

AMERICAN HISTORY

Paper 0409/01

The Making of a Nation 1754-2010

Key Messages

- To gain full marks in part (a) questions candidates should provide description containing relevant factual material. Broad generalisations can only be rewarded in the lowest level.
- Part (b) questions demand that candidates explain their ideas in some depth. They should be able to make a pertinent point, develop it and support it with carefully chosen evidence.
- Top marks for part (c) responses are obtained by providing balanced ('for' and 'against') and developed arguments. Comments should be supported with a reasonable range of detailed material, otherwise they will produce mere assertion.
- Candidates must observe the examination rubric. This states that candidates must 'Answer **three** questions, each from a **different** section. Each question has several parts. For each question you choose, answer every part, (a), (b) and (c).' These instructions are stated at the beginning of the paper, and while many adhered to them, a substantial number did not. Some candidates answered only one part (a), (b), and (c), each taken from three different questions. Others answered only one question and a minority answered all eight questions.

General Comments

A significant number of scripts demonstrated effective preparation on the part of the candidates. Many scored full-marks on part (a) questions by being precise and sticking carefully to date parameters.

With part (b) questions most responses addressed the requirement to explain rather than describe; the best involved well-supported comments often sign-posted with 'One reason for...' or 'Firstly...'. This indicated that the candidate appreciated that a number of reasons/factors needed to be discussed to reach the higher mark levels.

The majority of candidates were aware of the need to offer balanced comments in response to part (c) questions. Some very good answers revealed clear exposition, structure, organisation and a good range of supporting material before arriving at a consistent judgement in a conclusion. Such responses invariably started with a clear introduction before moving on to a 'point per paragraph' approach. The balance in such responses was often sign-posted by the second half of the answer starting with 'However...' or 'Although I agree to some extent with the statement I am not totally convinced by it for the following reasons...'. It is acceptable, especially with part (c) responses, for candidates to write in the first person (i.e. informally). Generally, though, candidates should adopt a more formal style of writing and avoid nuances such as 'we' (as in 'we, the Americans'), 'I'm telling you straight' and 'you have got to believe me'. A significant amount of slang and colloquialism was used and this detracted from the quality of answers.

Many responses would have benefited from closer attention to chronology and the importance of placing individuals and events in the correct period. For example, many believed the nineteenth century started in 1900. A significant number of answers placed events in the wrong century, decade or era and/or muddled events. Thus, for example, Martin Luther King frequently appeared as a key civil rights activist in the period 1918-45 (**Question 4(b)**); the Bracero programme flourished in the second half of the nineteenth century (**Question 3 (b)**); World War 1 became World War 2 and vice-versa; and, perhaps more understandably, Theodore Roosevelt became FDR. A main aim of the course is to encourage candidates to identify patterns of change and continuity over time. This is not possible unless a reasonably thorough and accurate knowledge of chronology is developed.

The most effective responses showed sound awareness of geographical/regional differences although a sizeable minority considered Europe to be a single country. There was also confusion in the Middle East in **Question 8 (c)** and responses sometimes made reference to the Korean and Vietnam and therefore not only displaced countries but also showed confusion over the time period. Similar number of responses to **Questions 3 (a)** and **(c)** confused Chinese with Japanese peoples. Well informed responses pointed out that this was a historical trait and described the implications of the legislation of 1882 to explain discrimination against the Japanese up to the 1940s.

Finally, the best responses displayed a good level of factual knowledge and conceptual understanding. Weaker answers tended to be superficial and generalised. Those who achieved success showed evidence of a methodical approach to learning historical material and had practised how they could apply their knowledge to historical problems.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A: Government and the People, 1754-2000

Question 1

- (a) A number of responses placed Paine in the correct era and knew that he had written *Common Sense*. Others displayed weaker knowledge and answers lacked secure knowledge of Paine's importance.
- (b) A few candidates wrote convincingly about the Continental Congress, Articles of Confederation and Philadelphia Convention but many made broad generalisations about how the US Constitution was created.
- (c) A number of answers showed basic knowledge and understanding about Democrats and Republicans but only the best displayed in-depth understanding.

Question 2

- (a) Most responses showed that Jim Crow laws were linked with segregation and gave a good range of examples of how the laws were implemented. A minority thought the laws were designed to improve the position of African Americans in society.
- (b) There were some very good answers to this question where candidates discussed a range of groups and placed them in the appropriate historical context. A number of responses associated groupings with parties related a narrative of contests between Democrats and Republicans.
- (c) Better responses to this question provided well supported comments about the importance of women's organisations compared to the role of women in World War 1. Quite a few answers referred to Rosie the Riveter (not relevant in this context) and some were unclear about the kind of work that women did during the war.

