

HISTORY

Paper 0416/11

Paper 11

General Comments and Key Messages

A number of candidates were able to demonstrate sound factual knowledge of both the Core and the Depth Study for which they had been prepared. Candidates used their knowledge effectively in writing well-developed explanations and arguments for their chosen questions. The majority of candidates managed the time available well, and were able to answer all the required questions. Only a small number of candidates were unable to complete the paper.

Candidates should ensure that they read and follow the instructions given on the paper carefully. There were fewer rubric errors this year. However, there were still a number of candidates who attempted all twenty five questions on the paper.

Candidates should read the questions carefully and ensure they are actually answering the question set, rather than writing lots of facts about the given area of the syllabus. It is also important that candidates look carefully at the dates given in questions, to ensure that they include material that is relevant to that particular period.

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. Some candidates constructed a clear hypothesis in response to a question but then needed to go on and use their factual knowledge to support this hypothesis.

Comments on Specific Questions

The following comments do are intended to help Centres in the preparation of their candidates.

Section A: Core Content

Questions 1 to 3

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

Question 4

- (a)** Some candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of the Triple Alliance, with answers focused upon the names of the countries within the alliance, the development of the Triple Alliance from the Dual Alliance and the support countries offered to each other. Candidates are expected to know the details of the Triple Alliance. Some candidates wrote about the Triple Entente instead of the Triple Alliance.
- (b)** Many candidates were able to state reasons why tension was increased by the arms race of the early twentieth century. Reasons stated included Britain feeling threatened by the growth of the German navy, the stockpiling of weapons and the increasing number of Dreadnoughts. More candidates could have developed these reasons into explanations. A number of candidates answered in very general terms only, with reference to the desire of all nations to be the most powerful.
- (c)** Candidates demonstrated detailed factual knowledge of events in Morocco and events in Bosnia in the years before the First World War. Many candidates only described events, rather than explaining why these events were a threat to peace. Part **(c)** questions require candidates to analyse events.

Question 5

- (a) Many candidates displayed detailed knowledge of the successes of the League of Nations in the 1920s. Successes described included the Åland Islands, Upper Silesia and various humanitarian issues. This question specifically asked about the successes of the League in the 1920s. Some candidates wrote solely about the failures of the League in the 1920s and 1930s, which was not relevant to this question. Some candidates gained maximum marks by describing the successes of the League in the 1920s, but then wrote at some length about the failures of the League, which was not required, using up time that could have been spent on another question.
- (b) Some candidates explained clearly that the absence of the USA had a detrimental effect upon trade sanctions and also explained the problems facing Britain and France due to the absence of the USA. Other candidates explained why the USA failed to become a member of the League, rather than why the absence of the USA caused problems for the League. Candidates must ensure they answer the actual question.
- (c) This question was answered well by some candidates. The role of Italy in the failure of the League was clearly addressed, with reference to both Corfu and Abyssinia. Answers were developed with explanation of the role of Britain and France in undermining the League in the Hoare-Laval Pact, and the slow pace of action in the Manchurian crisis. Many candidates adopted a purely narrative approach, and simply described the events surrounding Corfu, Abyssinia and Manchuria. These candidates often had very detailed knowledge of events, but needed to use this knowledge to link the actions of Italy, Britain and France to the actual failure of the League.

Question 6

- (a) Most candidates demonstrated detailed contextual knowledge of Hitler's foreign policy aims, and were able to state at least four relevant points. These were usually focused on the desire to overturn the Treaty of Versailles, the desire for a Greater Germany, Lebensraum and the aim of achieving Anschluss with Austria. Candidates are expected to know the difference between Hitler's domestic policy and his foreign policy. Some candidates wrote at considerable length about Hitler's policies towards women and children. These areas were not relevant to a question on foreign policy.
- (b) This question could be approached by explaining why the remilitarisation succeeded as an action and/or why it brought successful consequences. Answers focused on the overturning of a term of the Treaty of Versailles, the fact that Hitler was not opposed by the French and the strengthening of Hitler's position with the German citizens and the generals. Part (b) questions require candidates to explain reasons. A number of answers to this question described events in the remilitarisation of the Rhineland, and needed to explain why this was a success for Hitler.
- (c) Most candidates were able to describe the increased militarism of Germany and to identify at least one other cause of the Second World War, such as appeasement, German resentment towards the Treaty of Versailles or the Nazi-Soviet Pact. Some developed clear explanations of how these other causes led to war. Fewer candidates were able to explain how increased militarism led to war. They tended to describe how countries were increasing armaments, usually referring to Germany alone. This needed to be developed into explanation of how this led to increased tension and made each country more likely to increase its own armed forces to ensure its own safety, thus making war more likely.

