

# HISTORY (US)

---

Paper 0470/03  
Coursework

## **Key Messages**

IGCSE History coursework is about assessment of the historical significance of an individual, event, development or place. It is crucial that the title used makes clear to candidates that they should focus on assessing significance. This involves considering the different ways in which, for example, an event may be seen as being significant. It may have been significant immediately or in the longer-term, it may have been significant for some people but not for others, it may have been significant economically but less significant politically. It also involves reaching and supporting judgements about whether the event was more significant in some ways than in others. Assessment of significance should involve argument and counter-argument, with the candidate reaching an overall assessment of significance at the end. It is important that significance is not confused with success. Something can be significant because it was a failure. It is also important that candidates try to use ideas such as 'turning point', 'false dawn' and 'long and short term' where appropriate, and in deed, such ideas were seen in a good number of strong answers. It is also key that titles address significance, rather than tend towards causation. Some titles might use the word 'significant' but this does not mean that they are appropriate, for example, 'How significant were the policies of the Tsar in leading to the February Revolution?' Much better would be 'Assess the significance of the policies of Tsar Nicholas II.' The latter gives candidates much more scope and the chance to assess historical significance properly.

## **General Comments**

Much of the candidates' coursework that was moderated was of a high standard. The majority of centres set appropriate titles and nearly all candidates kept their answers within the word limit of 2000 words (although a few used significantly less than 2000 and thus did not give themselves a chance to produce answers of the necessary depth of analysis and assessment). Most answers were well organised and managed to avoid too much description or narrative. The best assessed significance from a variety of perspectives. Centres' administration of the coursework was generally excellent, with the correct number of samples sent to the moderator and the correct forms completed. It is important to remember that coursework should be set on a Depth Study. It should not be set on events covered in the international core content.

## **Comments on Specific Questions**

Titles that were appropriate and worked well this year included:

Assess the significance of the Night of the Long Knives.

Assess the significance of the Munich Putsch.

How far was the New Deal a turning point in US history to 1941?

How significant was the Battle of the Somme in the First World War?

How significant was the Warner Brothers studio in 1920s USA?

Assess the significance of Martin Luther King.

The appropriate titles seen in this examination session were those which encouraged candidates to focus on causal explanations. A title such as 'How significant was the Enabling Act in the Nazi consolidation of power?' will lead candidates to writing an analysis of the different ways the Nazis managed to consolidate their power. They may well assess and compare the importance of different factors, including the one named in the title, but the answer will not engage with historical significance. A title such as 'Assess the significance

of the Enabling Act' will encourage candidates to ask themselves about the different ways it might be significant and whether it was more significant in some ways than in others. The crucial difference between these two titles is that the second does not mention an outcome. This gives candidates more scope to consider significance in its widest and truest sense.

Some candidates used some of their 2000 words in describing the background or in description and narrative. However, the best answers briefly explained how they were going to address the title and then got straight into assessment of significance. Other answers would have benefited from using a range of criteria in this assessment. In other words, they needed to ask themselves questions such as 'how was this event/individual/development significant in different ways?', 'how significant was it for different people or groups?', 'was it more significant for some people than others?', 'was it more significant immediately or in the longer-term?' and so on.

The best answers assessed significance rather than just described or explained it. This involved argument and counter-argument. They also showed some understanding that judgements about significance are provisional and vary as the perspective changes. In addition, these answers tended to make use of ideas such as 'turning point' and considered issues such as how the event or individual merely hastened developments already underway or how far it changed the direction of events. This involves considering the situation and the direction of events both before and after the event or individual being assessed. Above all, candidates should be encouraged to ask themselves challenging questions about the event or individual and to develop and support their own ideas, views and judgements. Candidates need to support and justify their own personal judgements. Another crucial quality of the best answers seen was relevance. Such answers avoided wandering away from judging and assessing significance with argument and counter-argument. Weaker answers constantly drifted away from assessment into description or narrative or into assessment of other factors.

Coursework was mostly carefully and accurately marked. When there were reductions in the marks, this was usually because answers contained much description and narrative and insufficient use of a range of criteria to assess significance in its widest sense. It is helpful if summative comments can be provided for each piece of coursework. These should sum up the main strengths and weaknesses of the answer and should relate directly to statements in the generic mark scheme. Marginal comments can also be made alongside important parts of the answer. Comments that identify, for example, where significance is being assessed well or where an answer is lacking relevance, can be very useful, and many Centres provided detailed annotations which were most helpful.

