians time to organise reinforcements and that the people of Lombardy did not give the expected support to Charles Albert. A significant number of candidates wrote about Charles Albert's actions generally, rather than specifically about him delaying the invasion of Lombardy.
- (b) Explanations were focused mainly upon the importance of the relationship in agreeing the Treaty of Plombières. Some candidates identified a number of relevant points, including that Napoleon agreed to help Piedmont if it were attacked by Austria; these identifications needed to be developed into explanations by more candidates. A small number of candidates described who Cavour was, rather than focusing their answers on the question.
- (c) There were some effective answers to this question, with candidates explaining the importance of Mazzini in terms of the Young Italy movement and his appeal to the intellectuals in Italy, and the importance of Garibaldi with his expedition to Sicily and his liberation of Palermo. In better responses candidates developed points made into explanations. Some candidates wrote lengthy descriptions of Garibaldi's campaigns; these descriptions needed to be developed into explanations linking them to their importance in moving Italy towards unification.

Question 3

- (a) Some candidates demonstrated a detailed knowledge of John Brown's contribution to the abolitionist cause, giving a number of concisely expressed and relevant points, mainly centred on the events at Harper's Ferry. A small number of candidates wrote in general terms only, stating that John Brown was an abolitionist; this was mentioned in the question.
- (b) A number of candidates were able to identify that Lincoln was known for his anti-slavery views and that he was not on the ballot in the South. Both of these points were developed into explanations by a small number of candidates. Further identifications focused upon Lincoln having promised to raise tariffs and philosophical differences between Lincoln and the South.
- (c) There were some clear explanations of agreement with the statement in the question, focused upon the South's economic need to keep slavery and the North feeling that slavery was morally wrong. Overall explanations in agreement with the statement were stronger than those in disagreement. Some candidates explained that issues relating to trade also contributed to the outbreak of the Civil War; other candidates identified such points.

Question 4

- (a) A number of candidates gave clearly focused responses to this question, detailing points such as the size of Germany's army and navy, its developing empire and its industrial strength. The question clearly asked about Germany before 1914; some candidates gave details relating to Germany during the years of Nazi rule from 1933.
- (b) There were a number of clear explanations given, relating to Russia's rivalry with Austria-Hungary and also to Russia having the largest army. A number of responses gave detailed descriptions of Russia and its army and alliances; these responses would have been improved by reference to how these contributed to increasing tension between the Great Powers. Some responses focused on tension after 1914, which is not relevant to this particular question.
- (c) Most candidates were able to identify several relevant points on each side of the argument, such as the Kaiser sending a gunboat to Agadir, the humiliation of the Kaiser at the Algeiras Conference, the Kaiser testing the Entente Cordiale, German support for Austria in the Balkans and Russian support for Serbia. These identifications needed to be developed into explanations.

Question 5

- (a) There were many effective answers to this question, with candidates giving clear and focused details of the punishment given to Austria in the peace settlements of 1919–20. These usually focused upon limitations placed on the army, details of land losses and union between Austria and Germany being forbidden.
- (b) A number of candidates gave one clear explanation focused on Wilson’s desire to ensure world peace in the future. Most candidates were able to identify a number of reasons why Wilson wanted a ‘league of nations’; these identified points needed to be developed into explanations. Some candidates wrote at considerable length about the actions of the League of the Nations in the 1920s and the 1930s, which is not relevant to this particular question.
- (c) There were some effective answers to this question, with clear explanations given on both sides of the argument. Arguments in agreement with the statement in the question were focused primarily upon the failure of the Treaty of Sèvres, the creation of minority groups in new states and the long term effect of the Treaty of Versailles in contributing to the outbreak of World War Two. Arguments in disagreement with the hypothesis in the question focused mainly upon France feeling more secure and the creation of the League of Nations. A significant number of candidates wrote at some length about the terms of the various treaties forming the peace settlement of 1919–1920, without addressing the idea of failure.