Question 7

- (a) Detailed knowledge of decisions made at Yalta was used effectively by candidates. Most were able to state that Germany and Berlin were divided into four zones, and to detail the countries that were responsible for each zone. Some candidates also described decisions made about a Soviet sphere of influence in Eastern Europe, the treatment of war criminals and the holding of free elections in countries freed from Nazi occupation.
- (b) Some candidates gave clearly focused explanation of the Soviet Union's long held mistrust of the Western Powers, the lack of a common enemy and the Western Powers' belief that Stalin wanted to take over all of Europe. Candidates must ensure that they read the question carefully. The question clearly stated 'in 1945'; many candidates wrote about events after this date.

- (c) Increasing tension caused by the Berlin Blockade was clearly explained by some candidates. Other reasons explained included the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. Some candidates adopted a purely narrative approach, describing the events of the Berlin Blockade rather than explaining how the Blockade increased Cold War tension. Candidates do need to be aware of the difference between the Berlin Blockade and the Berlin Wall. A significant number of candidates wrote at length about the building of the Berlin Wall and its significance. This was not relevant to the question. The question asked about reasons for increasing Cold War tension in the years 1947-49. These dates were missed by some candidates.

Question 8

- (a) The key features of the Bay of Pigs incident were clearly described by many candidates. Details included the training received by the exiles, their equipment, their numbers and events occurring when they actually landed at the Bay of Pigs.
- (b) Some candidates developed clear explanations focused on Kennedy's desire to protect the USA and to be viewed as a strong president, coupled with the necessity to avoid reacting in a way that could be construed as an act of war. As in previous questions, a significant number of candidates only described events.
- (c) Candidates were able to give a variety of identified points agreeing and disagreeing with the statement in the question. Identified points included the withdrawal of missiles from Turkey and from Cuba, Kennedy improving his reputation, the decline of Khrushchev's reputation and the setting up of a hot-line. A number of candidates developed these points into substantiated explanations. A small number of candidates answered this question in generalised terms only, making unsubstantiated assertions that both Kennedy and Khrushchev were winners and losers.

Section B: Depth Studies

Question 9

- (a) Some candidates were able to give at least two relevant points of detail, focusing on the Nazi Party's desire to ensure that only 'true' Germans were allowed to live in Germany, the desire to eradicate communism and also to ensure that all Germans would have jobs. This question clearly highlighted that candidates must look carefully at the date specified. Some candidates wrote very detailed accounts of Nazi domestic policy from 1933 onwards, which was not relevant to this question.
- (b) Effective answers to this question explained that the Nazi Party's lack of success was directly linked to the success of the Weimar government between 1924 and 1929. Answers also highlighted that Hitler's term in prison left the Nazi Party without an inspirational leader. A small number of candidates wrote about Nazi success after 1929.
- (c) There were a number of clearly focused responses to this question. Explanations referred to Hitler's skill as an orator and his appeal to the people of Germany. On the other side of the argument, candidates stressed the importance of the Depression and of Nazi propaganda. Some candidates devoted their answers solely to the period from 1933 onwards. The question asked about success between 1929 and 1932.

Question 10

- (a) Many candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of the powers Hitler gained from the Enabling Act. Other candidates wrote in general terms only. Candidates are expected to know the details of the powers Hitler gained from the Enabling Act.
- (b) Developed explanations were given of the challenge from Röhm and the violence of the SA. A number of candidates wrote about Kristallnacht, rather than the Night of the Long Knives.
- (c) Effective answers to this question explained the role of the police state in controlling the people of Germany by referring to the Gestapo, the role of informers and the role of the courts. These points were all clearly linked to controlling the German people. Propaganda was also clearly explained, with reference made to the control of the radio and press. Some candidates answered in general

terms, stating only that people were scared of the police state. Some candidates discussed the types of propaganda used in some depth, and would have improved their responses by explaining how this controlled the German people.

