

# HISTORY (US)

---

Paper 0416/11

Paper 11

## General Comments and Key Messages

A significant majority of answers to this year's questions reflected sound understanding and good knowledge, supported by a wealth of factual detail. Candidates expressed themselves clearly and put the great deal of information they possessed to good use in the part **(a)** questions which reward recall and description. Many candidates answered these questions in the form of a short paragraph, which was an appropriate approach, and they grasped, correctly, that explanation is not required for these questions.

The best answers to part **(b)** and **(c)** questions applied knowledge precisely to what the question was asking, rather than writing lengthy introductions which 'set the scene', or which include information lacking in relevance. Candidates were able to gain some credit for the identification of relevant 'why' factors but the highest marks were awarded to answers which went further and developed each factor fully, thereby meeting the exact demands of the question.

It is encouraging to note that a significant number of responses to part **(c)** questions not only tried to argue both sides of the topic (both agreeing and disagreeing with the given interpretation), but also attempted to arrive at a judgement in the conclusion. Candidates should try to avoid repeating points already made in the essay and instead explain and analyse how far the argument both supports and disagrees with the focus of the question. Better responses achieved this. Some conclusions confined themselves to just asserting 'how far', rather than explaining which side of the argument is stronger than the other.

## Comments on Specific Questions

### Section A - Core Content

#### Questions 1-3

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

#### Question 4

Answers to part **(a)** tended to include general points about the growth of the British navy and the signing of an agreement with France, rather than more specific details about Britain's preparations for war. Credit was given for the building of dreadnoughts, the tactical development of the BEF and Territorial Army, and the military negotiations which grew out of the Entente Cordiale. There was some confusion in part **(b)** when candidates mixed up the details of the 1905 and 1911 Moroccan crises; answers did explain why the Kaiser was angry about French interests in Morocco and the tension which ensued after he was forced to back down at the Algeiras Conference. Part **(c)** attracted some good knowledge of the assassination at Sarajevo and Austria's ultimatum. Some answers were, however, unbalanced, because details of alternative causes of the First World War were only dealt with in a superficial manner.

### Question 5

This was a popular question. There were many good answers to part **(a)** which was not about Germany's land losses, but about alternative efforts to limit the power of Germany. Answers concentrated on specific examples of disarmament and reparations, gaining high marks. In part **(b)**, the reasons why Lloyd George argued with Clemenceau and Wilson was the focus of the question. The best responses referred to disagreements with France over the harsh treatment of Germany, and Lloyd George's clash with Wilson over specific elements of the Fourteen Points, such as self-determination. When each of these identified points were explained, it was possible to award higher marks. In other responses, candidates narrated the aims of the Big Three, rather than focussing on the demands of the question. Part **(c)** proved challenging to some candidates, and some answers appeared to be answering the question 'how fair was the Treaty of Versailles?' rather than the question set; nevertheless, some good responses were seen. Some wrote about the terms of the Treaty of Versailles and the impact that it had on Germany in the 1920s. Coverage could have included evidence to show how justified the treaties were, such as the perceived need to reduce the future threat to peace from Germany on the one hand, and how reasonable was it to punish Germany harshly, on the other. Credit was given for material from the other peace treaties signed with Germany's allies.

### Question 6

In part **(a)** there were some sound descriptions of the difficulties Britain and France faced as the leaders of the League. Good answers focused on the absence of the USA, how the First World War weakened Britain and France and their consequent reluctance to use military power to deal with conflict. Candidates seemed well prepared for part **(b)**, and they were able to show why the USA, as well as Germany and the USSR, did not join the League, either through their own choice or because they weren't invited. Some took this a stage further and commented in detail about the domestic situation in each country which resulted in their absence. In part **(c)**, there was evidence of good knowledge of the Abyssinian crisis and there were many creditable attempts to show how it led to the demise of the League. Explanations needed to include specific details of alternative factors; better responses avoided just writing a narrative list of the League's weaknesses, and were able to link each point as to why the League eventually failed.