Question 6

- (a) Many candidates were able to give at least one relevant point in response to this question, usually detailing that Lebensraum meant ‘living space’ and that it involved expansion eastwards. A number of candidates wrote about Hitler’s Greater Germany policy rather than Lebensraum.
- (b) There were some clear explanations given in response to this question, detailing that Hitler had taken Germany out of the League of Nations in 1933 so Hitler did not have to abide by their rules, and explaining that he viewed the League as weak as they had failed to stop the aggression of Japan and Italy. Some responses were focused on Chamberlain’s actions rather than on the League of Nations’ own policies. A number of candidates described at length Hitler’s actions in invading various countries, without closely addressing the question.
- (c) Effective answers to this question explained carefully that Hitler’s aggression meant that he invaded and occupied a number of different countries and that eventually war was the only way to stop him. On the other side of the argument explanations focused upon appeasement giving Hitler the confidence to continue with his aggressive foreign policy, and appeasement alienating the USSR. A number of candidates wrote at great length about the rationale for the policy of appeasement, rather than focusing upon the issue in the question. The question asked specifically about Hitler’s aggression and appeasement and their responsibility for war in 1939.

Question 7

- (a) Most responses to this question gave at least two relevant points, focused upon Soviet tanks and troops being sent into Hungary. Some responses also detailed what happened to Rakosi and Nagy. Some responses were generalised in nature; questions such as this one require a focused and specific response.
- (b) Answers were focused on the Berlin Wall being a symbol of division between East and West, it dividing families and also being a violation of agreements between East and West. Some responses developed these points into explanations. A number of responses were focused on the Berlin Blockade and the Berlin Airlift; this was not relevant to the question.
- (c) Some responses explained clearly that Solidarity showed that a united people could resist a Communist government, and then proceeded to link this to the decline of Soviet influence in Eastern Europe. On the other side of the argument, the withdrawal of Red army support and Gorbachev’s policies of perestroika and glasnost were explained. A significant number of candidates demonstrated that they had a detailed knowledge of Solidarity in Poland, and of Gorbachev’s policies of perestroika and glasnost; they described these in great detail. Better responses developed this knowledge to demonstrate an understanding of how these factors were responsible for the decline of Soviet influence in Eastern Europe.

Question 8

- (a) Relevant points made included Saddam Hussein's involvement with the Ba'ath Party, his involvement in assassination attempts and the support he gave to Bakr. Some responses focused solely upon Saddam Hussein's career after July 1968, which was not relevant to this question. Some candidates wrote generalised answers only, with no specific details given.
- (b) Responses identified that Saddam Hussein took eleven years to remove Bakr because he did not wish to appear as having presidential ambitions too soon, that he wanted to maintain Bakr's dignity and that he needed time to remove all those who could be a threat to him. Only a few responses developed these points into explanations; where identified points were expanded, it was usually with more description. It is essential that candidates develop identified points into explanations that are carefully focused on the question.
- (c) Effective responses to this question explained the importance of the personality cult in Saddam Hussein's consolidation of his dictatorship, detailing the exhibition about his life, the statues and paintings of him all over Iraq, and the positive portrayal of him in the media. On the other side of the argument, the use of terror and Saddam Hussein's modernisation programme were explained. A significant number of responses gave a variety of identified points only; development of these points into explanations would improve such answers.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

- (a) Candidates were able to identify a number of benefits Britain gained from its naval blockade of Germany, including the adverse effects on Germany's armaments industry, Germany struggling to feed her population, German morale decreasing and British morale increasing. Some responses gave just one relevant point about the effects of the blockade on Germany's ability to feed her population and then wrote more generally about the war.
- (b) Some candidates were able to identify relevant points, such as Britain being able to maintain control of the North Sea and being able to continue with the blockade of the north German coast. These identifications were developed into explanations in strong responses. A number of candidates wrote in general terms only, saying the Battle of Jutland was important because ships were lost at sea.
- (c) It was clear that some candidates had a detailed knowledge of the convoy system and other methods of dealing with the U-boat threat, such as Q ships and mines. These methods were described in detail. Candidates needed to develop their answers by explaining exactly the reasons why each method was or was not effective in tackling the U-boat threat.

