

HISTORY (US)

Paper 0416/11
Paper 11

Key messages

Successful responses are dependent upon candidates reading the questions very carefully to make sure responses are focused and relevant.

Checking the dates given in a question so that only relevant material is included in responses is also vital.

General comments

Good answers were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge of both the Core and the Depth Study for which they had been prepared. These candidates were able to use their knowledge to good effect in writing well-developed explanations and arguments in answers to their chosen questions. Less successful responses, whilst demonstrating sound factual knowledge, found it difficult to use knowledge effectively to answer the actual question set. **Parts (b) and (c)** of the questions require understanding and explanation. 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 responses. Candidates need to ensure that they use their factual knowledge to substantiate the arguments they make; some candidates set out a clear argument but would have improved their answers by supporting this argument with relevant factual knowledge.

A small number of candidates wrote very lengthy responses to **part (a)** questions, which resulted in them having insufficient time to fully develop their responses to **part (c)** questions.

There were a small number of rubric errors; some candidates chose **parts (a), (b) and (c)** from different questions, some answered just three **part (c)** questions, and some answered more than three questions. On the whole, candidates used the time allocated effectively, with many completing the paper.

It is important to indicate clearly the question number and part of the question being answered. Some candidates wrote one long paragraph in response to a question, and, in some cases, one long paragraph containing their responses to all the questions they had answered; it was sometimes difficult to distinguish where one part question finished and another part question began.

Comments on specific questions

Section A: Core Content

Question 1

- (a) Candidates needed to show knowledge of Mazzini's vision for Italy, and some candidates stated that Mazzini's vision for Italy included Italy being independent and unified. Other answers were generalised and made largely superficial comments, stating that Mazzini's vision for Italy was a positive one.
- (b) Candidates were able to identify general points, stating that Pope Pius IX issued his Allocution because he thought it was the right course to take. A small number of candidates identified that Pope Pius IX did not want to be dominated by Piedmont; this point was developed into an explanation in more successful answers.

- (c) Answers showed an awareness that the Austrian army had large numbers of reserves; this point was identified rather than explained. Weaker answers were generalised in nature, and needed to demonstrate a more detailed knowledge of Austria's military supremacy and other factors inherent in the failure of revolutions in Italy 1848–49.

Question 2

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

Question 3

- (a) Effective responses to this question gave focused descriptions of Harriet Tubman and the underground railroad, the influence of Harriet Beecher Stowe's novel and the formation of the American Anti-Slavery Society. Candidates should ensure they are writing about the actual timescale given in the question. Some answers were focused on the American civil rights movements of the 1960s and 1970s; this is clearly not relevant to this question.
- (b) Good answers constructed clear explanations of why views about slavery differed between Northern and Southern states. These explanations usually focused upon the Southern economy's dependence on slaves, and the North's opposition to slavery on moral grounds. Some less good responses focused on any differences between the North and the South, rather than the differences between their views about slavery; such responses lacked relevance to a question focusing upon differences between views about slavery. Some less successful answers were able to explain differences in views about slavery, but attributed particular views erroneously to the North when they were actually explaining the views of the South, and vice versa.
- (c) Some candidates identified that the Compromise of 1850 could be seen as a success because it delayed the outbreak of civil war. Such identification needed to be developed into explanation. Other candidates wrote generalised responses to this question. Candidates are expected to have knowledge of the details of the Compromise of 1850.

Question 4

- (a) Some candidates stated that Germany had plans for war such as the Schlieffen Plan, and that Germany was determined to develop a powerful navy. Other responses were generalised in nature, with little reference to specific details concerning the part played by Germany. Some candidates wrote in detail about the part played by countries such as Britain and Russia in the arms race but made no reference to Germany; these answers were not relevant as the question asks specifically about Germany's part in the arms race.
- (b) Identifications in responses to this question focused mainly upon Serbia's objection to the Austrian annexation of Bosnia, Germany's support for Austria and the development of Russian support for Serbia. Good answers developed these identifications into clearly constructed explanations. Some less successful candidates wrote lengthy descriptions about the Moroccan Crisis and the assassination at Sarajevo; such responses lacked focus on the actual question.
- (c) Good answers were able to develop an explanation focused upon the relative strength of the armed forces of the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente. Other responses were generalised, stating that both alliances were powerful, but without giving detailed knowledge in support of this statement. Candidates are expected to know the countries within the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente; a substantial number of candidates appeared unaware of who was in each alliance.