Question 11

- (a) Some candidates were able to state several relevant points, with a focus on land, the role of the Orthodox Church and the attitudes towards the Tsar. Other candidates wrote in generalised terms only, stating life was hard for the peasants.
- (b) The 'carrot and stick' approach introduced by Stolypin was clearly explained, as were Stolypin's reforms to improve the life of the peasants. Some candidates appeared unaware of the role of Stolypin and therefore wrote in generalised terms about Stolypin helping some people.
- (c) Candidates were able to explain that the Tsar's personal command of the armed forces meant that he was held personally responsible for military defeats and the suffering of the Russian troops. The explanation of other reasons for the fall of the Tsarist regime focused mainly upon the roles of Rasputin and the Tsarina. Some candidates wrote narrative accounts about Rasputin, without explaining how his actions contributed to the fall of the Tsarist regime.

Question 12

- (a) There were many effective answers to this question, with details given of Trotsky's skill as an orator, his skills in organising the Red Army and his intellectual abilities. Some general statements about Trotsky being a marvellous leader or being an able man were also seen.
- (b) Some candidates explained the various facets of Stalin's emergence as the main leader of the Soviet Union by developing reasons such as Stalin tricking Trotsky into missing Lenin's funeral, the withholding of Lenin's secret testament, Stalin's appearance as a man of the people and Stalin's skill at playing one group against the other. A number of candidates did not notice that the question stated 'by 1928', and made reference to events much later than 1928.
- (c) Developed explanations were given of the role of the NKVD, the Purges and the labour camps in instilling fear in the people of the Soviet Union. Other methods explained were the use of propaganda, the cult of personality and also control through the positive aspects of Stalin's rule in giving the people work and improved transport and communications systems.

Question 13

- (a) A variety of changes were specified in response to this question. They included the development of talkie movies, the changes in dance style, the development of Hollywood as the centre of movie making and the introduction of America's first radio station. A number of candidates wrote at some length about entertainment generally in the 1920s, without any reference to the changes.
- (b) There were some well-developed explanations relating to the fear of immigrants and socialist ideas, the desire to protect true American values and the conviction that only WASPs were true Americans. Some candidates wrote about the nature of intolerance in American society, rather than why there was intolerance.
- (c) The role of corruption in causing the failure of prohibition was effectively explained, with reference to corruption amongst prohibition agents, police officers, judges and government officials. Explanation of other reasons for the failure of prohibition focused upon the increase in crime and the fact that so many Americans did not agree with the prohibition law and therefore ignored it. A considerable number of candidates described the activities of Al Capone in detail, but they needed to go on to explain why this caused the failure of prohibition.

Question 14

- (a) Candidates detailed a number of Roosevelt's actions, including the Emergency Banking Act and the support given to those banks designated as reliable and therefore allowed to continue in business. The answers of some candidates would have benefited from greater focus on the actual question, as they wrote about the Wall Street Crash and how it caused problems for the banks, rather than concentrating how Roosevelt dealt with the banks to prevent economic disaster.

- (b) The effective answers to this question explained that Roosevelt set up the Tennessee Valley Authority to revive agriculture, to provide cheap electricity and to give much needed assistance to a poverty stricken area. A small number of candidates wrote about the Civilian Conservation Corps instead of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Candidates are expected to know the differences between the various alphabet agencies.
- (c) Some candidates gave detailed explanations of the failure of the New Deal to help the poor, with focus upon the poverty faced by old people and by the unemployed. Arguments were supported by reference to the views of Roosevelt's critics such as Huey Long and Father Coughlin. This was followed by clear explanation of other weaknesses of the New Deal, such as the lack of benefits for Black Americans and women. A number of candidates described the various alphabet agencies without reference to the question set; others simply described the successes of the New Deal; in both cases, answers would have been improved by focusing on the actual question.

Questions 15 to 25

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

HISTORY

Paper 0416/21

Paper 21

Key Messages and General Comments

This paper tests the skills of source analysis. The kinds of questions that occur on this paper involve source comprehension, interpretation and evaluation. The analysis is done in context; thus although no questions demand factual recall, contextual knowledge is vital in helping candidates to use the sources in the most effective ways.