Question 10

- (a) There were some concise and focused responses to this question, detailing the attack on the 'Lusitania', the Zimmerman Telegram and American public opinion. In some instances, the question was answered in very general terms only; candidates are expected to know the reasons why America decided to enter the war.
- (b) Some candidates were able to give one clear explanation focused upon the offensive being launched as one final attempt by Germany to win the war. Others gave a number of identified points, such as the impending arrival of the Americans to help the Allies, the problems at home in Germany and the failure of the submarine campaign to knock Britain out of the war.
- (c) A small number of candidates explained the significance of the Kiel Mutiny in ensuring the abdication of the Kaiser, and then proceeded to explain the suffering of the German people during World War One as another reason why the Kaiser had to abdicate. Most candidates who answered this question were able to identify some relevant points, such as the food shortages in Germany, the abdication being the only way to prevent civil war in Germany and the abdication being a condition for peace. Some candidates appeared to be unaware of the details relating to the Kiel Mutiny.

Question 11

- (a) There were a number of effective answers to this question, with relevant points such as the desire to overthrow Ebert's moderate government, to have a revolution like the Russian Revolution and to have the working classes controlling society. Some candidates focused their answers upon the events of the Spartacist uprising rather than detailing what the Spartacists wanted to achieve.
- (b) Candidates on the whole knew what proportional representation was and were able to describe it. Some candidates identified that proportional representation led to many coalition governments and allowed extremist parties to be represented in the Reichstag. A small number of candidates gave one or two clear explanations of why proportional representation was a weakness, usually focused on the number of coalition governments and the inherent problems this caused, and the platform given to extremist parties.
- (c) Effective answers to this question explained the cultural achievements of the Weimar Republic with reference to the lifting of censorship and the development of expressionism, meaning there was freedom to develop new ideas in a variety of areas. On the other side of the argument, explanations were given of economic achievements such as the ending of hyperinflation and the introduction of a new currency, and the negotiation of the Dawes Plan. Explanation also focused on Germany being accepted back into the international community. On the whole, explanations of achievements other than cultural were more developed; some candidates gave detailed explanations of economic achievements and only identified that there were new developments in art and the theatre, for example.

Question 12

- (a) Effective answers to this question detailed the work of the police in contributing to Nazi control through the tapping of telephones, the interception of mail and a network of informers, which all helped to find those who were disloyal to the Nazi regime. With reference to the courts, relevant points included judges and magistrates being biased as they had taken an oath of loyalty to Hitler, the setting up of the People's Court to try enemies of the state, and the punishments meted out by the courts. Some candidates did not take note of the word 'and' in the question, and only wrote about the police or the courts rather than both, as directed by the question.
- (b) There were some clearly focused responses to this question, with explanations of mass rallies being a propaganda opportunity, a way of encouraging loyalty and support for the Nazi regime and a way of reinforcing the personality cult of Hitler. Some candidates described what happened at the rallies, rather than explaining why the Nazis organised them
- (c) A number of candidates wrote effective responses to this question, detailing Hitler's control through propaganda, censorship, the Hitler Youth, education and fear. Some also detailed positive control through the use of Strength through Joy and the Beauty of Labour. Lack of total control was explained through a consideration of the activities of people in the church like Cardinal Galen and Pastor Niemöller, and the attitude of young people within groups such as the Swing Movement and the Edelweiss Pirates. Many candidates demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the methods of control used by Hitler and the Nazis, and also of the opposition which meant that Hitler did not have total control. This knowledge needed to be used to construct focused explanations, rather than writing a narrative.

Question 13

- (a) Relevant points given in response to this question included peasant uprisings and the killing of landlords, details of various strikes, the Potemkin Mutiny and university candidates staging a walkout.
- (b) A number of candidates identified that Stolypin was important because he used the 'carrot and stick' approach, and because he introduced reforms to help improve the lives of peasants. These identifications needed to be developed into explanations of why this meant Stolypin was important to the Tsarist regime.