Question 5

- (a) Successful answers demonstrated detailed factual knowledge of the effects of the Treaty of Trianon on Hungary, with the break-up of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, limitations on armed forces and armaments and the details of which land was lost and to whom all being mentioned. A number of candidates erroneously gave details of the Treaty of Versailles in response to this question. Candidates are expected to know the details of all the peace treaties of 1919–1923, not just the details relating to Versailles.

- (b) Effective answers to this question made clear reference to the Fourteen Points and explained exactly why Wilson believed that the Fourteen Points should form the basis of the Treaty of Versailles. Points explained included the belief that the Fourteen Points would ensure a fair and lasting peace and that the Fourteen Points, through identification of the causes of the war, were focused on providing solutions so war would not reoccur. Some candidates demonstrated that they had the knowledge to answer this question well, but this knowledge could have been used more appropriately, as lists were given of the Fourteen Points and the terms of the Treaty of Versailles without any explanation as to why Wilson believed the Fourteen Points should form the basis of the Treaty of Versailles.
- (c) There were some well-developed responses to this question, with candidates demonstrating a clear and detailed understanding of Clemenceau's aims and how far these were reflected in the peace settlement of 1919–1920. Responses focused primarily upon Clemenceau's desire to achieve security for France and the return of Alsace-Lorraine on one side of the argument, and, on the other side, Clemenceau being unable to achieve his desire to split Germany into many states, with an independent Rhineland state being of great importance. Again many candidates demonstrated that they had the factual knowledge to answer this question, but the knowledge was not always used effectively. Some responses simply gave two lists, one of Clemenceau's aims, and the other of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, without any explanation of connections between them. Some candidates answered the question as if it asked 'Was the Treaty of Versailles fair?', while others wrote three paragraphs detailing the aims of Clemenceau, Lloyd George and Wilson. To do well, candidates need to answer the actual question given on the paper.

Question 6

- (a) Some candidates gained maximum marks here, with clearly focused answers describing Hitler's takeover of Austria. Most candidates were able to achieve at least one mark, as they were aware that German troops marched into Austria in 1938. There were a number of responses with inaccurate chronology; candidates needed to be aware of the actual order in which events took place during Hitler's takeover of Austria.
- (b) There were many highly effective responses to this question. Candidates explained the underlying distrust between Stalin and Britain and France, with reference to Stalin not being invited to the Munich Conference, Stalin's belief that Britain and France were weak as they had allowed Hitler to break terms of the Treaty of Versailles, and the underlying ideological differences between them. Explanations relating to Stalin's interest in parts of eastern Poland and his desire to gain time to build up his armed forces were also given. Some less successful responses explained why Hitler wanted to make the deal; the question specifically asks why Stalin wanted the deal, so responses focusing solely upon Hitler lacked relevance.
- (c) Some candidates explained that the remilitarisation of the Rhineland was important to enhance Hitler's reputation and consolidate the support of the army generals for his plans. Explanations of the importance of the Spanish Civil War focused primarily on the opportunity given to Hitler to test his new military equipment and Blitzkrieg tactics in an actual war situation. Some candidates described the events of the remilitarisation of the Rhineland rather than explaining why it was important for Hitler's plans. A number of weaker responses focused in general terms only on the Spanish Civil War.

Question 7

- (a) Successful answers demonstrated a detailed knowledge of the main agreements reached at the Yalta Conference. Answers usually included reference to the division of Germany and Berlin into four occupation zones, and a statement of the four countries controlling the occupation zones. Reference was also made to Germany being required to pay reparations, Stalin's agreement to intervene in the war with Japan after Germany's defeat and the agreement that liberated countries would be allowed to hold free elections.

- (b) Good answers included effective explanations, focused upon the change in leaders, Truman informing Stalin that the USA had successfully tested an atomic bomb and that Stalin had not adhered to the idea of free elections. The question clearly asks about changes taking place between the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences, but weaker responses strayed well beyond the remit of the question, with details relating to the Berlin Wall, Korea, the Cuban Missile Crisis and Vietnam.
- (c) Effective answers to this question explained how Stalin's failure to abide by Yalta and Potsdam caused the Cold War on the one hand, and then explained other reasons such as Churchill's Iron Curtain speech, the Berlin Blockade, the Truman Doctrine and Marshall Aid. Less good answers described these points in considerable detail, without actually explaining how they helped to cause the Cold War. This question asks specifically about the causes of the Cold War; some candidates wrote about events such as Korea, Vietnam and the Cuban Missile Crisis which all occurred during the Cold War, but did not cause it initially.