Section B: Who are Americans?

Question 3

- (a) This question was generally answered with a degree of accuracy, although in some cases Chinese peoples were confused with the Japanese.
- (b) A significant number of answers grouped factors under 'push' and 'pull' and many made detailed references to the 1848 Treaty of Guadalupe, work issues and the Mexican Revolution. Some did not grasp the relevance of the time period and, subsequently, discussed the impact of the Bracero programme.
- (c) Many answers confused the Japanese with the Chinese. A number of strong responses discussed the importance of Pearl Harbor, internment and employment/work issues.

Question 4

- (a) There were many solid answers to this question and most candidates were well-informed about the origins of the Ku Klux Klan and how it impacted on African Americans. Many emphasised the instilling of fear and described in some detail how this was achieved.
- (b) To be successful, candidates needed to show an awareness of the significance of the time period stated. A small minority discussed the importance of the NAACP, Garvey and Randolph. Many talked about Martin Luther King, the Montgomery Bus Boycotts and Rosa Parks. Some demonstrated very insecure knowledge by writing about how the status of African Americans had not changed due to the continuation of slavery.
- (c) There were some sound answers that dealt with both individuals using a comparative framework. Many knew about King, in particular his oratory skills and the importance of the March on Washington. The best answers took a balanced approach while others tended to dismiss the contribution of Malcolm X. In a number of cases conclusions were based on assertion rather than historical evidence. Malcolm X was considered by many to have had a negative influence because he promoted violence, but such claims were rarely substantiated.

Section C: Economic and Social Change, 1754-2000

Question 5

- (a) A considerable proportion of response confused Theodore Roosevelt with Franklin D. Roosevelt.
- (b) Many responses contained highly generalised comment and anachronisms. For example, it was not uncommon to see answers that referred to the radio, television and even the Internet.
- (c) The most effective responses recognised the implications of this question and made very useful comments about Nixon's policies and the impact of the Vietnam War on the American economy. Weaker answers often gave very loose descriptions about the importance of oil compared with other sources of fuel/energy without being able to place such comments in context.

Question 6

- (a) There were some excellent responses that differentiated the Second Great Awakening from other developments in religion. Weaker responses offered only vague comment about the role of religion in American society without referring to the period specified in the question.
- (b) A number of responses demonstrated good knowledge of the Jazz Age and ranged more broadly beyond the emergence of jazz music. The best responses focused on explaining the importance of the era and gave a good range of examples to support comments. Weaker answers often skipped over 'importance' and simply identified changes.
- (c) This question provoked some interesting, thoughtful and varied responses. The best answers provided balanced, well supported arguments; there was generally a sound understanding of issues relating to hippy lifestyle, as shown through some well-considered use of evidence e.g. drug culture and Woodstock. Less strong answers drifted into generalisation, often mixed with moralising about the virtues of living as a hippy.

Section D: America and the World, 1754-2010

Question 7

- (a) A minority were well informed on this topic and achieved full marks. Less effective responses contained only vague notions of what happened and often confused the events of 1775-83 with those that occurred in other conflicts.
- (b) Some answers explained the importance of the 1812 War and its causes with great clarity. A number confused it with the Revolutionary War, or even the Civil War.

- (c) Again, there were some impressive answers to this question where candidates understood the concept of imperialism and were able to provide balanced answers with a consistent understanding of relevant regional developments.

Question 8

- (a) There were some excellent answers to this question. Many described how attitudes changed and how they were influenced by pressure groups and specific events. A number of candidates did not do themselves justice by confusing World War 1 with World War 2.
- (b) Many responses discussed the importance of the threat of Hitler and Pearl Harbor, but a number also discussed the sinking of the Lusitania and the Zimmermann Note. Some revealed a lack of secure chronology by discussing, at some length, the threat of communism and the impact of the Vietnam War.
- (c) The majority of answers made general comments about whether the US should be involved at all and that 'little seems to have been achieved.' Most contained some knowledge about 9/11 and Osama Bin Laden but contained little detail beyond this. Quite a few answers discussed Afghanistan, Korea and Vietnam. This is important to note as some well-prepared candidates achieved high marks for (a) and (b) but performed less well in (c).