- (c) There was evidence that some candidates had a detailed knowledge of reasons for the collapse of Tsarist rule in 1917. Explanations of the loss of support from the armed forces focused upon the Tsar's failure as commander-in-chief of the army, soldiers refusing to obey orders and soldiers shooting their own officers. Other factors were also explained clearly, such as the actions of the Tsarina, the role of Rasputin, the effects of strikes on the economy and the food shortages throughout the country. Some candidates used their knowledge to describe events, for example, writing at some length about Rasputin's relationship with the Tsarina, without explaining why this was important in the collapse of Tsarist rule in 1917.

Question 14

- (a) Relevant points made included the decision of the Provisional Government to continue the war, the failure to solve the food shortages, the failure to carry out land reform and the problems ensuing as a result of the Kerensky Offensive. Some responses were generalised in nature, with no reference made to the specific criticisms made of the Provisional Government by its opponents.
- (b) Some candidates were able to identify that many leading Bolsheviks had already been arrested and that Lenin thought his own life was in danger. A small number of candidates developed these identifications into explanations. A number of candidates wrote about events from October 1917; these were not relevant to this question.
- (c) There were some highly effective responses to this question, with clear explanations given of the disunity amongst the Whites, their lack of discipline and the White generals failing to co-ordinate their attacks. Disagreement with the statement in the question focused upon the Reds having control of the railways and the large industrial centres, and the skill of Trotsky as commander of the Red Army. Some candidates gave a response based on only one side of the argument; for stronger answers, candidates must ensure that they consider both sides of the argument.

Question 15

- (a) Relevant points given included that investors' shares became worthless, that investors went bankrupt and that investors lost confidence in the American economy. Some responses focused on the consequences of the Wall Street Crash generally, rather than specifically for individual investors, as asked in the question. A few candidates described the Wall Street Crash in detail, without a clear focus on the actual question.
- (b) A number of candidates were able to give at least one explanation in response to this question. Explanations were focused upon Roosevelt travelling during his election campaign to meet ordinary people and to share with them his ideas for a new deal, and the contrast between Roosevelt and Hoover, with the perception of Hoover as being uncaring. Most candidates were able to give at least two valid identifications, usually identifying that people thought Hoover did not care about them and that Roosevelt inspired confidence with his ideas.
- (c) Effective answers to this question explained that limited export markets caused problems because American producers were left with goods they could not sell, and on the other side of the argument, gave explanations of the unequal distribution of wealth and the low incomes of many Americans. A number of candidates wrote about the weaknesses of the American economy after the Wall Street Crash, when the question asked about the weaknesses prior to the Wall Street Crash.

Question 16

- (a) Relevant points made included the use of dams to control flooding and to help irrigate the land, the planting of trees to improve soil and the production of cheap electricity. Most candidates were able to give at least two relevant points.
- (b) Responses to this question included relevant identifications such as the perception that Roosevelt was behaving as a dictator, that his policies were unconstitutional and that the Supreme Court had the ultimate power to block any measures introduced by Roosevelt. A few candidates developed one of these identifications into an explanation. Some candidates described opposition to Roosevelt's New Deal generally, rather than explaining why Roosevelt was unable to deal effectively with the Supreme Court's opposition to the New Deal.

- (c) Effective answers to this question explained that racial discrimination was not ended by the New Deal, focusing on segregation still occurring, and the failure to pass an anti-lynching law. On the other side of the argument, explanations were focused upon the failure of the New Deal to end unemployment, inequality in the workplace for women and the poverty still experienced by so many people, especially in rural America. Most candidates attempting this question were able to give at least two valid identifications; these needed to be developed into explanations.

Questions 17 to 19

The limited number of responses to these questions prevents useful comment.

Question 20

- (a) Relevant points made in response to this question included the Black Consciousness Movement wanting people to be proud of black history and culture, and encouraging people to break free from apartheid. A number of candidates appeared to be unsure of the details of the aims of the Black Consciousness Movement.
- (b) Some candidates demonstrated an awareness that Oliver Tambo established ANC offices in foreign countries and that he played a role in keeping the ANC together during the later years of apartheid. These points were identified rather than explained. Some candidates wrote in general terms only, stating that Oliver Tambo helped the ANC.
- (c) Some candidates were able to identify relevant points in response to this question, citing that the ANC called on people to make South Africa ungovernable, that government buildings were attacked, and they also identified the role of MK in the violence of the 1980s and the early 1990s. Some answers were very general in nature and did not refer to specific historical events.