# HISTORY (US)

---

Paper 0416/13  
Paper 13

## Key messages

- The answer to a question should have a clear focus on the question as set.
- Answers to **parts (b) and (c)** should be developed into explanation.
- Evaluations to **(c)** part answers should not be a repetition of what has been written previously.
- The development of an overview chronology of the period of study would benefit candidates when they are constructing longer answers.

## General comments

Many of the answers to this year's questions reflected sound understanding and good knowledge, and were supported by a wealth of factual detail. Candidates expressed themselves clearly and were able to put all of the information they had 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 a good approach.

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 including material lacking in relevance. Credit was awarded for the identification of relevant 'why' factors but higher marks were awarded to answers which went further and developed each factor fully, thereby meeting the demands of the question.

A significant number of the responses to part **(c)** questions not only tried to argue on both sides of the topic (both agreeing and disagreeing with the given hypothesis), but also attempted to arrive at a judgement in the conclusion. Although some conclusions simply asserted 'how far', other responses went on to explain which side of the argument was stronger than the other.

## Comments on specific questions

### **Section A - Core Content**

#### **Questions 1–4**

There were too few answers to these questions to make meaningful comments.

#### **Question 5**

This was a popular choice. There were many good answers to the **part (a)** questions, which was about features shared by the peace treaties which followed the First World War. Weaker responses only referred to losses imposed on Germany under the Treaty of Versailles. Better responses gained credit for relevant comparisons; for example, the defeated countries not only lost territory, but also were made to pay reparations and were disarmed. In **part (b)**, the reasons why Germany's people were unhappy with the Treaty of Versailles attracted some general answers about diktat, harsh reparations, losses of land and war guilt; better responses explained what it was about these features which fuelled people's disappointment. Less successful answers were dominated by descriptions of the terms of the Treaty, rather than an analysis of why Germans hated them. **Part (c)** produced some weaker answers which tended to describe Lloyd George and Clemenceau's aims. Better responses argued, for instance, that Clemenceau was pleased that Germany's economic power and military capacity had been reduced, although he failed to get the Saar Basin for France and he failed to establish the Rhineland as an independent state. Further credit was achieved for additional points about Lloyd George, such as his satisfaction that the reparations Germany had to pay were

not as high as France wanted them to be, and this meant Germany was still in a position to trade with Britain. He was not happy, however, that German-speaking people were under the rule of other countries.

### Question 6

In **part (a)** there were some sound descriptions of how the Spanish Civil War made Europe a more dangerous place. These answers often related to how Hitler tested his armed forces in conflict, the opportunity taken by the Luftwaffe to practise and perfect dive-bombing techniques, and the collaboration between Hitler and Mussolini, who then formed the Rome-Berlin Axis.

In **part (b)**, candidates were not always able to explain why Germany left the League of Nations. Statements such as, 'It was linked to the Treaty of Versailles which Hitler hated', 'Germany was the only country to have been forced to disarm', or 'Hitler was already gained some credit. For higher marks, each statement would need development to explain why Hitler felt it necessary to leave the League. In **part (c)** there was evidence of good knowledge of appeasement which was used to support the idea of British and French weakness. Candidates knew a great deal about the Nazi Soviet Pact and could explain why it contributed to the tensions which eventually led to war in 1939. Better responses avoided just writing a narrative of events and were able to link what happened to the reasons for war; for example, appeasement encouraged Hitler's aggression to the point where he no longer believed that Britain and France would intervene when Poland was invaded. In this style of question, candidates should keep their arguments to the two factors stated.

### Question 7

Candidates knew many detailed points about the 'domino effect' in **part (a)**. A significant number of answers to **part (b)** contained much narrative about Nixon's military strategy in Vietnam rather than focusing on the issue of why he found it difficult to withdraw US forces. Stronger responses included two, or sometimes three, developed points about anti-war protests, US reluctance to admit defeat and the failure of Vietnamisation. **Part (c)** answers sometimes lacked balance; it was important that the focus was on Kennedy and Johnson's terms of office, and whereas candidates knew a great deal about Johnson's escalation of US involvement in Vietnam, they tended to gloss over Kennedy; the key, as seen in better answers, was to use both presidents and compare their policies and success.

### Question 8

There were a small number of responses to this question. **Part (a)** required knowledge of methods used by the Soviets to maintain control of Hungary. Stronger responses were able to provide the four relevant points or two well-developed points for full marks. **Part (b)** attracted some general points about the success of Solidarity, but they lacked detail. Better candidates were able to explain that Solidarity had the support of the Catholic Church, whereas elsewhere in Eastern Europe, Communist governments had tried to crush the Christian churches. In Poland, however, the strength of the Catholic religion meant that the government dared not confront the Catholic Church. Answers to **part (c)** were unbalanced because there was sound knowledge of the advantages of the Berlin Wall to the USSR, but less explanation of its advantages to the Western allies.