As with all examinations, candidates receive credit for responding to the question asked. On this paper candidates sometimes write about the source(s), and lose sight of what they are asked. To prevent this, it is a good idea to begin each answer with a sentence responding directly to the question. So, for example, if asked 'Does this source prove?', candidates could respond immediately with 'I think this source does (not) prove because.....'

The last question always carries the most marks. It asks candidates to test a hypothesis against evidence offered by all the sources. There will always be evidence both to support and to question the hypothesis, so answering on one side only will not allow candidates to achieve higher marks. Candidates need to go further than asserting that a source does/does not support the hypothesis; the answer must show how the source content indicates support or not.

The strengths demonstrated by candidates included a good depth of factual knowledge, and a well-developed ability to comprehend and make sense of the content of the sources. The main area where improvement is needed is on source evaluation, with many candidates reluctant to question the reliability of the sources, or if they do, using generalisations about source types, rather than analysis of the specific claims being made in a source. For example, on questions demanding comparison of sources, some candidates would have benefited by showing more awareness that genuine comparisons can only be made where a common criterion is used as the basis for comparison. The comments below on **Question 1** on both the options provide more detail on this issue. There were also answers that showed developed source evaluation of source content in context, notably on both **Questions 5** (i.e. both the nineteenth-century and twentieth-century topics).

There were very few incomplete scripts, and rubric errors were a rarity. The numbers of candidates answering the twentieth century questions greatly outnumbered those opting for the nineteenth century.

Comments on Specific Questions

Option A: 19th Century topic

Question 1

In general, candidates could identify some valid agreements or disagreements between the sources. There was also a lot of writing about the sources in which the answer struggled to establish a proper basis for comparison. Many stated, for example, that the sources were different because Source A said that *Reconstruction was not radical enough*, whilst Source B said that *the Civil War amendments brought some freedoms to black Americans*. One can see how this might be perceived this as a disagreement, but the two statements are not mutually exclusive. A disagreement would have to be on the issue of whether Reconstruction was radical enough, or on whether the Civil War amendments brought some freedoms. It is only by establishing the common criterion on which the comparison is based, that a genuine agreement or disagreement can be identified. The other main issue which arose was when candidates attempted to use the sources' overall judgements on Reconstruction in their comparisons. On this level, the two sources agreed that Reconstruction was a failure, though it had some achievements. Some answers differed from this, for example stating that Source A was negative about Reconstruction, whilst Source B was positive.

Whilst aspects of each source might lend themselves to this conclusion, the sources as a whole do not support it. In sum up, since the two sources contained few overt contradictions or agreements, candidates should have looked more carefully on the source detail in order to make valid points.

Question 2

Most answers identified that both sources were about the Freedmen's Bureau, and many spotted that both indicated Johnson's opposition to it. Better answers went beyond what the sources showed and explored instead the messages that the cartoonists were trying to get across. Here there was a significant difference, in that Source C was critical of Johnson, and thus supportive of the Bureau, whilst Source D was hostile to it. Many were able to detect the opinion contained within Source D but did not operate on the same level on Source C. The very best answers showed awareness that the two artists had different purposes for what they drew, in that they aimed to produce different effects on their audiences. The artist of Source C was aiming to gain support for the Bureau, whilst Source D was using the supposed failings of the Bureau to stir up opposition to it.

Question 3

Ultimately, given an understanding of the context in which a source was produced, one should not be surprised by what it says or shows. Nonetheless, without this contextual understanding, it was easy to be surprised that, in the aftermath of the Civil War, Johnson should show such sympathy for the South, or that a newspaper editor should speak with such a lack of respect about the President. Once candidates started to use their contextual knowledge, though, the surprise could be explained. The weaker way of doing this was to check Johnson's claims about the South against the reality, which would still lead one to be surprised. A better route was to use knowledge about Johnson to show that what he was saying was entirely consistent with his career/beliefs. There was a final route which a few candidates took, which was to show how it was unsurprising that a radical Northerner would feel this way about Johnson.

Question 4

It was possible to misinterpret this cartoon and see it as mocking the ex-slave. However, most avoided this trap and were able to suggest some plausible messages of the source, such as that it was showing the deep desire for education amongst the freed slaves. Some answers could have been improved by exploring the opinion of the cartoonist. The picture was not just illustrating what was happening, but was approving of it. Thus the message was that what the 'old scholar' was doing was admirable.