Question 21

- (a) Responses to this question included relevant points such as Nasser gaining complete control of the Suez Canal, the removal of the blockade of the Tiran Straits and Nasser's prestige increasing. Some candidates were able to answer the question in general terms only.
- (b) Some candidates were able to identify various activities of the Palestine Liberation Organisation between 1967 and 1976 that caused tension, such as the hijacking of an Israeli passenger plane in 1968 and the attack on Israeli athletes at the 1972 Munich Olympics. In stronger answers, these identifications were developed into explanations.
- (c) Responses included the identification of examples of superpower involvement in conflict in the Middle East, such as the USA replacing Israeli tanks in the Yom Kippur War, the USSR giving financial aid to Egypt, and the Arab states using the weapon of oil to influence the actions of the USA. Some successful responses were seen; others needed to develop these identifications into explanations.

Question 22

The limited number of responses to this question prevents useful comment.

HISTORY (US)

Paper 0416/21
Paper 21

Key messages

- At the start of the examination, candidates should take time to read carefully through all the sources.
- Candidates should use the time available efficiently, answering all the questions in their chosen option, and taking care not to run short of time on **Question 6**, which carries the most marks of all the questions.
- Candidates should directly answer the questions they are asked. If asked why something happened, reasons must be given. If candidates are asked to explain whether or not they are surprised, they should say what they find surprising and why. The same, direct approach, applies to the other types of question on the examination paper.

General comments

Most candidates produced complete scripts, consisting of positive responses to all the questions. The level of comprehension of the sources was good, as was knowledge of the context in which the sources are set. Questions offering opportunities for source evaluation were often answered effectively. Although most answers were properly focused on the question, there were candidates who commented on source reliability in almost every question. Whether or not you can believe what a source says is only relevant in certain questions – typically those asking about proof, trust, surprise – whilst in others, such as those asking for comparisons or messages, it is generally unnecessary. The other way that lack of focus can occur is when answers don't directly address the question. This might be, for example, where the question asks why something was published at a certain time, but the candidate's answer doesn't provide a reason.

There were many fewer responses to the nineteenth-century option. Generally, the quality of responses was stronger on the twentieth century option.

Comments on specific questions

Option A – 19th century topic

Question 1

This question asked what impressions could be derived from Source A about events leading to the Franco-Prussian War. This was inviting inferences that could be made from the source. Some candidates simply repeated parts of the source. No matter how relevant to the War, this could not be seen as an adequate response. There were also valid inferences that didn't deal with the main message of the source, such as France wanting revenge for being cheated in 1866. Better answers did not merely spot the inference, but also supported it from the source content. However, a good number of candidates saw that the overall inference to be drawn from the source was that Prussia was the most responsible for increasing tensions before 1870.

Question 2

Sources B and C contained both agreements and disagreements, and for almost all candidates the issue of whether Bismarck was lying in Source B was determined simply by face-value comparison of what the two sources said. Thus, in Source B Bismarck says there will be war with France before

long, whilst in Source C he says there will be peace for ten or fifteen years, so he must be lying. Alternatively, in Source B he says he will never advise the King to wage war and in Source C he says he will do all he can to prevent war, so therefore he is telling the truth. A small number of stronger answers moved beyond this to question the reliability of what Bismarck was claiming. For example, if Bismarck was planning to go to war with France, would he reveal this in an interview with a British journalist?

Question 3

Most candidates seemed unaware of the Luxembourg crisis of 1867, and therefore struggled to use Source D effectively. Without specific contextual awareness, answers could only be based on the content of the source, interpreted in a much more general context of Bismarck's plans for German unification. Some valid reasons were given based on messages of the source; for example, that it was published to show that Bismarck would protect Germany against France. However, answers which had the specific knowledge to interpret the source properly, or to suggest possible purposes the cartoonist might have had in mind, were the strongest.