## Section B – Depth Studies

### Question 9

There were few answers to this question. Candidates were able to identify some general problems faced by early tanks such as mud, mechanical breakdowns, lack of manoeuvrability and slowness of pace in **part (a)**. The same characteristic was apparent in responses to **part (b)**; candidates provided many general descriptive points such as the use of military aircraft for observation and reconnaissance, the detection of troop movements, and the fact that they could spot gaps in the enemy's lines. These responses would have benefited from developing more precise explanations about their importance. There were many balanced answers in **part (c)**, which debated whether or not Haig was the 'Butcher of the Somme'. The use of detailed knowledge of Haig's career was, on the whole, impressive.

### Question 10

Of the limited number of responses to this question, **part (b)** was well answered because candidates had sound knowledge to explain why Russia left the First World War in 1918. **Parts (a) and (c)** revealed less secure understanding of the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk and why British civilians joined the army.

### Question 11

It was rare to see a poor answer to **part (a)**; answers included detailed references to concentration camps and a significant number of candidates gained full marks. In contrast, there was weaker knowledge of why Kristallnacht occurred in **part (b)**. Answers which developed two or more of the following identified factors scored well: for example, it was caused by the murder of a German diplomat in Paris by a Jew; it was revenge for the murder; it was an anti-Jewish protest; it was a way of destroying Jewish businesses and synagogues. Less successful responses tended to be more generalised accounts of anti-Semitic movements. There was often good knowledge of Nazi methods of control as required by **part (c)**. There was balance in many answers which argued on the one hand that oppression was the key – supported by details of the police state such as use of the Gestapo, courts and concentration camps. On the other hand, responses offered a range of alternative factors including the genuine sense of patriotism shared by many Germans who were proud of the achievements of the Nazi state which had full employment and excellent public facilities and road networks.

### Question 12

**Part (a)** posed few problems and there was good knowledge of the 'Final Solution'. Responses displayed an understanding of the term and of the manner in which it was carried out. There were also many good answers to **part (b)**; the reasons why some women were unhappy with Nazi policies were generally well known. References were made to why some women disliked traditional domestic roles and dress, and the policy which forced many professional women to leave their jobs. Many found it difficult to apply relevant knowledge to both sides of the **part (c)** question about living standards under the Nazis. Supporting evidence included huge improvements in employment, benefits gained through the Strength through Joy organisation, and the fact that farmers enjoyed price guarantees. The idea of a 'feel good factor' was allowed when supported with details. On the other hand, counter arguments referred to wages which did not rise significantly, the outlawing of trade unions, food rationing from 1939 onwards and the privations suffered by Jews and other oppressed groups.

### Question 13

Candidates knew a great deal about the importance of religion to the Tsar's autocracy in **part (a)**, but answers to **part (b)** tended to be more descriptive. The question was looking for a precise explanation as to why discontent continued after the 1905 Revolution up to 1914. Some candidates included events of the 1905 Revolution, which lacked relevance. Answers to **part (c)** revealed sound arguments explaining the Tsar's shortcomings on the one hand, and alternative factors on the other, such as food shortages, high prices, industrial unrest and the impact of Rasputin.

### Question 14

There were few answers to this question. There was some general knowledge of the 'cult of Stalin' (**part (a)**), while explanations of the disastrous impact of the Purges tended to be more descriptive than analytical (**part (b)**). The removal of experienced officers in the army, the loss of every one of the navy's admirals, the inexperience amongst the leadership of the forces when facing Hitler, and the loss of skilled engineers, were typical of the identified reasons given but sometimes they lacked detail. **Part (c)** answers could often have been more effectively argued because unbalanced answers either focused on Stalin or Trotsky, rather than both.

### Question 15

**Part (a)** was well answered. Many candidates could correctly identify a range of Republican policies which encouraged industrial growth in the 1920s. Some responses to **part (b)** tended to be overly descriptive, without reference to specific supporting factors. There was a great deal of information about Henry Ford and how assembly line production was organized. However, each point needed to be applied to the demands of the question by explaining why this method of production helped the US economy to grow in the 1920s. For **part (c)** it was important to balance different groups of people, some of whom benefited from the boom and some of whom did not. Answers were particularly strong when explaining factors relating to immigrants, farmers and black Americans. Arguments about alternative groups who did prosper in the 1920s tended to be less developed. Typically, the latter might have included explanations of prospering upper and middle class people who were able, for instance, to own cars and purchase luxury goods.

