

HISTORY

Paper 0416/11

Paper 11

General Comments and Key Messages

Many 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. A small number of candidates were unable to complete the paper.

Candidates need to read the questions carefully and ensure they are answering the question which is set. This is especially true of questions that include a date; candidates need to take the date or dates given in questions into account when framing their answers.

It was noticeable this year that many candidates were able to show a detailed factual knowledge of their chosen Core and Depth Study. This meant that many candidates achieved highly on part (a) questions, which require factual recall alone. Some candidates adopted a narrative approach to answering part (b) and (c) questions; they have the historical knowledge required to answer these questions and need to demonstrate their understanding by explaining factors, rather than just describing them. Some candidates constructed a clear hypothesis in response to a question; they need to use their factual knowledge to support this hypothesis, rather than construct narrative responses. Answers to part (b) questions require explanations supported with factual knowledge. Answers to part (c) questions require explanations supported with factual knowledge and an analysis of the issue in the question.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A - Core Content

Questions 1 to 3

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

Question 4

- (a) Some responses described in depth the part played by Germany in increasing colonial rivalry, with focus upon Germany's desire for 'a place in the sun', the Berlin Conference of 1885, and the German involvement in Morocco. Some candidates based their answers entirely upon the naval rivalry between Britain and Germany, rather than the part played by Germany in increasing colonial rivalry.
- (b) Effective answers to this question explained that the Alliance System created two armed camps and developed this idea to explain how the threat of war was increased. Answers also included explanation of the concern felt by isolated countries. Some candidates displayed a detailed knowledge of the members of the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente; this knowledge needed development into explanation of why this increased the threat of war.
- (c) Some candidates were able to identify a number of factors that increased Great Power tension before the First World War, including the problems in the Balkans, the rival alliance systems and Anglo-German naval rivalry. Candidates were able to describe these factors in some detail; effective answers were developed to explain how these factors increased tension between the Great Powers.

Question 5

- (a) Many candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of the Treaty of Versailles' impact on Germany's military and included details of points such as the number of men allowed in the army and navy, the banning of conscription and the demilitarisation of the Rhineland. A number of answers focused upon the impact the Treaty of Versailles had on Germany generally, as they included details relating to land losses and reparations; these lacked relevance to a question about the impact upon the military.
- (b) Candidates displayed a depth of knowledge about the aims of Woodrow Wilson, Lloyd George and Clemenceau, and many deployed this knowledge effectively to write comparative explanations of why these aims differed. Some candidates wrote lists of the aims of the Big Three without explaining why these differed; some also explained why the aims were similar, whereas the question asked why the aims of the Big Three differed.
- (c) The focus of this question was upon Germany's reaction to the Treaty of Versailles. Some candidates developed well-argued answers, explaining, for example, that German horror at the military terms of the Treaty was justified because these terms left them vulnerable to attack, and that German outrage was not justified given the terms the Germans imposed upon Russia in the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk. However, some responses stated that Germany was horrified at the Treaty's terms and then simply listed the terms. Many candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of the terms of the Treaty, but needed to develop this knowledge to construct explanations that focused upon Germany's reaction to the Treaty being justified or unjustified.

Question 6

- (a) Effective answers to this question detailed the introduction of conscription, the signing of the Anglo-German Naval Treaty and its terms, the building of military equipment and the remilitarisation of the Rhineland. Some responses missed the time limit of 'by March 1936', and detailed Germany's role in the Spanish Civil War from July 1936. Some answers gave detailed statistics of the number of aeroplanes, battleships and military personnel in Germany, although these statistics were usually those for 1939, rather than March 1936.
- (b) There were some well-developed explanations in response to this question. Explanations focused upon Hitler's desire to unite all German speakers and to develop a Greater Germany. Some candidates also developed an explanation based upon Hitler's desire to acquire Austria's mineral wealth. Candidates are expected to have a sound knowledge of the reasons why Hitler wanted Anschluss and exactly what the Anschluss was. They therefore need to be aware that Anschluss was the uniting of Germany and Austria, rather than the reuniting of the two countries.
- (c) Many candidates demonstrated an extensive knowledge of the details of appeasement. A number of candidates used this knowledge effectively to explain that Chamberlain was both right and wrong to follow this policy. Arguments focused upon the need for Britain to have more time to prepare for war, the memories of the carnage that occurred in the First World War, and, on the other side of the argument, the alarm caused to the USSR, the missed opportunities to stop Hitler and the point that appeasement was morally wrong. A number of responses simply described the policy of appeasement without explaining why it was right or wrong.