AMERICAN HISTORY

Paper 0409/02
Defining Moments

General Comments

This was the first examination of the syllabus. The quality of the answers produced varied enormously and marks awarded almost spanned the entire mark range. There were some extremely strong responses, alongside others which struggled to achieve marks. In the cases where candidates did not achieve very highly, there was usually one main reason. Too many candidates did not make adequate use of the sources. This is particularly important in answering **Questions 1-4**. It is worth stressing the fact that this is a source-based paper and that the content of the sources must form the basis of the answer. If the content is not used the answer will only achieve Level 2 in the mark scheme. Knowledge and evaluation should be applied but if this is not linked to the internal content of the source(s) then Level 2 is the ceiling. To progress beyond this level on **Question 1** knowledge must be added and for **Questions 2, 3 and 4**, knowledge or evaluation must be linked to content to reach Level 3 with Level 4 for answers that use the source(s), provide supporting knowledge and attempt to evaluate. Centres are advised to see the mark scheme to see how this was applied.

Content: candidates should use the detail in the source(s). Answers should be based on specific points in the source(s) and, ideally, candidates will quote directly from the source(s) or in the case of a visual source refer directly to various aspects of the image. Too many candidates merely summarised the contents of the source(s) or referred to the source(s) in general terms. Indeed, a large number of candidates ignored the source(s) altogether and based their answer on knowledge only. Even very well informed answers that address the issue at the heart of the question but who use knowledge only limit themselves to a Level 2 mark.

Knowledge: candidates should use knowledge to support the content of the source(s). To do so effectively knowledge should be linked to the content to substantiate or refute the source(s); in other words, to aid the assessment and analysis of the source(s). The selection of knowledge is important to ensure it is relevant and pertinent to the question. Ideally, knowledge will be integrated with detail from the source(s) rather than detached from it. To separate content and knowledge, merely implying the link between the two, is less effective not least because it reads as two mini-answers. Nonetheless, the latter approach allows the Examiner to consider Level 3.

The knowledge base of the majority of the candidates was not always comprehensive. Sometimes they did not know enough about either the Civil War or Vietnam. Detailed factual knowledge about the topic to be examined is essential. Whilst the content of the sources allows candidates to produce an answer it is insufficient to access the higher marks. Centres are advised to devote sufficient amounts of their teaching time to the history of one of the topics. The syllabus recommends that candidates study for only one topic. It is not advisable for candidates to study both topics because of the time needed to teach the topics and the difficulty for candidates to decide which one to tackle in the examination. Some candidates attempted all ten questions but did not have sufficient knowledge to draw on for either topic and consequently their answers were very thin. Candidates need to be prepared for a specific topic so that they enter the exam determined to focus on that topic and with confidence borne of a sound working knowledge of that topic.

Evaluation: candidates should comment on the quality of the source and, specifically, its value in relation to the question. This can be done by an examination of the provenance of the source(s). In examining the provenance candidates might consider the interests or motives of the author, the audience addressed, the significance of the location and/or timing, the type of source, the language used, the angle or weight of the content and so on. Only by doing so, will candidates be able to assess fully the reliability, usefulness, significance, accuracy or value of a source(s) or reach a judgement about the source(s). Too many candidates accepted the sources at face value and seemed to regard them as a body of information rather than as evidence. As a result, candidates were credulous rather than critical in their treatment of the sources. They should be more sceptical in their approach. Even if a source is reliable/useful/convincing etc..., candidates need to demonstrate why that is the case. In some respects evaluation is possible only

with knowledge. Candidates should draw on the information provided beneath each source to help all candidates and allow even those whose knowledge is limited to make an attempt at an answer. Simply, a careful reading of the content of the source(s) should give candidates the chance to make an evaluative comment. However, as indicated in the previous paragraph, without adequate grounding in detail of the topic candidates will struggle to produce full answers.

It should be noted that a significant number of candidates entered for this paper, did not in fact sit the paper.

Specific Questions

1. The mark scheme provides guidance on how candidates may have answered the questions and the levels of marks. It is not prescriptive.
2. More candidates tackled **Section B** on Vietnam than **Section A** on the Civil War.

Section A: The American Civil War, 1861-1865

Question 1

Most answers were descriptive though some candidates made a good attempt to identify an overall message. Only a small number were able to add any knowledge to support the points made in the cartoon about the political, military or financial effects of the war. Quite a few seemed unaware that the cartoon was about the Civil War.