### Question 7

Candidates knew the more obvious points about the problems which arose at the Potsdam conference in part **(a)**, such as the clash between Truman and Stalin. A significant number of answers to part **(b)** were general descriptions of Soviet expansion into Europe. Two or three valid developed points about the Soviet Union wanting to expand communism, to have more control over its neighbours and its search for security, would have secured very high marks. Part **(c)** answers sometimes lacked balance; it was important to read the question carefully and limit responses to the impact of Western policies on Soviet expansion. Which policies had more success than others and why? Better candidates were able to balance the effects of the Truman Doctrine, Marshall Plan and the Berlin Airlift, avoiding narrative accounts of events. In an attempt to maintain balance, some were able to explain why the West failed because the Soviet Union maintained its grip on much of Eastern Europe.

### Question 8

It was rare to see a poor answer to part **(a)**; most candidates included details such as the stopping of free movement, divided families, how people were denied access to the opportunities in West Berlin and the dangers of trying to cross the Wall without permission. Part **(b)**, in contrast, could have been better answered, with more extensive contextual knowledge. Credit was given for developing points such as the government underestimating the political threat which Solidarity posed, the charismatic leadership of Lech Walesa, the support he gained from the Catholic Church and the ambivalent attitude of the Soviet Union. Some responses to part **(c)** would have benefitted from greater balance; although candidates recounted in detail how Gorbachev's reforms undermined Soviet control in Eastern Europe, arguments about the low standard of living were too generalised – specific examples about high food prices (such as meat), poor housing and the lack of luxury goods (compared with the West) were needed to support the explanation.

## Section B – Depth Studies

### Question 9

In part **(a)** some answers featured descriptions of the SA which were limited in scope; others met the demands of the question by concentrating on ‘activities’. Candidates needed to be secure about specific details when asked to explain the rise of Hitler to the position of Chancellor in 1933, as required by part **(b)**. In some answers there was a lack of balance as candidates concentrated on the ways the Nazis exploited the Depression, linking propaganda and votes to promises to help alleviate the worst effects of unemployment. To gain higher marks, an understanding of the political crisis and subsequent negotiations relating to Hindenburg, Papen and Schleicher were required, as they are central to the offer made to Hitler to become Chancellor. This latter aspect appeared less well known. In contrast, part **(c)** was well answered, as there was good understanding of the impact of the Reichstag Fire, balanced by explanations of the Enabling Law and the Night of the Long Knives, in consolidating Hitler’s hold on power.

### Question 10

Part **(a)** posed few problems and there was good knowledge of the Night of the Long Knives. It was also rare to see poor answers to part **(b)**; the ‘importance’ of propaganda was usually defined in terms of ‘impact’, which was a sound approach. Most candidates avoided lengthy narratives about ‘how’ the Nazis spread propaganda, and were able to relate their ideas to the specific explanation demanded by the question. Many candidates were able to apply relevant knowledge to both sides of the part **(c)** question and this resulted in high marks. The effective activities of the police state were used as evidence of oppression, while explanation of the ‘opposition’ such as church leaders, Edelweiss Pirates and the Navajos Gang gave these answers balance.

### Question 11

Candidates knew a great deal about the nature of peasant life in part **(a)**. Answers to part **(b)** would have benefited from being fuller and from containing more specific knowledge. The question was looking for a precise explanation of the problems caused by revolutionaries amongst the industrialised and rural working class by the Russo-Japanese War and the 1905 Revolution. Answers to part **(c)** revealed some knowledge of the Dumas, the policies pursued by Stolypin, and the increased prosperity of, for example, the Kulaks.

### Question 12

Many good answers to this question were seen. There was secure knowledge of the Great Terror in part **(a)**, and the importance of the Purges in part **(b)**. Stalin’s insecurities and sense of personal threat were well known, although sometimes they lacked detail about ‘Old Bolsheviks’, army generals, show trials and specific individuals. Part **(c)** answers were often effectively argued, if unbalanced, with sound analysis of the cult of the personality against a background of poor living and working conditions. Answers encompassing the latter tended to be more superficial.