### Question 16

There were few responses to this question. **Part (a)** was well answered but candidates tended to offer general explanations of the Second New Deal in **part (b)**. Developed reasoning might have included concerns that progress was slow in overcoming unemployment and needed more immediate measures, such as the WPA. The Second New Deal was introduced, however, to produce a fairer and more caring society and these measures were more long term. This meant bringing in legislation such as the Social Security Act, which provided old age pensions and unemployment benefits based on an insurance scheme funded by taxes levied on workers and employers. Answers to **part (c)** were sometimes unbalanced by focusing much more on Republican opposition than on Supreme Court decisions.

### Questions 17–20

There were too few answers to these questions to make meaningful comments.

### Question 21

In **part (a)**, many candidates possessed good knowledge of Nasser's takeover of the Suez Canal in 1956. **Part (b)** answers tended to contain general comments about Israel's dislike of Nasser. Typically, these included Nasser's desire for revenge following an earlier defeat by Israel, Nasser's receipt of arms from the USSR, the encouragement of Fedayeen attacks from Egyptian soil and Nasser's ambitions to take over the Suez Canal. In **part (c)**, some responses would have benefited from the inclusion of detailed knowledge about the extent of Israeli success during the Suez Crisis. Some responses approached the question well, firstly defining the nature of 'success' and then supporting arguments by explaining Israel's achievements on the one hand, and the continuing threat posed by Arab neighbours, on the other.

### Question 22

It was rare to see a weak answer to **part (a)**. Those who attempted **part (b)** produced strong responses about why Israel did not allow Palestinian refugees to return to their homes in Israel. Typically, good answers explained how around 700,000 Palestinian Arabs fled from their homes by 1949, which gave the new nation of Israel considerable areas of land and houses for its increasing population of Jews. The Jews wanted as few Palestinian Arabs as possible within Israel so that it was a Jewish state with its own language and culture. **Part (c)** produced many well-supported arguments to assess the importance of the first Intifada. Candidates were able to explain why it brought much sympathy for Palestinians, even in the USA; this was balanced by recognition that the Intifada did not bring any improvements in Palestinian living conditions. Many responses provided well-supported points on each side of the argument, some going on to analyse 'importance' and arrive at a judgement.

# HISTORY (US)

---

Paper 0416/23  
Paper 23

## Key messages

The understanding of the context of the sources was generally good and there was considerable evidence of background knowledge being used to help answer the questions being asked. Candidates were better at interpreting and comparing sources than they were at evaluating them. Many were able to work out the messages of the sources. However, some would benefit from reading the source as a whole and giving greater consideration to the point of view of the author or artist. Those who attempted to evaluate the sources with generalisations about source type were less successful in their responses. Candidates need to go beyond accepting or rejecting sources at face value, or at the level of undeveloped provenance. The best attempts at evaluation were nearly always those that focused on a source's purpose in its historical context. These answers considered the reservations one should have about a source because of its purpose and used this to inform their responses.

## General comments

Most candidates responded well to the demands of the paper. An overwhelming majority of candidates answered on the twentieth-century topic; consequently there were too few responses on the nineteenth-century option for meaningful comments to be made.

Candidates responded well to the precise details in the questions. For example, on **Question 4 in Option B** the issue of surprise was addressed by many in their opening sentence; this is a strategy that works well.

While many candidates did very well in response to **Question 6**, there were some who did not use the sources as the basis of their answer. Similarly, those who grouped the sources together and made general comments about the statement usually struggled to engage with the content of each source. Candidates need to use the sources to both support and disagree with the given statement. The sources provided enabled them to do both and, consequently, to write a balanced answer.

## Comments on specific questions

### ***Option A: 19<sup>th</sup> century topic***

There were too few responses on this option for any meaningful comments to be made.