Question 8

- (a) There were many detailed and clear answers to this question. Responses focused on the lack of freedom of speech, fear of the secret police, the banning of religion, Soviet control over education in schools, the presence of Soviet troops in Hungary and the country being run by the Communist Party even though they had only achieved a small percentage of the vote.
- (b) Effective responses to this question explained how the strong support for Solidarity, both within Poland and in media support from the west, and the fear of a general strike meant that the Polish government agreed to meet Solidarity's demands. Some less successful responses were descriptions of Solidarity's work which did not address the question. A small number of candidates did not seem to know what Solidarity was, writing as if Solidarity was a country.
- (c) Good answers were able to explain that the Berlin Wall was built to prevent East Germany losing its well educated young people and its skilled workforce. Most candidates were able to describe the building of the wall, and to identify why it was built; these identifications needed to be developed into explanations. Some candidates wrote in some detail about the Berlin Blockade rather than the Berlin Wall. Candidates should know the difference between the Berlin Blockade and the Berlin Wall.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

- (a) Good answers explained that the Schlieffen Plan changed, as the German advance was now to go through Belgium alone. Less successful answers described the Schlieffen Plan in some detail, but their answers lacked any indication of the changes Germany made to the plan; the plan was described as it was originally conceived.
- (b) Candidates were able to identify that it was important for the Schlieffen Plan to succeed for Germany to avoid fighting a war on two fronts, and for Germany to be able to win the war. Good answers developed these identifications into explanations. Less successful responses featured lengthy descriptions of the Schlieffen Plan, rather than explaining its importance for Germany.
- (c) Good answers explained the role of the BEF in slowing down the progress of the Schlieffen Plan. Other answers described what the BEF was, but did not refer to whether the BEF was successful or not. There were a number of generalised responses to this question, stating mainly that the BEF took part in some of the battles of the First World War. Candidates are expected to know the contribution of the BEF in the First World War, and whether it was successful or not.

Question 10

- (a) Responses to this question included points such as the Zimmermann telegram being a message in the form of a coded telegram, the telegram being sent to the German ambassador in Mexico from the German Foreign Office and it being issued in January 1917.
- (b) Some candidates demonstrated that they had the contextual knowledge to answer this question effectively, identifying points such as the March 1918 offensive being Germany's last chance to win the war, that all German reserves had now been recruited, the failure of the submarine campaign to knock out Britain and the anticipated arrival of American troops and equipment on the Western Front. Effective answers developed these points to explain why Germany launched the March 1918 offensive. Weaker answers did not move beyond identifying points.
- (c) As in responses to 10(b), good answers were able to identify a variety of relevant points in response to this question. Points usually focused on the lack of discipline and low morale amongst the German troops, the effect of American troops and equipment and the larger numbers of Allied troops. Less successful responses stopped at identification of points; these points must be developed into explanation if answers are to look at both sides of the argument and address the aspect of 'how far.'

Question 11

- (a) Candidates demonstrated that they had detailed knowledge about proportional representation in Weimar Germany, and some gave clear details of its disadvantages for Weimar, focusing on the Germans being used to autocratic government, extremist parties now having a public voice, coalition governments creating instability and the difficulties of decision making. Some less successful answers described proportional representation in Germany without actually detailing the disadvantages of the system for Weimar Germany.
- (b) There were some effective responses to this question, with candidates giving two clear explanations focused on the Spartacists wishing to establish a communist-style government and the vulnerability of the Republic at this time. Some candidates attributed an incorrect political affiliation to the Spartacists, claiming that they wanted to establish a right wing government.
- (c) There were some very well-developed and clearly focused answers to this question, with focus on Stresemann's achievements on one side of the argument and the underlying weaknesses of the German economy and the perceived moral decline on the other. Some less successful responses identified points on both sides of the argument but were unable to develop these identifications into explanations. Better candidates were able to use their contextual knowledge to clearly support the arguments they were giving.

Question 12

- (a) Good answers were able to give several clear examples of Nazi actions taken to reduce unemployment. Examples given included jobs on public works projects, the reintroduction of conscription, jobs being created in factories to produce weapons and other military equipment, Jews being deprived of their jobs and not being counted as unemployed and women being persuaded to relinquish their jobs. Some less successful responses were generalised answers and others described working conditions in Nazi Germany without stating the action taken to reduce unemployment.
- (b) Effective answers to this question explained clearly that the Nazis encouraged the 'perfect Aryan family' because they believed the Aryans were the master race, to use the Aryan family as role models for all Germans and because they wanted to rid Germany of those they believed to be inferior. Some answers were focused on the family generally rather than the 'perfect Aryan family' as stated in the question.