### Question 13

Part **(a)** was well answered. Many candidates could correctly identify social effects such as unemployment, Hoovervilles, soup kitchens, loss of farms and savings. Responses to part **(b)** required an analysis of structural difficulties in the economy such as weak demand for agricultural products or the output from traditional industries. Explanations of the Wall Street Crash were not required. For part **(c)**, answers focused on Roosevelt’s appeal and tended to be one-sided. Successful responses maintain a balanced approach to part **(c)** questions such as this; in this case, specific knowledge of the impact of Hoover’s treatment of the Bonus Marchers on his reputation before the 1932 election was required.

### Question 14

Part **(a)** was generally very well answered, with details of the Emergency Banking Act, the four day closure and offer of government grants to restore confidence. The successes of the NIRA were less well known in part **(b)**; two developed explanations of the importance of the PWA, and of the NRA, including how they helped the recovery, would have improved many responses. Answers to part **(c)** focused on the Republicans’ insistence on ‘rugged individualism’ and ‘laissez-faire’, rather than on the Supreme Court or the views of radical leaders. This limited the credit awarded, as the ‘other side of the argument’ was not addressed in such answers.

### Questions 15–19

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

### Question 20

The problems of Jewish migration and the violent nature of the clash between Palestinian Arabs and Jews attracted some strong responses in part **(a)**. Similarly, candidates were able to explain in some detail the problems faced by Britain in Palestine in part **(b)**. Better answers analysed the impact of the Second World War on Britain, the violence of the Irgun campaign and the pressure on the British government to change its policy towards Holocaust survivors and hand the problem over to the UN. In part **(c)**, candidates applied their knowledge of Jewish determination to create a homeland on the one hand, and explained the relative weakness of the Arabs (when compared to Israel's military strength) on the other, to gain high marks.

### Question 21

There were some impressive answers to part **(a)**, with evidence of detailed knowledge of Nasser's actions immediately prior to the outbreak of war in 1967. Part **(b)** revealed good understanding of the reasons for the attack on Israel in 1973; developed answers explained Sadat's motives, the issue of occupied territories and land lost in 1967, and the timing of the attacks at the start of a Jewish religious festival. Two valid fully explained factors were given by many candidates. Part **(c)** gave many candidates the opportunity to use their knowledge of Israel's military superiority and a range of alternative arguments, to explain its survival in the period 1956–73. The latter point included support from the US, and Arab mistakes and lack of co-ordination. Developed explanations in support of, and in challenge to the statement, attracted high marks. The best responses went further, and included an evaluation and explanation of 'how far' it was military superiority compared to other factors.

### Questions 22–25

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

# HISTORY (US)

---

Paper 0416/21

Paper 21

## General Comments and Key Messages

The overwhelming majority of candidates answered on the twentieth century option. The general standard of answers was high. Strengths included: detailed knowledge used to effectively analyse sources, detailed comparison of sources, and interpreting cartoons. A number of candidates spent much time paraphrasing or describing sources before addressing the question in a few lines at the end of their answers. Candidates should try and consider the purpose of sources carefully. Working out the purpose of a source can lead to good answers in several different types of questions. It was also surprising to see so many candidates writing one-sided answers to **Question 6**. Better candidates were able to explain how some sources supported the hypothesis and how other sources disagreed with it.

Candidates should try to read and interpret sources as a whole. When they are asked to interpret sources they should try to avoid basing their answers on just one aspect of a source. They should ask themselves 'what is the overall point of view of the author or cartoonist?' This is just as important with written sources as it is with cartoons. Also, it is vital that candidates read questions carefully and think about what a question is asking them to do. Although many candidates managed to interpret the sources and approach the questions appropriately, others neglected to address the actual question asked. Answers to comparison questions need to be based on comparisons, questions asking whether candidates are surprised by a source, or whether they believe a source, must produce a clear answer to this – 'yes', or 'no'. They should then use the rest of their answer to support this. Answers to questions about why a source was published should explain how their analysis of the source can be used as an explanation of publication.