Question 4

Some contextual knowledge would have improved a number of responses to this question. Those candidates who knew about the Ems Telegram were able to explain why the drastic change illustrated by the differences between Sources E and F had occurred, and were therefore unsurprised by it. Other answers were based on the fact that Source E shows the French wanting peace, but three days later in Source F they want war, which on the face of it is surprising. There were a few answers that neglected to address the question directly, and never stated whether or not they were surprised.

Question 5

It was possible for candidates to produce plausible misinterpretations of Source G. The most common was to think that the cartoon was predicting Prussian defeat. The fact that it shows 'the war dead' argues against this, and suggests that it applies to the actual fighting in August 1870. There were sub-messages that candidates identified, most obviously that the war had caused many casualties. However, a full interpretation needed to encompass both the dead and 'Bismarck's nightmare'. It was reasonable to see the nightmare as Bismarck regretting the casualties, or not having foreseen them. The very best answers pushed this idea a little further and saw that the cartoonist was blaming Bismarck for what was happening.

Question 6

This question always asks candidates to test a hypothesis against the evidence offered by the sources on the paper. There will always be some evidence to support, and some to question, the hypothesis. However, some candidates either just agreed or just disagreed with the hypothesis and found evidence on only that side. There were also answers that did not deal adequately with the sources, generally grouping them and just asserting whether or not they agreed. The task is to find evidence in the sources and to use this to illustrate how it shows agreement or disagreement. For example, it would not be sufficient to say '*Source F does not support the idea that Prussia was responsible for the war. It says France was.*' It would be necessary to show how Source F does this: '*.....because it says that Paris was gripped by war fever and that people who supported peace were shouted down by the mob.*' The best responses to this question took each source in turn, and showed how the source either supported or did not support the hypothesis. There are still a few candidates who think the question is about the hypothesis, rather than about the evidence (about the hypothesis) offered by the sources. These candidates wrote essays about the events but did not use the sources very much, if at all. This was not a valid approach to the question.

Option B – 20th century topic

Question 1

This question asked candidates to compare two sources to determine how far they agreed. The sources contained plenty of agreements and disagreements, and most candidates were able to find

some. However, the nature of the sources required candidates to be careful about how exactly they matched them. For example, both sources made claims about the reactions of the French to proposals for the League of Nations. It was possible to match on the basis of what French liberals thought, but not on French socialists or conservatives, both of whom were mentioned in only one of the sources. It was also possible to show a difference between the two sources on Clemenceau's attitude. Similar details had to be noted on what the extract said about the Americans or the British, and their leaders. Candidates who generalised about the sources tended to miss the detail required for proper matching. A few stronger answers tried to see the overall messages of the sources, and view them as a whole. It was certainly possible to suggest that the sources did agree that overall prospects for the League were uncertain.

Question 2

Although many candidates were able to deal effectively with this question, there was evidence that others had problems in comprehending the sources in the context of early 1919. The reference to the 'Commission' in Source D was sometimes taken to mean a commission of the League. It was commonly assumed that the League was already in existence. The specific claims in the sources sometimes deflected candidates away from the main messages; for example, the claim in Source C that the Covenant was the work of so many Englishmen. In short, many candidates found comparing the sources, even on the basis of face-value comprehension, quite challenging. For those that could comprehend and compare the sources, it was generally the case that finding a contradiction was in itself proof that Source C was wrong, or, more rarely, concluding that the sources agreed and therefore Source C was right. Some candidates, though, were able to add some source evaluation to their analysis. They would provide the comparison, but their judgement on whether Source C was right would be based on whether one could believe it (or disbelieve Source D). Cross-references to other sources to resolve this issue, particularly to Sources A and B which had been used in the previous question, were quite common, but the sources could also be analysed on the basis of contextual knowledge of the differing views of the British and French about the forthcoming peace settlement.