Question 5

Utility questions frequently elicit the response that the source is useful for the information it provides – this can mean that information is taken at face value from the source. Some candidates took this approach, though the blatant mismatch between what Grady was saying and the reality of life in the South should have discouraged them. Indeed, many realised this and, having used examples such as the Jim Crow laws, or the Ku Klux Klan, rejected the utility of the source on the grounds that it was unbelievable. These were good answers but they still contained an essential misunderstanding – that an unbelievable source is not useful as evidence. The critical question is a matter of how one wishes to use it as evidence. Source G did not tell us anything factual about life in the South, but it did tell us what white Southerners wanted people in the North to think about the South.

Question 6

Some good answers were seen and most candidates were capable of working through the sources, finding evidence both to support and to question the hypothesis. Some wrote about the sources without making it clear which side of the hypothesis was being argued. Some appeared to suggest that this was self-evident, but it should always be spelt out. The least successful answers did not address the sources at all, writing instead on the lives of black Americans during Reconstruction. Some answers would have benefited from being aware that marks are available for evidence of source evaluation. Had they used, for example, Source G as an evaluated source, i.e. as evidence that the lives of black Americans had *not* improved, they would have achieved more marks.

Option B: 20th Century topic

Question 1

In general, candidates could identify some valid agreements or disagreements between the sources, and many found examples of both. There was also a lot of writing about the sources in which the answer was unable to establish a proper basis for comparison. Some stated, for example, that the sources were different because Source A said that *Clemenceau was under attack in France*, whilst Source B said *Clemenceau got the best possible deal for France*. One can see how this might be perceived as a disagreement, but the two statements are not mutually exclusive. A disagreement would have to be on the issue of whether Clemenceau was or was not under attack, or on whether he got the best possible deal or not. It is by establishing the common criterion on which the comparison is based, that a genuine agreement or disagreement can be identified. Many candidates attempted to find an aspect of overall judgement in the sources that could be compared, generally on whether the Big Three were pleased/succeeded, but the fact that Source B made no mention of Lloyd George prevented these attempts from working. To sum up, since the two sources contained few overt contradictions or agreements, candidates had to work more carefully on the source detail in order to make valid points.

Question 2

When the question asks why something has happened, a reason will be an essential part of the answer. Some candidates interpreted the cartoon and neglected to offer a reason for publication. The most common response was to provide a contextual reason – because this was the time when something, for example, the treaty negotiations, was going on. At this level, minor inaccuracies, for example from candidates who said that the cartoon was when the Versailles Treaty had been signed, did not harm responses. Other answers interpreted the cartoon in such a way as to cast the message as a reason for publication – to say/show/tell something about the treaties. The cartoon was full of sub-messages – valid points of interpretation that fell short of understanding the overall, ‘Big Message’ of the cartoon – such as explaining the bandage around Germany’s mouth as a reference to the ‘Diktat’. The ‘Big Message’ had to encompass all the defeated powers or all the treaties; for example, to show that all the defeated powers deserved to be treated harshly. The best answers, however, understood the specific purpose of the cartoonist in the context of May 1919 as the reason for publication. At this stage the Versailles Treaty had not been signed, and the British public were clamouring for a harsh treaty. The cartoonist was reflecting this feeling and putting pressure on the peacemakers not to relent and to make sure that all the treaties were tough on the defeated powers.

Question 3

This question gave candidates an opportunity to evaluate the sources, and more candidates could have taken it. The first task was to identify the way in which the sources differed. The crucial point here was Clemenceau’s rhetoric of ‘justice’ being contradicted by House’s admission that the Treaty was a bad one. Most candidates understood this difference, and concluded that the difference meant that one or the other must be wrong. This was not really an explanation of the idea of ‘proof’. To make further progress candidates had to explore the credibility of what was being claimed – not at the level of fact checking, for example on whether or not Germany had destroyed industries – but on the essential matter of just/unjust that separated the sources. The most obvious route was to see Clemenceau’s words as special pleading, designed to justify the harsh terms and to persuade the audience that they were ‘just’. In this light his words could not disprove House’s judgment. Evaluating Source E was also possible, and achieved by some candidates. Cross-referencing its claims to those in Source H would have provided some interesting insights, but more obviously Source A’s claims about none of the peacemakers being satisfied would have been some confirmation for House’s view.