Question 7

- (a) A considerable number of candidates showed an in-depth and focused knowledge of the decisions made at Yalta and Potsdam in relation to Germany. Answers focused primarily upon the division of Germany into four zones of occupation, the names of the countries controlling the zones, the division of Berlin and the agreement to find and punish German war criminals. Candidates were required to focus upon Germany in this question; some responses detailed all the decisions taken at Yalta and Potsdam, rather than just those relevant to Germany.
- (b) Candidates were able to identify that mistrust increased due to the USSR and the USA no longer having a common enemy, the death of Roosevelt, Truman's distrust of Stalin and the ideological differences between capitalism and communism. Stronger candidates developed these points into clearly structured explanations. Candidates need to pay careful attention to the dates given in questions. This question asked specifically about 1945; some responses included details of events such as the Berlin Blockade and the Cuban Missile Crisis, which are outside the time frame of this particular question.
- (c) A number of candidates produced developed explanations about the Berlin Blockade contributing to the Cold War. Many candidates described the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan and needed to develop their description to explain why these could be blamed for the Cold War. Some answers to this question focused solely upon a generalised description of ideological differences between the USA and the USSR.

Question 8

- (a) Many candidates were able to identify that too many people were leaving East Berlin to go to the west, and also that the Soviets demanded that the Western powers vacated the whole of Berlin. Some candidates' responses would have been improved by the ability to differentiate between the Berlin Blockade and the building of the Berlin Wall; a number of responses were focused solely upon the Berlin Blockade.
- (b) Candidates demonstrated an understanding that the reforms in Czechoslovakia were threatening Soviet control and were able to explain this point. Some answers to this question were generalised in nature and stated only that there was a threat. More candidates could have been aware that, whilst the Soviets were concerned that the Prague Spring reforms would lead to Czechoslovakia leaving the Warsaw Pact, Czechoslovakia did not actually leave the Pact.
- (c) Candidates displayed a detailed knowledge of Gorbachev's reforms of *perestroika* and *glasnost*, and also of events relating to Solidarity. Some candidates were able to use this knowledge effectively to explain how these factors contributed to the collapse of Soviet control over Eastern Europe. Some responses explained how Gorbachev's reforms led to problems in the Soviet Union itself; the question required explanation of how Gorbachev and other factors led to the collapse of Soviet control over Eastern Europe.

Section B – Depth Studies

Question 9

- (a) Candidates focused their answers on the abdication of the Kaiser, the appointment of Ebert, Germany as a democratic republic, and the situation relating to the Spartacists. An awareness and understanding of terminology such as 'political', 'economic' and 'social' would have helped some candidates to ensure that their answers had a relevant focus.
- (b) Many candidates demonstrated very detailed knowledge of the French invasion of the Ruhr; some used this knowledge effectively to develop explanations. Most candidates were aware that the French invaded the Ruhr as Germany had failed to pay reparations and stronger responses developed this point with an explanation that the French then invaded to take payment of the reparations in kind.
- (c) This question required candidates to explain whether the Weimar Republic was able to deal successfully with Germany's problems between 1922 and 1929. Explanations focused upon Stresemann's success in improving the economy and on gaining international acceptance of

Germany, and, on the other side of the argument, the suffering caused by hyperinflation and the illusion that Germany's economic problems had been solved. There were many responses with detailed explanations on both sides of the debate. In other responses, candidates wrote about Germany's problems during World War One and then Hitler's rise to power in the 1930s – both of which are outside the time scale of the question.

Question 10

- (a) A number of candidates were able to point out that Hitler wanted to create employment and did this through public works schemes such as building autobahns, and also that he spent money on rearmament. Some responses were focused on Hitler's policies generally, rather than being specific to his economic policies.
- (b) Clear explanations were developed focusing upon the indoctrination of children, the promotion of loyalty to Hitler and the preparation of children for their future roles in life. There were many detailed descriptions of the composition of the School curriculum; better responses then developed to explain why the Nazis had changed the curriculum. Some candidates would have benefited from an awareness of the differences between the Hitler Youth programme and the composition of the School curriculum.
- (c) Effective explanations of the success of Nazi youth policies focused upon the use of education to control German youth and the nature of the Hitler Youth. Failure of the Nazi youth policies could have been more effectively explained. Candidates identified groups such as the Edelweiss Pirates and the White Rose group as being anti-Nazi; they then needed to develop explanations showing how the attitudes and actions of these groups demonstrated that Nazi Youth policies were unsuccessful.