Question 3

The question asked why the cartoon was published, so answers had to include reasons for publication. Some candidates managed to interpret the cartoon satisfactorily, but forgot to give a reason. Reasons could be based on context, on the messages of the cartoon, or on the possible purposes of the cartoonist, but without a reason, the question was not being properly answered. The cartoon could be interpreted in two entirely contrasting ways – optimistic or pessimistic about the League's prospects. Either way, the cartoon was saying that the League had high aspirations. A full interpretation required both the prospects and the aspirations to be included, and many candidates were able to give a reason which did this. Others managed either the prospects or the aspirations – not quite so good as a response. The best answers moved beyond the cartoon's messages to a consideration of why, at this time, the cartoonist might have wished the audience to see them; in other words, to a consideration of the cartoonist's purpose. The line most commonly taken was that the cartoonist was a supporter of the League and would therefore want to win over public opinion.

Question 4

This question was answered well by most candidates. The source was well understood, and this fed through into the quality of the responses. Contextual knowledge of the French attitude to peace-making was also good, and was used to inform many answers. Almost all candidates were able at the least to provide reasons based upon what Bourgeois wanted to tell Wilson, but very commonly this was supplemented with knowledge of what the French had experienced during the war, and what they wanted to avoid in future. The best answers could extend this kind of analysis into reasons based on Bourgeois' purpose, in other words into explaining what he wanted to get Wilson to do. The most common of these reasons was to ensure Wilson would agree to the League having a proper armed force with which to deal with future aggressors.

Question 5

There was a clear contradiction between Sources G and H. Source G said the League stood for peace, but Source H shows leaders of the league sowing the seeds of future wars. If this contradiction was spotted, candidates were generally ready to concede that Source H was indeed surprising. It was also possible to claim that the sources agreed that the League's purpose was to promote peace, and that therefore Source H was not surprising. However, not all candidates were able to do this matching of content. Source H in particular produced some miscomprehension, with candidates struggling to see the relevance of Eastern and Western hemispheres. Better candidates went beyond content matching, to question the reliability of the sources, and used their knowledge of American attitudes towards the League to explain that the sources simply reflected the pro- and anti- attitudes of their authors, and so disagreement between them was only to be expected.

Question 6

This question always asks candidates to test a hypothesis against the evidence offered by the sources on the paper. There will always be some evidence to support, and some to question, the hypothesis. However, some candidates either just agreed or just disagreed with the hypothesis and found evidence on only that side. There were also answers that did not deal adequately with the sources, generally grouping them and just asserting whether or not they agreed. The task is to find evidence in the sources and to use this to illustrate how it shows agreement or disagreement. For example, it would not be sufficient to say *'Source E does not support the idea that the League had little support from the beginning, because the cartoonist obviously supported it.'* It would be necessary to show how Source E does this: *'.....because it shows how the League will have a great future and work for the abolition of war.'* Better responses to this question took each source in turn and showed how the source either did or did not support the hypothesis. A few candidates misinterpreted the wording of the hypothesis and thought they had to judge whether the League had a little or a lot of support. There are still a few candidates who think the question is about the hypothesis, rather than about the evidence (about the hypothesis) offered by the sources. These candidates wrote essays about the events but did not use the sources very much, if at all. This was not a valid approach to the question.

HISTORY (US)

Paper 0416/03
Coursework

Key messages

Titles are crucial. They need to be appropriate to enable candidates to demonstrate the necessary skills and understandings.

It is important that candidates understand they need to assess significance in its broadest sense. This means that they need to ask themselves how far someone or something was significant for different reasons and in different ways.

It is also helpful if candidates understand that they need to assess significance, rather than simply explain or describe it. They should attempt to do this throughout their answers and leave out passages of description, narrative or background.

Candidates often claim that someone or something is significant because it led to a particular outcome. They also need to assess how far the outcome mattered.

General comments

The overall standard of the work was high, with many candidates using appropriate titles and demonstrating a good understanding of how to assess significance. The Germany Depth Study was used by most centres but the Depth Studies on the USA and Russia were also used. A small number of centres developed their own Depth Studies for coursework. These enabled the centres to study aspects of their own local or national history. Some very interesting work was produced.

Nearly all centres carried out the administration of their coursework efficiently. The appropriate forms were correctly completed and the requested sample of work was promptly dispatched, often with helpful letters explaining the context in which the coursework was taught and completed.