- (c) A number of candidates wrote well-developed responses to this question, demonstrating clearly how attractive the Nazi regime was to some young people and not to others. On one side of the argument, candidates stressed the appeal of activities within the Nazi Youth and also explained that the Nazi regime was seen as attractive by young people as they were conditioned by propaganda within their education and lives more generally to see it this way. On the other side of the argument, explanations focused upon young peoples' dislike of the regimentation and restrictions of the Nazi regime, with this being linked closely to the activities of the Swing Movement and the Edelweiss Pirates. Some less successful answers displayed detailed knowledge of young people during the Nazi regime and wrote long descriptions of their activities; such answers would have benefited from a focus on the actual question of how attractive the regime was for young people.

Question 13

- (a) Good responses to this question focused upon the autocratic nature of Tsarist rule, the Tsar's belief that God had appointed him as Tsar, the Tsar's secret police, the Okhrana and the Church's support for the Tsar. Some less successful candidates framed their answers in generalised terms only.
- (b) There were some focused explanations in response to this question, with reference being made to the October Manifesto, the loyalty of the army and peace being made with Japan. A number of candidates wrote explanations focused on Russian involvement in World War I; this lacked relevance to a question asking why the revolution of 1905 was unsuccessful.
- (c) Answers were focused on the events of 'Bloody Sunday' and how these events destroyed confidence in the Tsar on one side, and the defeat in the war against Japan and problems in agriculture on the other hand. A number of less successful responses consisted of detailed explanations focused on reasons for revolution in 1917.

Question 14

- (a) Good answers were able to state the exact dates relevant to the 'July Days', and also knew that workers, soldiers and sailors had come out on to the streets in protest. There was also awareness that there had been unrest over food shortages and the continuation of war throughout July. Some candidates wrote generalised answers only, with no specific points relevant to the 'July Days'.
- (b) Relevant identifications such as the Provisional Government's decision to continue with the war, the prospect of another winter of shortages and desertion and mutiny in the armed forces were given. Better answers developed one identification into an explanation; this usually focused on the decision of the Provisional Government to continue with the war.
- (c) Lack of unity amongst the Whites was explained clearly by some good candidates, with reference to the variety of groups within the Whites, all with differing ideas and aims. Explanations relating to Trotsky's role as commander of the Red Army were comprehensive in nature and demonstrated a clear understanding of the importance of Trotsky in the Whites losing the Civil War. A number of candidates answered this question in general terms only, making points about disorganisation without any specific reference to the events of the Civil War in Russia.

Question 15

- (a) This question was answered well by most candidates attempting it, with very clear focus on the impact of the Wall Street Crash on the American economy. Impacts stated included businesses and banks going bust, workers losing their jobs or having their wages cut, the collapse of business confidence, less money meaning people could not afford to spend money on buying goods and business expansion being abandoned. A minority of candidates described the Wall Street Crash events rather than focusing upon the impact of the Crash on the American economy.

- (b) Effective responses to this question explained the contribution of stock market speculation to the Wall Street Crash, focusing primarily on confidence in the stock market being of paramount importance and how this confidence was eroded when speculators realised their shares had lost value and therefore rushed to sell them, thus causing more general panic selling. Some candidates wrote about causes of the Wall Street Crash generally, rather than focusing on stock market speculation as demanded by the question.
- (c) Good, balanced answers explained the contribution of Republican policies to Hoover's defeat in 1932 on one side and the personality, policies and election campaign of Roosevelt on the other. Some candidates demonstrated that they had a wide and detailed knowledge of why Hoover lost the Presidential election of 1932, but this knowledge was not always used appropriately. Often candidates gave lengthy descriptions of Republican policies and Roosevelt's personality without explaining why this meant defeat for Hoover. Some candidates also wrote at length about the work of the alphabet agencies in the New Deal once Roosevelt was president, which is not relevant to this question.

Question 16

- (a) Good answers showed specific contextual knowledge of the ways in which Roosevelt helped farmers. Points made included loans being given to small farmers to help them buy land, the reduction of livestock numbers forcing up prices, payments to farmers to take land out of production, and the identification of the Agricultural Administration Agency being set up by Roosevelt.
- (b) There were a number of effective explanations given in response to this question. These included explanation focused on the need to identify and close unsafe banks and the restoration of confidence. Most candidates were able to give several identifications of reasons why Roosevelt needed to deal with the banks in 1933; to score high marks, these needed to be developed into explanations.
- (c) This question asked specifically about the threat to the New Deal from the Supreme Court and from radical critics. Some candidates explained the threat posed by the Supreme Court by focusing explanation on the Supreme Court declaring parts of the New Deal unconstitutional. Explanations focused on the radical critics were relatively unusual; candidates tended to describe the actions and policies of radical critics without explaining how they posed a threat to the New Deal. Less successful responses wrote about opposition to the New Deal in its widest sense, rather than focusing on the opposition from the Supreme Court and radical critics as demanded by the question.