## Comments on Specific Questions

Option A: 19th century topic

### Question 1

There were a number of agreements and disagreements of detail between Sources A and B and many candidates managed to find at least some of these. The best candidates focused on the overall difference – that Source A suggests the working classes were more important, while Source B suggests that it was the middle classes who mattered more.

### Question 2

Most candidates were able to explain that the cartoonist's message is that the revolutions were threatening the existence of the ruling regimes. These answers were supported by good use of the detail in the cartoon. Fewer candidates tried to explain whether or not the cartoonist approved of what was happening. A small number of candidates described the cartoon instead of interpreting it, limiting the marks which could be awarded.

### Question 3

There are good content reasons for why Source E does and does not make Source D surprising. For example, Source E shows the people supporting the revolution but Source D shows that many people acted against the revolution. Some candidates pointed out that there is no reason why Source E should make Source D surprising because they are about different places and situations. Use of contextual knowledge turned these answers into very good responses. Some candidates focused on the provenance and purpose of one of both of the sources.

#### Question 4

This question requires candidates to both compare the sources and to evaluate them. A number of candidates were able to evaluate the sources separately but they then needed to explain which one they trusted more through comparison. There was some good use of the provenance and purpose of the sources, and the candidates' contextual knowledge, to evaluate the sources individually. Some candidates made weaker use of the provenance and simply claimed the sources were biased.

#### Question 5

Questions such as this one that ask candidates to explain why a source was published at a particular time require three elements. They need to explain why the source was published when it was. This requires some explanation of the context - in the case of this source, events in Germany in 1848. They also need to explain the message of the source. Finally, they need to bring these two elements together and explain the purpose of publishing this cartoon in Germany at that particular time. Purpose needs to involve impact on the intended audience e.g. to discourage such extreme revolutionary behaviour in Germany by warning that any Parliament set up will be a disaster. Some candidates only explained the context and didn't interpret the message of the article, while others interpreted the article but neglected to go on to explain its purpose. It is important that candidates make clear that what they write in their answers is being offered as a reason for publication. Some candidates explained context, message or purpose, they didn't explain that these were reasons for publication.

#### Question 6

The two aspects of a good answer to this question are **(i)** clear explanations of how particular sources agree or disagree with the hypothesis, and **(ii)** keeping the focus of the answer on the given hypothesis. Candidates should be aware of the fact that there will always be some sources that support the hypothesis and some that disagree with it and should avoid the tendency, seen in some answers, to only explain how sources support the hypothesis. It is not necessary to write at length about each source. What matters more is the directness and quality of the explanation. The following is typical of some of the better approaches to this question which were seen: 'Source D does not support the view that the revolutions were a real threat to the social system. This is because it tells us that many people in France did not want to overturn the social system. When they became aware of what was happening in Paris they marched there to stop the violent events. They regarded the revolutionaries in Paris as "barbarians". While many of the people outside Paris were determined to defend the social system because they had a lot to lose, there was not much danger of it being overthrown.' It is important that candidates understand what is involved in producing a good answer to this question. It carries the highest mark tariff on the paper. A number of candidates were unable to achieve good marks because they neglected to use any of the sources in their answers.

Option B: 20<sup>th</sup> century topic

#### Question 1

The sources provided many agreements and disagreements. Most candidates were able to locate some of each, although the differences were rather more obvious than the similarities. Most candidates, for example, were able to explain the agreements about providing Germany with a grievance, Germany being too strong after Versailles and the peacemakers wanting a better Europe. The best answers read the sources as a whole and looked for an overall point of view – Source A says that the treaty was not responsible for the Second World War, while Source B claims it was. A number of candidates lost time by paraphrasing each source in detail before comparing them.

## Question 2

The best answers were based on an understanding of the points of view of the two cartoonists. They are both criticising the Treaty of Versailles and the peacemakers. Some candidates thought the '1940 class' in Source C referred to Germany and this made it difficult for them to interpret the cartoon effectively. As is often seen with comparison questions, a number of candidates interpreted both cartoons perfectly well but then needed to go on and compare them. However, this question was answered well overall and a good number of candidates achieved higher marks.