Question 11

- (a) A small number of candidates described that Lenin was given passage through Germany in a sealed train. A number of candidates wrote solely about events in November 1917, rather than April.
- (b) There were some clear explanations of Bolshevik failure to harness discontent. A number of candidates wrote about the events of November 1917, rather than explaining the importance of the July Days.
- (c) Clear understanding of the problems ensuing from the continuation of the war against Germany was shown in responses. Better candidates demonstrated an understanding of a number of reasons for the overthrow of the Provisional Government; others demonstrated an understanding of the continuation of the war against Germany only.

Question 12

- (a) Some answers highlighted that kulaks were rich peasants and also that they were detested by Stalin. Other responses were unable to describe who the kulaks were.
- (b) Detailed knowledge of the features of collectivisation was demonstrated in responses to this question. Explanations focused upon the need to update farming methods and make farming more efficient, and collectivisation being seen by Stalin as a method of dealing with the kulaks. Some responses described the features of collectivisation, rather than explaining why collectivisation was important.
- (c) There were some very effective explanations of Stalin's success coming at the expense of the workers. The success of Stalin's industrialisation policies tended to be identified, rather than explained. Candidates were clearly aware that Stalin's industrialisation policies meant that the USSR became the world's second largest industrial power and was capable of surviving a world war; these identifications were substantiated as explanations in better responses.

Question 13

- (a) Candidates needed to be aware of the problems facing traditional industries in America in the 1920s, and aware of which industries were the traditional ones. Effective answers described problems such as a decline in world trade affecting ship building, the development of synthetic fibres meaning that there was less demand for cotton and woollen textiles, the availability of cleaner fuels and the competition from newer industries. Less effective answers simply identified the traditional industries, rather than describing the problems they faced.
- (b) There were many effective answers to this question, with clear explanations of over-production, the falling demand from Europe and the problems caused by American tariffs. Some answers focused upon the consequences of the difficulties, rather than explaining why American agriculture faced these difficulties.
- (c) Well-developed explanations focused upon the stimulus given by the expansion of the automobile industry to other industries, the creation of many jobs, the Republican policy of laissez-faire, the development of credit and also advertising. Some candidates described factors in great detail; developing these descriptions into explanations by showing how they were responsible for the economic boom would have improved some responses.

Question 14

- (a) Many candidates demonstrated detailed knowledge of the consequences of the Wall Street Crash for the American people, describing consequences such as unemployment, the loss of life savings, the loss of homes, people suffering from malnutrition and starvation and having to queue for food. There were some responses written in very general terms only, simply stating that life was tough and people were very unhappy.
- (b) Some candidates explained that the government was worried about the sheer number of ex-servicemen demanding their war bonus payments early, and substantiated this with details of the numbers involved and the setting up of camps around the city of Washington. There were also some generalised responses to this question, stating only that the Bonus Marchers demonstrated.
- (c) Effective answers to this question explained the role of speculation in causing the Wall Street Crash, emphasising the nervousness felt by speculators about the value of shares and the ensuing desire to sell shares, ultimately causing a large drop in values. Candidates also explained the contribution of credit buying of shares by speculators. Over-production was explained as a weakness in the American economy. A number of candidates described the events of the Wall Street Crash; this description required development to explain how speculation on the stock market and weaknesses in the US economy were responsible for the Wall Street Crash.

Questions 15 to 25

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

HISTORY

Paper 0416/21

Paper 21

General Comments and Key Messages

The key message is to write focused and relevant answers. Some candidates' answers are simply repetition of what the sources say, or description of what they show. Focus and relevance demand that everything in the answer serves a purpose – the purpose of answering the question. So, for example, if the question asks how different two sources are, writing about only one of the sources does not answer the question. Every sentence should serve the purpose of advancing a comparison between the two sources. Or if the question asks whether or not you trust an account, do not spend time copying the source, go straight into the argument of what you can and cannot trust, and why.