Question 2

No set answer was expected: the extract could be interpreted in different ways. Indeed, some candidates explained how the blockade could be viewed as effective or ineffective. The most convincing judgement were those that concluded that even if the escape of the 'Cornubia' and its re-emergence suggests the blockade was ineffective the loss of the cargo was the key point, as without supplies from abroad the South lacked the resources to win the war. Several candidates were uncertain about which side was being blockaded despite the reference to 'Yankees' in the text.

Question 3

The mark scheme identifies several features of battles which the artist includes in the sketch but few candidates were able to discuss the utility of the source to any depth. The best responses were aware that Civil War battles attracted spectators when they were fought near a town, so the sketch would need to be reasonably accurate to be at all convincing to people at the time. Of course, the camera was available, and widely used, to capture images of the war. Some consideration of the accuracy of a sketch compared with a photograph would be a way of evaluating the source. As such this question serves to highlight the importance of teachers presenting candidates with a range of different types of sources in preparation for the exam.

Question 4

There was a tendency for candidates to treat each source discretely. Whilst this is unsurprising given their different perspectives the evaluation of the source(s) and the application of knowledge would encourage a more engaged approach as candidates considered the interests of the authors and the accuracy of the claims made by both. In that respect, this question served to emphasise the importance of candidates doing more than simply summarising the content. Some did this by commenting on the mayor's duty to the people he served and Sherman's concern to explain himself to his superiors. However, more candidates could have questioned the motives of the authors if they had been more critical, as emphasised above.

Question 5

The majority of answers were one-sided and uniformly of the view that the Battle of Gettysburg was the most important event in the war. This question is intended to encourage a discussion and candidates were expected to consider the importance of Gettysburg. However, to reach the higher marks candidates have to also show that a counter argument is possible. Cross-reference to Sources A to E could have helped candidates offering them the chance to assess the importance of the naval blockade and Sherman's March but many other military events, for example, Grant's victory at Vicksburg, could be considered. Source F hints at the counter-argument by referring to 'other noble achievements' on land and sea. Source F is

intended to be used primarily as a trigger to spark debate and for the candidate to show what he/she knows and can do, though it contains much that candidates can use to inform their response.

Section B: The American Civil War, 1861-1865

Question 6

Many answers were descriptive and a little vague. Although candidates may feel that Vietcong tactics are obvious they need to be stated clearly and with reference to the content. So, one aspect of their tactics was 'hiding in the jungle' but candidates should explain how this is portrayed. Similarly, the Vietcong deployed the tactic of 'ambush' but the source should be used to explain how this is shown. Many were able to add knowledge about tunnels, booby traps and the Ho Chi Minh Trail and so on. Several candidates commented on how the US forces responded but this was not strictly relevant as the question is about the tactics of the Vietcong, not the US.

Question 7

No set answer was expected: the extract could be interpreted in different ways. Indeed, some candidates explained how US bombing could be viewed as effective or ineffective. Those who realised the motives of the author, as founder of the Vietcong, could help arrive at a judgement were able to produce more thoughtful responses than those who merely described the content. Similarly, many were able to refer to the scale of the bombing and certain aerial campaigns, like 'Rolling Thunder' to support the position they adopted.

Question 8

Some read Source C with sufficient care. Those who did were able to identify at least some of the three main points made. A few built on the content to add knowledge about the Tet Offensive and the nature of public opinion in America. Alas, too many based their answers exclusively on knowledge and often of one factor –political, military or otherwise – and there was little evaluation of the provenance or the content.

Question 9

There was a tendency for candidates to treat each source discretely with emphasis on Source D. This was understandable given the limited scope of Source E. However, the link between the sources is clearly the focus of the question and not all candidates were prepared to make the connection. Only a few were alert to the experience of the author of Source D as a means of evaluating the source. A small number made reference to the US tactics of 'search and destroy' and 'hearts and minds' as supporting knowledge. With either evaluation or knowledge the candidates would have been able to develop the link between the sources.

Question 10

The majority of answers were one-sided and uniformly of the view that the account provided in Source F was convincing. However, this question is intended to encourage discussion and to reach the higher marks candidates have to also show that a counter argument is possible. Candidates ran through various reasons that explain the atrocities committed by US soldiers using the content of Source F and often elaborating on it. Some answers were rather subjective offering an apology or defence of the atrocities rather than an analysis. Very few argued that the account was unconvincing even though it is possible to challenge many of the points made in Source F. Candidates should be encouraged to cross-reference Sources A to E which offer scope for further comment and the chance to develop the argument. Source F is intended to be used primarily as a trigger to spark debate and for the candidate to show what he/she knows and can do, though it contains much that candidates can use to inform their response.