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

#### **Question 1**

There was a wide range of answers to this question which asked candidates to assess the level of agreement between two sources. The best responses identified points of agreement and disagreement and illustrated these with content from both sources. Weaker answers summarised the sources without making specific comparisons. The agreements were more easily spotted by candidates than were the disagreements, and many candidates were able to explain the former well. For example, many responses explained that both sources agree that the League was successful in resolving the dispute between Sweden and Finland, or the dispute between Greece and Bulgaria. Many answers also recognised that both sources agreed that the League was successful when

smaller states were involved and that it was just an addition to existing power politics. One point of disagreement centred on the League's effectiveness when great powers were involved. In A, the League was 'less effective' when great powers were involved. In B, the League's intervention in 'the clash between Britain and Turkey over oil-rich Mosul in 1924' is used as evidence of its ability to 'keep the peace in matters involving a great power.' Candidates need to explain points of disagreement rather than just describing differences between the sources; in other words, disagreements must be about the same thing. Many candidates attempted to compare the reasons for the League's failure in Abyssinia, stating that Source B blames Britain and France. There was, however, no direct point of comparison to this in Source A. The best responses compared the overall 'big messages' of the sources; that is that Source A was negative about the League, while Source B was positive.

### **Question 2**

In this question, candidates were required to compare two cartoons. Less strong responses compared surface details or undeveloped provenance. Most candidates, however, managed to address the question, and clear attempts at comparisons were made in all but a few responses. The very best answers focused on the disagreement between the cartoonists' overall opinions. They explained that Source C approves of the League and believes it will prove effective in the future, whereas Source D is mocking the League because it can only deal with small disputes, like the one between Bulgaria and Greece. The majority of candidates were able to interpret the cartoons and explain similarities between them, for instance, many recognised that both cartoons showed the League as powerful, or as stopping war. While valid, these answers would have been improved if they had then gone on to provide a comparison of the big messages; in Source C the cartoonist, whose work was produced in 1920, is predicting that the League will get stronger overtime. In Source D, the overall message is also positive - the League can effectively deal with small disputes.

### **Question 3**

This question proved the most challenging for a number of candidates and there was some misinterpretation in answers. Many saw the cartoon as a sign of the League gaining peace or based their answer around the mistaken belief that the central figure in the image was either Mussolini or Hitler. While some candidates were able to recognise the context of Manchuria, this was not always used to explain the League's failure. Without the context of Manchuria, candidates were only able to explain sub-messages, of which there were many, for example: the League is weak, the League has no principles or the League turns a blind eye to problems. Those candidates who achieved higher marks made use of the words 'prophesies for 1932' and were able to explain how the cartoon is predicting that the League will cave into Japan and allow Japan to get away with its invasion of Manchuria. The best responses came from candidates who could also explain the cartoonist's viewpoint, i.e. that he is condemning the League for this.

### **Question 4**

This question asked whether or not source F is surprising. The crucial thing in a question of this nature is for candidates to make it clear whether or not they are surprised, and by what – their explanations can then have a proper focus. Also, explanations should be consistent with the stance taken on surprise. Some candidates based their answers on Source F alone and used every day empathy or reasons internal to the source to explain their lack of surprise; for example, not surprised Chamberlain said the League had disappointing results as it could no longer be relied upon to secure the peace of the world. Those who achieved higher marks tended to consider the source as a whole, rather than focusing an answer on details within it. They also explained surprise, or, in the very best responses, a lack of surprise. Another good approach was to look to the other sources on the paper, or to relevant contextual knowledge, to support arguments.

### **Question 5**

In **Question 5**, candidates were asked to consider two conflicting written sources and conclude whether the content of one proved the other wrong. Here, the evaluation of the sources could have been better. Some responses recognised that the provenance and/or purpose of the two sources was a crucial element in the answer, but then went no further than stating that one being written by a Soviet and the other by the Secretary General of the League meant that Source G proved Source H



wrong. Another approach was to use the dates of the sources – here, some answers would have benefitted from greater development. Most candidates dealt with this question by mismatching the content of Source G with Source H and stating that this meant Source G does prove Source H wrong. Most highlighted the disagreement over the League's degree of success – Source G states it failed as its policy led to three wars and a fourth one threatened, while Source H says the League 'succeeded during a number of years' and its 'balance-sheet' was 'not altogether unfavourable'. Those candidates that were able to make a developed use of the provenance or purpose of either source achieved good marks.

### **Question 6**

Overall this was answered very well, and many candidates achieved high marks on this question by carefully explaining how a number of the sources could be seen as providing convincing evidence that the League of Nations was a failure, while others said the League was not a failure and enjoyed at least some degree of success. The most successful answers examined the sources one by one and explained how the content of each supported or disagreed with the given hypothesis. Some candidates would have improved their answers by making it clear whether the source under discussion supported or disagreed with the given statement. Candidates should avoid grouping the sources together and making assertions about them as a group; this rarely worked well. Good responses also avoided summaries of the sources and generalisations about source type. The best responses included genuine evaluation based on a source's purpose, rather than simple statements involving bias or undeveloped provenance.