Most candidates were able to write positive responses to all the questions. The sources posed no particular problems of comprehension. Candidates have two hours in which to complete this paper, and many write lengthy scripts. As hinted above, time spent on thinking, rather than on writing, would for many candidates be beneficial. The most obvious strengths in the answers were the ability of most candidates to comprehend the sources in their historical context, to bring contextual knowledge into their arguments, and, noticeably more than in previous years, the ability to provide developed arguments on source reliability. The single most important area of weakness is in the interpretation of cartoons. This is, admittedly, a demanding skill, requiring both an understanding of the events and a familiarity with the physical appearance of the main characters, as well as an ability to grasp the specific points the cartoonist is making. For those teachers who do not already do so, it would be worthwhile to make a specific effort to familiarise their candidates with a collection of cartoons on the topic for the year's paper.

Comments on Specific Questions

Option A: 19th Century option

Question 1

The usual, but not invariable, format for the first question is to ask for a comparison of two sources. Candidates need to be aware that there will always be both similarities and differences between the two sources, so answers dealing only with surface comparisons on one side can only gain modest marks. Additionally, the highest level answers will generally do something more than simple comparison of source detail, perhaps detecting similarities or differences in the arguments of the sources taken as a whole. With these two sources candidates found plenty of surface comparisons – for example the fact that in both sources there was mention of Lincoln's call for militia volunteers, or that the sources differed in the numbers of these volunteers. However, taken as a whole, these sources were advancing arguments about the causes of the war, and specifically about the relative importance of slavery. The best answers saw that in both sources preserving the Union was a prime cause, but that the sources differed in that Source B regarded slavery as the fundamental cause which would require the North to fight for the Union, whilst Source A did not.

Question 2

On one level the cartoon was very straightforward, showing a slave ripping apart a map of the United States, whilst a stereotypical Southerner and Northerner watched on. Most candidates were able to detect some sub-messages on the attitudes of the onlookers, the problems caused by slavery, or the divide suggested by the ripping of the map. However, two elements were often missed. First, the date of the cartoon, which predated the war. Many answers assumed that the cartoon was commenting on the outbreak of war, whereas it was, in fact, a prediction of things to come – that slavery would destroy the Union. Second, the cartoonist's attitude, detectable in the words 'The United States – a Black Business', was almost never used.

The true message of the cartoon is the cartoonist's disapproval of the situation in which the issue is going to destroy the Union.

Question 3

This question asked whether the fact that Lincoln signed the Emancipation Proclamation in 1863 proved that he had been lying in 1861 when he said that he would not. Most candidates manoeuvred their way around this by fastening onto the other aspect of Source D – that Lincoln also said he was anti-slavery – to argue that he was actually telling the truth. There was always a suggestion with these answers that they did not fully comprehend the point Lincoln was making in Source D, and that they were certainly unaware of Lincoln's need to be circumspect on the issue of slavery at that particular time. Interestingly, very few candidates concluded that the difference between the two sources did indeed prove that Lincoln was lying in Source D. Although a few candidates noted the time difference between the two sources, this was usually only to note that Lincoln might simply have changed his mind, rather than to give a contextually informed answer based on what had actually changed between the two dates.

Question 4

As with **Question 2**, candidates usually were able to detect sub-messages of the cartoons, and sometimes produced valid comparisons of these. However, many struggled, despite the wording of the question, to see the way through to making a comparison on the basis of what the two cartoonists thought about the events depicted. Source G was somewhat easier to understand, as often candidates failed to work out who exactly Columbia was dealing with in Source F. Nonetheless many answers spotted, for example, that the North was stronger than the South in both sources, or that secession was not working for the South. These comparisons were still not really engaging with the cartoonists' views, though. A few answers did detect that both cartoonists were in favour of saving the Union, though their disagreement over how to save the Union was missed.

Question 5

This was a question where there were opportunities to use contextual knowledge, or cross-reference to material in other sources, however most answers focused on empathetic arguments. Instead of focusing on why, in June 1861, Douglas might have been concerned by Lincoln's conduct of the war (as evidenced in Source A, for example), most answers concluded that it was entirely unsurprising that an ex-slave would want slavery to be abolished, because he would know how awful slavery was. Of course, this is fair enough as an explanation of his personal attitude to slavery, but it is insufficient to explain his particular concern at that particular time. Most answers did not, for example, show an awareness that the reason he was making the speech was because he believed the war was NOT being fought over slavery.