Questions 17 and 18

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

Question 19

- (a) Responses to this question included details relating to the pass system, segregated housing for black people and black workers not being allowed to join trade unions. Some weaker responses were generalised in nature, stating only that black people had few civil rights and giving no specific examples.
- (b) Some candidates identified that the migrant labour system gave white people a guaranteed workforce and that it created wealth for the white population. Good answers developed these identifications into substantiated explanations. C
- (c) Some candidates were able to give one explanation of the contribution of gold mining to the success of South Africa's economic development by 1945, usually focusing on the value of exports. Less successful answers identified that gold mining created jobs, but without developing an explanation. Most candidates made no mention of other areas contributing to South Africa's economic development such as manufacturing and the role of major public corporations.

Question 20

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

Question 21

- (a) Some candidates stated that Nasser announced the nationalisation of the Suez Canal in 1956. Some weak answers focused solely on the actions of Great Britain, France, Russia and the USA, rather than focusing on the actions of Nasser as demanded by the question.
- (b) Explanations in response to this question were focused on it being the role of the United Nations to be involved in any crisis situation like the Suez Crisis of 1956. Some candidates were also able to identify that Britain and France had defied the United Nations' Charter. Less successful responses to this question were generalised, with little focus on the actual question.
- (c) Explanations were focused primarily on Nasser gaining control of the Suez Canal. Some candidates also identified that Israel had shown itself to be a strong military power. Less successful were generalised in nature, with a lack of specific contextual knowledge.

Question 22

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

HISTORY (US)

Paper 0416/21
Paper 21

Key messages

Candidates should spend time on reading and understanding the sources before attempting to answer the questions.

Candidates need to ensure they have an awareness of the totality of the evidence offered within the sources, so that answers to any the questions can, if appropriate, be informed by material taken from any of the sources (particularly relevant to questions involving source evaluation.)

Candidates need to ensure that they understand what the sources actually say and mean

Candidates should spend the first 10–15 minutes of the examination on reading, absorbing and thinking about the sources.

General comments

The general quality of answers was high, demonstrating a good level of ability in all the source-handling skills. Answers were stronger on source interpretation, i.e. where what the sources meant was at issue, rather than on source evaluation, where the analysis tended to be based on generalisations about source type rather than on a properly developed analysis of reliability/utility using cross-reference or use of sources' purpose and audience. **Question 6** remains an area where candidates could improve their performance. Some still try to answer on the hypothesis alone, rather than on how far the sources offer it support, or they attempt to use the sources but do not succeed in doing so effectively; that is, the way in which the source offers support or not is not explained.

Comments on specific questions

Option A: 19th century topic

Some less successful responses gave vigorous condemnations of British imperialism, particularly explicit in **Question 6**, focusing on how unjustified British actions were, rather than on whether or not the sources demonstrated this. Candidates found it hard to detect the attitudes of the cartoonists in Sources F, G and H, and tended to take these cartoons at face value. Nonetheless, none of the sources proved inaccessible to candidates, and many positive, developed responses were produced on all the questions.

Question 1

Almost always, **Question 1** asks candidates to compare two sources for agreements and disagreements, and this was no exception. There will always be points of detail from the two sources that can be matched: here, for example, that both sources state that there was an amnesty and it lasted until 1859, or the disagreement that total casualties were given at hundreds of thousands in Source A but as millions in Source B. Good answers noted both agreements and disagreements of this type. However, there is usually also an agreement or disagreement of a different, and better, nature to be spotted. Better responses took the sources as a whole and suggested, using the source content, that Source A indicated a degree of sympathy for the British that was entirely lacking in Source B, which was much more condemnatory in tone. This showed a higher level of understanding than the simple matching/mismatching of details.

Question 2

The question asked whether candidates were surprised by Queen Victoria's attitude, given what Canning had written to her. Less successful responses answered simply on Queen Victoria, with no reference to Canning, which ignored an important aspect of the question. The basic element on which arguments about surprise should have been constructed was the extent to which the two sources agreed with each other. If they agreed, why would you be surprised? If they disagreed, why would you not be surprised? Possibly the problem candidates faced was to tease out what the true attitudes of Canning and Victoria were, and this was not entirely straightforward as both sources contained aspects which were critical of the harsh punishment of Indians, and aspects which supported it. Ultimately, though, the sources made it clear that Canning disapproved and Victoria approved. The best answers could see this, and then explained whether or not they were surprised by the difference. This explanation could be any valid argument based on contextual awareness, e.g. of Canning's 'Clemency Proclamation', or on material from other sources.