Comments on specific questions

Although there were a few titles this year that did not focus on significance at all, most of the titles were appropriate and worked well. Those that worked best were worded 'Assess the significance of X' or were very similar to this. The advantages of this type of title are that it puts the focus on assessment and is open. Naming an outcome is deliberately avoided. If a title asks 'How significant was X in helping Hitler to consolidate his power?' this openness is lost. Such a title puts the focus on the consolidation of power instead of on 'X' and will lead many candidates into a causation-style answer, where they compare the importance of a range of factors that contributed to the consolidation of power. This is not what is required. The first type of title mentioned above allows candidates to consider the different ways in which 'X' may have been significant. They can use a range of criteria to help them do this and they can assess whether it was more significant in some ways than in others. Titles such as 'Explain the significance of X' or 'How was X significant' encourage candidates to explain how someone/something was significant, rather than assess how far it was significant.

The choice of subject is important. Some work better than others. Some can simply be too big and often overwhelm the candidates. The title 'Assess the significance of Hitler' follows the approach advocated earlier and has been seen to work, but it involves a massive topic making it hard for candidates to control and organise. It would also be rather difficult to argue that Hitler was of little significance. Subjects of a medium size often worked best – not too large to control and get on top of, but large enough to raise a range of

possible approaches and arguments. Excellent work has been seen this year on topics such as the Reichstag Fire, the Munich Putsch, the New Deal, Prohibition and the 1905 revolution in Russia.

The one exception to these comments about titles is if the focus is to be on 'the idea of a 'turning point'. However, the same format can be used, for example, 'Assess how far X was a turning point.'

There were many excellent answers this year and the overall standard was very high, demonstrating a good understanding of the concept of significance and of the approaches used to assess it. The best answers were well organised, with a consistent focus on assessment of significance. It was significant that this assessment was not left to conclusions at the end of the answers but was present throughout the responses. They contained little description, narrative or long introductions. Good knowledge and understanding of the historical period was used to support arguments and conclusions. A significant feature of these answers was that they took the form of an argument about significance which gradually built and developed. There was a sense that the candidates were in control and knew exactly where they were going. They investigated different ways in which their subject might or might not be significant, using argument and counter-argument. One way in which these answers were distinguishable from less successful ones was that they made effective use of counter-argument to explore arguments that their subject was not so significant. Other answers simply gave lots of examples of how their subjects were significant. The best answers also demonstrated some understanding that judgements about significance are provisional and can change according to the criteria used to measure significance. These answers often showed candidates developing their own ideas and taking some risks, often using ideas such as 'turning point' and 'tipping point'. There were often conclusions that compared the different ways in which their subjects were significant and reached supported, argued overall judgements.

Although candidates are encouraged to use a range of criteria to measure significance, these criteria should not be used mechanically, nor should they be listed at the beginning of answers and then not revisited. Candidates need to choose the criteria and approaches that they think are most appropriate for their subject.

The best answers did not base judgements about significance simply on what an individual did or achieved, or on the results of an event or development. Instead, they investigated why these achievements or results mattered. This might be in an economic, political, social or cultural sense. Long and short-term impact might be considered. It might involve assessing the impact on different groups and considering the depth, breadth and duration of the impact. Some candidates produced some very interesting work by asking whether failures could be significant. In contrast to answers that tended to repeat more predictable arguments, much of the best work focused on assessments of significance, used interesting ideas and took some risks with arguments which were fresh and genuinely based on the candidates' own ideas.

Most centres correctly used the generic mark scheme which can be found in the syllabus booklet. This mark scheme should be used exactly as it is and should not be adapted. It should be used holistically. Candidates' answers also need to be considered as whole with their overall qualities then matched to the overall demands of one of the levels in the mark scheme. Exact matches are not expected and so a 'best-fit' approach needs to be used.

Overall, the marking this year was accurate, although some centres had their marks adjusted. Many centres provided very useful detailed marginal and summative comments on their candidates' work. Marginal comments are most useful when they identify key features of an answer such as passages of description or effective assessment. The summative comments should be used to explain why a certain level has been awarded and direct reference to the features of the level should be made.