Question 6

This question is about the sources, and the evidence they give in relation to the given hypothesis. It is not about the hypothesis, so if an answer does not make any mention of the sources, it will not get far. Secondly, the question asks 'how far', which is a clear signal that the sources will contain evidence both for and against the hypothesis. Answers on one side only will therefore be limited in the credit they receive. Finally, the source content must be used to show how it either supports or questions the hypothesis, and it is this final requirement that many candidates find hard to satisfy. What does *using* a source mean? Ideally it will mean the identification of an aspect of the source (not necessarily a quote, a précis will do just as well) that is relevant to the argument. So, the hypothesis was that the Civil War was fought over slavery. How about Source A? Using the source would produce something like this: 'Source A does not support the hypothesis because it says that Lincoln believed making slavery a focus of the war effort would shatter Northern unity'. The best approach is to go through each of the sources in turn. Grouping the sources is a bad idea as candidates often draw conclusions about the group which are not true of all the sources in the group. In the end, most candidates score a reasonable mark on this question, but this is often as a result of successfully using only a small minority of the sources they have actually written about.

Option B: 20th Century option

Question 1

The usual, but not invariable, format for the first question is to ask for a comparison of two sources. Candidates need to be aware that there will always be both similarities and differences between the two sources, so answers dealing only with surface comparisons on one side can only gain modest marks. Additionally, the highest level answers will generally do something more than simple comparison of source detail, perhaps detecting similarities or differences in the arguments or opinions of the sources taken as a whole. With these two sources candidates found plenty of surface comparisons – for example the fact that in both sources there was mention of the blockade and the placing of Soviet missiles in Cuba, or that the sources differed on whether the missiles were offensive or defensive in nature. However, taken as a whole, these sources were advancing arguments about who was to blame for the Cuban crisis. The best answers saw that the sources differed in that Source A held the Soviet Union responsible, whilst Source B blamed the USA.

Question 2

In questions that ask whether or not you are surprised by a source, it is essential both to make it clear whether or not you are surprised, and by what. Only then can an explanation of why you are surprised have a proper focus. Many answers would benefit from greater clarity in these respects. It should also be apparent that the explanation advanced should actually be consistent with the stance on surprised or not surprised. Again, some answers manage to lose sight of this. In this question many answers used 'everyday' empathetic reasoning to explain their lack of surprise – knowing how disastrous a nuclear war would be, of course nobody would want one. This meant that Source C was overlooked (to which the question made specific reference), which showed that US military planning did envisage the possibility of nuclear war. Clearly, then, those answers that used Source C in their answer were better than those that did not. However, there were two other approaches that also provided effective lines of reasoning. Instead of (or in addition to) turning to Source C to support their arguments, candidates could use other sources on the paper, or their own knowledge of the events. This approach could mean that, for example, candidates were surprised by the pacific Kennedy in Source D by comparison with the more assertive Kennedy in Source A, or suggest that Kennedy's caution was entirely unsurprising given the Bay of Pigs fiasco. Finally, there were answers that used the provenance of Source D to argue that the Kennedy depicted in Source D was a version created by his brother for a specific purpose – to shape the historical record by creating a favourable image of Kennedy's conduct during the crisis.

Question 3

Of the two cartoons used in this question, Source F proved by far the more accessible, even though a significant minority of candidates could not recognise Khrushchev. Its message was more straightforward, and almost every candidate was able to give some sensible interpretation of it. Source E was a different matter. The main issue was whether or not candidates understood that it was a representation of the Cuban crisis – many answers made no reference to the crisis, and simply described the cartoon at face value. This was a significant limitation, since the question was asking for a comparison of the messages of the two cartoons. There were several ways in which the sub-messages of these cartoons were both similar and different. In both for example, nuclear war was imminent. Alternatively, in Source E the superpowers were risking war, whilst in Source F they were trying to prevent war. Reasonable answers were able to make these comparisons and use source content to support them. Only rarely, though, did candidates see their way through to detecting the cartoonists' points of view about the crisis. Only through these points of view could one engage with the 'big message' of who was to blame for what was going on. Some saw that in Source E Kennedy was seen as the hero, whilst Khrushchev was depicted as the villain, but then assumed that the cartoonist in Source F was praising the leaders for their responsibility. Whilst this was permitted as equivalent to a comparison of sub-messages, it was missing the point that Source F was actually condemning the leaders for having taken the world to the brink of destruction.