Question 3

A surprising number of answers concluded that the source was not particularly useful as evidence about the Mutiny because it simply showed how Indians were brutally punished. This response seemed to be based on the idea that the Mutiny was something separate from the British reaction to it. Nonetheless, such answers were regarded as being of the same quality as those who agreed that the source was useful for showing the brutal punishment. The majority of answers, given a question on source utility, did not explore the issue of how far utility could be affected by reliability. True, some were prepared to reject the source on the basis that it was British, and so biased, ignoring the real point that the British would hardly have admitted such cruelties unless they were true – what would be the point of making up something that made one seem so brutal? The best approach, though, was to explore how the source could be used as evidence, given what one could infer from it. The best candidates, therefore, took the source as evidence about the British rather than the Indians, and concluded, for example, that it was useful as evidence of how cruel or how racist or how inhumane the British response was.

Question 4

On Source F, as on Source H, the best candidates detected that the cartoons were critical of Canning. Accordingly, most of the messages derived from Source F were to do with Canning protecting or patronising the Indians. Essentially these were sub-messages, valid as far as they went, but not engaging with the opinion of the cartoonist. Since the question asked for reasons for publication, most answers included some reference to the context, either general to the Mutiny, or more specifically on Canning's Proclamation. Very good answers showed a genuine understanding of the cartoon, first to give the genuinely critical message as a reason, and then to suggest a purpose for the cartoonist wishing to have such a message published. The best answers suggested that the reason was to persuade the audience that Canning's liberal attitude to the mutineers was wrong.

Question 5

Sound answers, using the word 'Justice', had little problem seeing that Source G approved of the harsh repression that was used to quell the Mutiny. Good answers could go beyond this to make a valid comparison with Source H. As mentioned above, many candidates could not come up with a proper interpretation of Source H, and assumed it approved of Canning – this was to miss 'Too civil by half' and the two dead children. The most common conclusion, then, was that the sources differed in their messages, though this did not prevent valid answers on comparison of sub-messages, such as both sources showing that the British were ruthless towards the Indians. Nonetheless, there was still a good number of answers that understood the attitudes of the cartoonists and concluded that both agreed with the ruthless repression.

Question 6

Despite the fact that some individual sources proved challenging for candidates to interpret fully in some questions, in **Question 6** they are permitted to use sources at face value, and thus do not suffer a double penalty. So, for example with Source H, candidates would be credited with valid source use for arguing that it showed British reaction was justified because it shows Canning's reaction was merciful in defending the sepoy (of course, they would also be credited for the opposite argument based on a proper interpretation of the cartoon). In fact, a number of the sources offered evidence both for and against the hypothesis, and what really counted was the way in which the candidates used the sources. This remains a tricky issue for many: the content of the source must be used to illustrate how it offers support or not, and it is not sufficient only to make assertions. However, candidates who based their answers on the sources were at least on the right lines. Candidates who wrote about the hypothesis, rather than the sources, which is not what the question required, were less successful in their answers. Here, successful answers needed to do more than to condemn British imperialism: they needed to explore whether or not this was the view of the sources.

Option B: 20th century topic

The sources on Iraq's occupation of Kuwait were all accessible to most candidates, with the possible exception of Source I, where, despite the White House in the background, many thought the President referred to in the cartoon was Saddam Hussein. Answers were notable for the amount of contextual knowledge they contained, though this could, in some responses, have been better focused on the demands of the question.

Question 1

Less successful answers tried to argue that the sources contained different reasons for the invasion of Kuwait (though the reasons were actually very similar), or that the attitude of the USA was different (it was similar). Another weakness was to try to compare the attitudes of the authors, but to get this wrong (overall both advanced justifications for Iraq's actions, but often candidates detected that one or other source blamed Iraq). More successful answers were able to spot at least some agreements, though few saw the disagreement on the amount of money owed to Kuwait. Detecting agreements and disagreements earned good credit, and the best answers looked at the sources as a whole, and saw them as both, on balance, sympathetic towards Saddam.