## Question 3

There were many good answers that demonstrated an understanding of what the cartoon was saying about the fate of Czechoslovakia. However, the best candidates realised that the cartoonist is criticising British policy over Czechoslovakia. When using cartoons candidates should always be encouraged to consider the point of view of the cartoonist. Most political cartoons are not simply analysing situations - they are usually making an important point.

## Question 4

There was a wide range of answers to this question. Some candidates produced a good analysis of the source but neglected to state whether they were surprised or not. In answering this type of question, candidates are advised to first state whether they are surprised or not, and then explain their reasons. The best answers were based on contextual knowledge and understanding and explained a lack of surprise about the fact that Hitler is justifying sending troops into Austria. He was speaking on the day that German troops were sent in. Slightly less successful answers, again based on contextual knowledge, explained how Hitler was lying in parts of the interview. A number of candidates, whose responses identified what they were or were not surprised by, would have benefited from producing an adequate explanation.

## Question 5

This question also produced a wide range of answers. The best candidates realised that there were good reasons for Lloyd George to both agree and disagree with the cartoon. In Source G he says that there will be another war because of the number of small German speaking states that have been separated from Germany by the Treaty of Versailles. The cartoonist also shows that war was likely. However, the reason for war given by the cartoonist is different. He points to the 'spineless leaders of democracy' and their failures in the 1930s. Some candidates only got as far as the agreement over the likelihood of war.

## Question 6

The two aspects of a good answer to this question are **(i)** clear explanations of how particular sources agree or disagree with the hypothesis, and **(ii)** keeping the focus of the answer on the given hypothesis. Candidates should be aware of the fact that there will always be some sources that support the hypothesis and some that disagree with it and should avoid the tendency, seen in some answers, to only explain how sources support the hypothesis. It is not necessary to write at length about each source. What matters more is the directness and quality of the explanation. The following is typical of some of the better approaches to this question which were seen: 'Source E does not support the idea that the Second World War was caused by the Treaty of Versailles because it says that British appeasement was the problem. It criticises the way that Britain let Germany take Czechoslovakia. It was this policy of appeasement that encouraged Hitler to take more and more and which led to the war in 1939.' It is important that candidates understand what is involved in producing a good answer to this question since it carries the highest mark tariff on the paper. A number of candidates were unable to achieve good marks because they neglected to use any of the sources in their answers.

# HISTORY (US)

---

Paper 0416/03  
Coursework

## General Comments and Key Messages

The number of entries for the coursework option in this examination session was very close to that seen in November 2013. The November 2014 examination session was the last one for the present version of IGCSE History coursework. The pattern of this year's coursework was similar to that of previous years. All of the assignments were appropriate. Many Centres used the Board-approved assignments, while a small number constructed some very interesting ones of their own, some of which were based on aspects of local history.

Most of the marking had been completed carefully and there were many detailed and useful annotations to the candidates' work, which helped Moderators greatly. Small adjustments were made to the marks of number of Centres. This was usually on Assignment 1.

## Comments on Specific Questions

### Assignment 1

Adjustments to marks were most often made where the candidates' analysis was not of sufficient depth to merit the marks awarded. Some candidates needed to focus more on aspects of questions such as 'how far', and on comparing the relative importance of causal factors all the way through their answers, rather than just in conclusions. Better responses contained such features, and much very good work was seen. As in previous examination sessions, essay titles, rather than structured questions, produced the most successful work.

### Assignment 2

There was much good source analysis and evaluation in Assignment 2. Many candidates displayed good understanding and skills in the use of historical sources.

It is important to remember that the coursework requirements change for 2015. Candidates will be expected to submit just one piece of work assessing the significance of an event, individual or development. The use of sources is not required. Questions need to encourage candidates to focus on assessing significance. Questions should be left open to allow candidates to use their own criteria for assessing significance. It is expected that the best answers will assess significance from several perspectives, using different criteria.

Detailed guidance on all aspects of the new coursework requirements can be found in the Coursework Training Handbook produced by Cambridge International Examinations. This is essential reading.