Question 4

When asked whether or not you trust a source, it is reasonable to assume that there might be some reason not to, though, of course, there also may be aspects of it that are trustworthy. Some answers simply accepted what the source said, often on the basis that it was true since it agreed with the candidate's knowledge of the events. Alternatively, the source was rejected on the basis that it was biased, written too long after the events, or by someone who was not even in the meeting described. Answers based only on asserting (lack of) reliability meet only surface requirements; what is required is an explanation of how and

why the source may be seen as (un)reliable. In other words the answer needs to evaluate the majority of answers did exactly that, most often by showing the bias displayed by depicting Khrushchev as begging Khrushchev for help, but also by using other sources or contextual knowledge to support/confirm the claims in Source G. The other way of evaluating the source was to assess Khrushchev's purpose in representing events in this way – an obvious exercise in self-justification, particularly given that he ultimately lost office, at least in part, as a consequence of the Cuban crisis.

Question 5

Most candidates were able to interpret the cartoon effectively, and use this in providing reasons why it was published at the end of October 1962. A few candidates did not see that the cartoon was commenting on the resolution of the crisis, and provided a more general reason relating merely to this being the time the crisis was going on. In practice reasons related to two different aspects; context (what was happening at that time), and message (what the cartoonist wanted to say). The first of these was straightforward – it was published at that time as that was when the missiles were removed, when the crisis was over, when Khrushchev backed down. The second was slightly more problematical. There were obvious sub-messages – for example, to show that Khrushchev was taking his missiles out of Cuba – but what to make of the comment that this was hurting Khrushchev more than Castro? This was clearly hinting at Khrushchev's bad faith in his treatment of Castro. The best reasons, then, had to appreciate this dimension of the cartoon.

Question 6

This question is about the sources, and the evidence they give in relation to the given hypothesis. It is not about the hypothesis, so if an answer does not make any mention of the sources, it will not get far. Secondly, the question asks 'how far', which is a clear signal that the sources will contain evidence both for and against the hypothesis. Answers on one side only will therefore be limited in the credit they receive. Finally, the source content must be used to show how it either supports or questions the hypothesis, and it is this final requirement that many candidates find hard to satisfy. What does *using* a source mean? Ideally it will mean the identification of an aspect of the source (not necessarily a quote, a précis will do just as well) that is relevant to the argument. So, the hypothesis was that the superpowers acted reasonably during the missile crisis. How about Source A? Using the source would produce something like this: 'Source A does support the hypothesis because it says that Kennedy's goal was to support peace and freedom around the world'. The best approach is to go through each of the sources in turn. Grouping the sources is a bad idea as candidates often draw conclusions about the group which are not true of all the sources in the group. In the end, most candidates score a reasonable mark on this question, but this is often as a result of successfully using only a small minority of the sources they have actually written about.

HISTORY

Paper 0416/03
Coursework

General Comments and Key Messages

There was a significant increase in the number of candidates entered for the coursework option. The general standard of work was high. Most centres annotated candidates' work in detail, carefully explaining where and why marks were awarded. This was of great assistance to Moderators.

Comments on Specific Questions

The marks awarded by most Centres were left unchanged by Moderators. Marks were adjusted more for Assignment 1 than Assignment 2.

Assignment 1

For high marks to be awarded for Assignment 1, one or more of the following should be present: a sophisticated understanding of how causal factors link together; a good grasp of the differences in function between different types of causal factors such as triggers and preconditions; developed explanations of why some causal factors can be seen to be more significant than others. Occasionally, high marks were awarded by centres with little evidence of any of these.

The most successful work fulfilled the above criteria, and was often produced in response to an essay title, rather than to structured questions.

Assignment 2

Most Centres use the Board-approved assignments for Assignment 2. There was much good work for Assignment 2, with candidates able to interpret, evaluate, compare and use historical sources at a high level. The marking of the work by centres was generally accurate.

It should be noted that the coursework requirements change for the May/June 2015 examination session. From summer 2015 onwards, candidates are required to produce just one piece of work that is a maximum of 2000 words in length and which assesses the significance of an individual, group, organisation, development, place or event. Centres should refer to the Coursework Training Handbook produced by Cambridge International Examinations.