Question 2

Candidates readily spotted the contradiction between Sources C and D, which nicely opened up the discussion on whether or not this was surprising. In less successful responses, it was, simply because it was a contradiction, and no further explanation was attempted. Others neglected to use Source D and concentrated on explaining why they did or did not find Source C surprising. These explanations could be well argued and supported, but could never be a complete response to the question. They were at least explanations though, and as such were a better level of answer than mere comparison. The best approach was to detect the contradiction, and then to explain it using contextual knowledge or other sources. Many perceived Source D as a deliberate attempt to mislead Saddam. Others saw Source C as Saddam's attempt to mobilise his supporters in preparation for the invasion of Kuwait.

Question 3

This question required a similar approach to **Question 2**. Two sources had to be compared, and then a decision reached on whether what appeared to be a contradiction was evidence for Saddam lying (showing lack of sincerity). On the face of it Saddam offers some form of negotiation, and a desire for peace, in Source E, and then in Source F his Foreign Minister shows no interest in either of these. Clearly this could be evidence of insincerity in Source E. However, what better candidates detected was that Source E was perhaps not what it seemed – that Saddam's offers were in themselves bogus, which would then account for the behaviour of Tariq Aziz in Source F. This argument could be based on an explanation using contextual knowledge of what Source E was really saying, or on an analysis of Saddam's likely purpose in making this announcement – representing his actions in a positive way in order to win over domestic or world opinion.

Question 4

To an extent this question was well answered. Very few candidates indeed failed to recognise that the cartoon showed Saddam. Sound answers interpreted the cartoon as having a message hostile to Saddam – that he was a tyrant, responsible for many deaths, prepared to do anything for power, and so on. These sub-messages were all valid, but did not address the more problematic aspect of the cartoon, the reference to ‘Occupying the moral high ground’. For a few candidates that meant that the message of the cartoon was that Saddam’s actions were morally right, a clear misinterpretation. Others tried to include in their answers the idea that Saddam thought he was right, which was still missing the essential point, but did not undermine other valid sub-messages in their answers. The best answers saw that the cartoonist was making a point about Saddam’s hypocrisy – that he was claiming to be right only as a ruse to achieve his brutal aims, and that there was a gulf between what he claimed to be doing and what he was actually doing.

Question 5

The question asked how far the two cartoons agreed, but as mentioned above many candidates had difficulty in interpreting Source I, with each of the figures in the cartoon frequently being seen as Saddam Hussein. On the other hand, Source H was almost universally correctly taken as Saddam leading Iraq to destruction, so even weaker answers were able to do some interpretation. Despite this, valid comparisons of sub-messages could still be achieved if Source I was seen as anti-war: for example, a candidate might conclude that both cartoons showed that the war would lead to many deaths. Much rarer were comparisons on the overall messages of the two cartoons. In both the leaders (Saddam and Bush) are shown to be realising that they face disaster.

Question 6

Although the question referred to the outbreak of hostilities in 1991, it was clear from candidates’ answers that they were looking at the hypothesis much more broadly; in effect they were answering on ‘Who was to blame for the tension/conflict over Kuwait?’ It was decided that this approach was valid, and to reward answers accordingly. The real challenge in this question was to understand how a valid estimation of blame might be argued. Weaker answers mainly consisted simply of Saddam being to blame because he invaded Kuwait – but we know he invaded Kuwait; the issue is whether this was blameworthy. This problem affected many attempted source uses. For example, on Source A, the argument might be proposed that Saddam was to blame because he invaded Kuwait as Kuwait was drilling in the Rumaila oilfield. In fact, this works as an answer on why he was not to blame. Nonetheless, enough sources pointed unambiguously to blame or lack of it for most candidates to find it possible to use some on both sides of the hypothesis, thereby securing a good level of reward. The weakest answers failed to use the sources at all, writing simply on whether or not the hypothesis was true.

HISTORY (US)

Paper 0416/03
Coursework

Key messages

Generally, candidates achieved success in the coursework component when they:

- were given titles that give them full opportunity to assess significance;
- were encouraged to **assess** significance and not just describe or explain it;
- had been introduced to ideas such as turning point, false dawn, and short and long term, equipping them with useful conceptual tools;
- made assessments and argued all the way through their answers;
- used a clear and sustained conclusion to deliver, argue and support the overall judgement about significance.

General comments

This was the second year in which the new coursework regulations have been used and the overall quality of work was impressive. Candidates kept to the word limit and, as a result, they generally produced concise and focused answers that reached judgements about significance. Nearly all Centres set appropriate titles and the marking criteria were used accurately. There were few adjustments to Centres' marks. These were usually reductions, especially to the top part of the mark range. It should be remembered that for work to be awarded marks at or near the top of the mark range, it must be outstanding rather than very good. This means a focus on argument and assessment throughout and a sophisticated understanding of the nature of historical significance, as well as of the historical context. Most of the work was marked with great care and with detailed annotations.