Question 4

For most candidates Source G was more accessible than Source F, though some assumed that the figure leaning against the keystone was Wilson. The messages within Source F were more complex, but most could see the cartoon as evidence that Wilson was in charge, and was seeking international peace. There were lots of sub-messages to compare – on whether the USA was involved/important/would succeed or on how the other powers were represented as working for peace or not. To compare the ‘Big Messages’, candidates needed to see both cartoons as comments on the League of Nations. What they had in common was a belief that the League would not work. The best candidates saw this but also appreciated that the cartoons differed in their opinions on why the League would not work, or on who they blamed for its weakness.

Question 5

Ultimately, given a full understanding of the context in which a source was produced, one should not be surprised by what it says or shows. Nonetheless, without this contextual understanding, it was easy to be surprised here that Wilson seemed to be advocating a harsh peace, when what we know about Wilson would lead us to expect him to advocate a peace based on justice. Most candidates made this point, and some were more specific about Wilson's policies, making reference to the League or the Fourteen Points. These answers, however, missed the vital clue in the provenance. The speech was made by Wilson after the Versailles Treaty had been concluded, whilst he was on a speaking tour around the USA. The best answers were therefore unsurprised, as they understood that Wilson's tasks were to persuade the US Congress and the American people to accept the Treaty, so that it would be ratified. In effect, he was talking to an audience reluctant to accept the terms of the peace, so he had to represent it in this way. It was notable that a large number of candidates were capable of evaluating Wilson's speech in context and it seemed that the very obvious contrast between what he was saying, and what candidates would have expected him to say, sparked off this analysis.

Question 6

Most candidates were capable of working through the sources, finding evidence both to support and to question the hypothesis. However, there were some who didn't spot that it was asking specifically about the peacemakers, and not the victorious countries and their populations in general. 'Peacemakers' was interpreted as the 'Big Three' (or Four) and their delegations. Some wrote about the sources without making it clear which side of the hypothesis was being argued. Some appeared to suggest that this is self-evident, but it should always be spelt out. The least successful answers did not address the sources at all, writing instead on the peace-making process. This could not receive high marks. Some answers would have benefited from being aware that marks are available for evidence of source evaluation. Had they used Source G as an evaluated source, i.e. as evidence that the peacemakers had *not* got what they wanted, they would have achieved more marks.

HISTORY

Paper 0416/03
Coursework

Key Messages and General Comments

The entry for the coursework option rose this year. There was also an improvement in the overall quality of the work, which was already very high. As a result of this the Moderators saw much interesting work, demonstrating a range of historical skills.

The relevant assessment objectives were tested appropriately and much of the centre marking was accurate. Many Centres produced detailed and helpful annotation of their candidates' work which was most helpful. Most Centres had their marks left unchanged but a small number had their marks adjusted. This was mainly for Assignment 1.

Comments on Specific Questions

Assignment 1

The number of Centres using essays for this assignment continues to increase. The best work was focused, with little irrelevant description or narrative, and with every paragraph contributing to the overall analysis. It was encouraging to see more candidates reaching, and supporting, substantial conclusions. However, this remains an area where there is some leniency in the marking. When candidates come to, for example, argue that one factor was more important than another, they do need to construct developed and supported clinching arguments. Repeating points already made will not justify high marks. The best work started with a clear argument which was then substantiated throughout the rest of the answer. This is to be preferred to answers that explain several factors and then add a rather weak conclusion on at the end.

Those Centres using the Board-approved assignments will often be requiring candidates to analyse short, and long term, causes. The best answers, and those justifying high marks, are those that explore the different functions of these different types of causal factors. However, this must be done through real causes and not in a purely theoretical way.

Assignment 2

Most Centres used the Board-approved assignments which comprise of a range of sources with a number of questions testing skills such as comparing, interpreting and evaluating. This ensured that candidates had to display a wide range of source skills and also served as a useful preparation for Paper 2. Much impressive work was produced and the marks awarded were rarely changed by Moderators.