Comments on specific questions

Setting an appropriate title is crucial. The titles that worked best this year shared four characteristics:

- (i) they contained the word 'significant';
- (ii) they made clear that an assessment or evaluation of significance was required. This was achieved by using terms such as 'assess' or 'how significant' and by avoiding asking candidates to simply explain how a factor was significant;
- (iii) they did not name an outcome in the title. Titles such as 'Explain how significant the Depression was in Hitler's rise to power' are best avoided because they can become studies of causation rather than significance, with candidates simply writing about the relative importance of a series of causes. A title such as 'Assess the significance of the Depression for Germany' would be more appropriate;
- (iv) the subject chosen should be one that is not too vast but at the same time gives candidates possibilities for approaching an assessment of its significance in several different ways. It would not be a good idea, for example, to set a title such as 'Assess the significance of Hitler.'

The above does not mean that every question has to follow the formula of 'Assess the significance of X for Y'. However titles are worded, they should give candidates a range of opportunities for assessing significance. Sometimes, asking how far an event was a turning point can work very well, but the right subject has to be chosen. It is recommended that titles are sent to Cambridge for approval. Titles that worked well this year included:

Assess the significance of the Reichstag Fire for Germany.

To what extent was Prohibition significant for the USA in the 1920s and 1930s?

Assess the significance of the Tet Offensive.

To what extent was the Dawes Plan a turning point for Germany?

Assess the significance of Lenin in the period 1917–1930.

Assess the significance of Stalin's purges for the USSR.

There were many excellent answers from candidates. These answers often shared three main characteristics. Firstly, they were focused and relevant. They did not drift into description or narrative or lose time on introductory background and they engaged with the assessment of significance from the beginning until the end. Secondly, they were not simply surveys or descriptions of ways in which the subject was significant. Instead, they assessed significance, rather than describing it. This involved developing and supporting arguments. They had an overall point of view about the significance of the subject and supported this with argument and counter argument. They argued that the subject was significant in some ways but perhaps not so significant in others, and on the basis of this they reached an overall judgement. Finally, they used a range of criteria to assess significance. In other words, they asked a range of questions about significance and assessed it from different perspectives. These should be the candidate's own criteria and questions and should vary from candidate to candidate. While it is important that candidates are introduced to the concept of significance and to the use of criteria earlier in the course, they should not be provided with a list to use with the coursework exercise.

Weaker answers included much description and narrative and were often based on the assumption that an individual was important because of what they did or that an event was important because of what it was. It is important that candidates understand that, when assessing significance, there is a second vital step to take. It is not enough to argue that somebody was significant because of what they did or what they achieved. What matters is the impact (in various ways) of what they did or what they achieved. Some candidates equated significance with success. This led them to assume that failure always meant lack of significance. It is important that candidates understand that a failure can be as significant as success. It also helps if candidates understand that assessing significance should involve considering what happened/what the situation was before the named subject, as well as after it. If what somebody did led to an important change, this can only be understood by considering what was happening before. Some candidates appeared to believe that it was only necessary to look at the consequences of actions and events.

Some candidates approached the exercise as if it were about causation. For example, in response to a title about the significance of the war at sea in the First World War, they compared its importance in the final Allied victory with that of other possible causes. This often led to answers that were surveys of a range of causal factors, and where most time was devoted to factors other than the one that should have been assessed. An alternative, and more satisfactory approach, is to focus on the named subject and assess its significance through the use of a range of criteria (detailed guidance is given about this in the *Coursework Handbook*). Better assignments adopted this approach.

The generic markscheme was generally used accurately. It is important to remember that it should be used in a 'best fit' way. In other words, a response does not have to meet all the criteria in a level before being placed in that level. The crucial question to ask is – which level descriptors does the response match overall? It is also important to note that the skills listed in the markscheme need to be used by candidates to help them respond to the title and to make assessments about significance. Candidates are not being asked to display these skills for their own sake. Credit should only be given when there is evidence of a skill being used to develop arguments, assessments and statements about significance. The markscheme also contains clear reference to the ability to develop and support arguments and judgements. This reinforces what has been stressed earlier in this report – that it is important candidates are encouraged to develop, argue and support their own points of view rather than just produce descriptive surveys.

Cambridge International General Certificate of Secondary Education
0470 History June 2016
Principal Examiner Report for Teachers

Most Centres annotated responses in detail. This was most helpful. Marginal annotations can be used to identify key points in the answer, while summative comments should identify the key overall characteristics of a response with clear reference to the terminology in the markscheme.