AMERICAN HISTORY

Paper 0409/03
History Around US

The key aim of local 'History Around Us' coursework is to encourage candidates to develop an interest in their own area and its history. On the evidence of the coursework samples submitted by Centres, that aim has been widely achieved. This is in large measure due to the enthusiasm and dedication of the teachers. Many candidates performed well and made clear that they enjoyed discovering and investigating sites of interest in their locality.

Administration

Administration is often the last element addressed but its importance must not be overlooked. It is for this reason that this element of the report is positioned at the beginning: carrying out the administration accurately and completely is an essential part of the submission process.

Teachers/Centres should ensure that the following procedures are followed:

- Centres must include the MS1 form with the coursework;
- Centres are required to identify the teaching sets in which candidates were taught and to ensure that the sample provided reflects the balance of candidates across sets;
- each piece of coursework must have two sheets attached to the front - the *Individual Candidate Record Card* which can be found at the back of the syllabus, and the *Research Portfolio: Cover Sheet*.

The *Individual Candidate Record Card* must be completed by giving a summary statement on each Assessment Objective to show the basis on which the marks were awarded. This should follow closely the terms used in the generic mark scheme as well as indicating the content via which the candidate has demonstrated the understanding required to reach the level awarded. Statements such as 'satisfactory work' or 'excellent work' should be avoided. It is important that the comments show how the marker has differentiated between the work of candidates.

Where marks are adjusted as a result of internal moderation, the final mark awarded, as well as the justification for that adjusted mark should be recorded on the *Individual Candidate Record Card*. In cases of adjustment there is no need to justify the original mark. Some confusion arose where Centres had left the original mark on the work that was submitted along with the justification for the original mark.

It is also important that candidates receive the final mark awarded, post-internal moderation. Centres should ensure that this mark is recorded on the MS1 as there were several examples where candidates were credited with too many or too few marks because the pre-internal moderation mark was used.

The *Research Portfolio: Cover Sheet* is a requirement and candidates cannot be awarded marks unless it is provided. Internal moderation must take place. Centres are required to submit an explanation of how this was carried out. The procedures to be followed are explained in the syllabus, **Section 6.2**. Until such time as there is an accredited teacher in each Centre, one teacher in the Centre should take overall responsibility for the internal moderation.

Annotation of the candidates' work varied. It is important that besides what is written on the Individual Candidate Record Card there are marginal comments to identify where the candidate shows understanding in relation to the assessment objectives and at what level.

The MS1 must be included with the scripts selected for external moderation together with the lists of candidates and marks. The column headed teaching group should show the teaching set so that it is possible to check that the requirement for the sample to reflect the balance of candidates taught by different teachers is met.

The work submitted

The comments on the qualities of the work are intended to highlight what was successful and what could be improved. Examples are used where possible to illustrate the points, but it should not be assumed that the coursework topic was either perfect or wholly unacceptable. The examples are included to identify what appeared to work well and where improvements might be considered. Experienced Centres may wish to resubmit proposals to receive comments on refinements they have made, while Centres new to the syllabus are required to submit their proposals.

The sites investigated

The sites chosen were suitable in that they allowed candidates to develop their ideas about a range of significances. However some sites presented such challenges that many candidates found it difficult to access the higher levels. This tended to be more of an issue where there was a wealth of material about the initial development of the site. In such cases weaker pieces of work were unlikely to get beyond assessment of the contemporary significance of the site. Indeed, in some instances the sheer interest and technical specifications of a site encouraged candidates to describe the site at length without assessing it. The Hoover Dam is an important site, but needs to be approached with care because there is so much detailed material about its construction.

Most candidates suggested significance that might be attributed to a site and provided some supporting evidence. Most commonly candidates provided evidence for contemporary significance. Going beyond this to show historical significance is more difficult because it requires candidates to assess the role played by the site within a line of development. As an example, the Falcon Field Air Force Base near Mesa provided women with employment as mechanics, whereas previously they had been engaged in low level agricultural work. This established a difference between two periods of time, with the site providing the stimulus for the difference, but the developmental account was more limited in scope. Candidates were limited by a lack of source material on the relevant aspects before the site was developed. Those candidates who investigated the significance of the site in the development of Anglo-American relations before, during and after the Second World War were better equipped to evidence their judgements as relevant source material was more readily accessible.

Studies were most successful when candidates focused on different groups of people when assessing the significance of a site, rather than on more abstract themes such as economic or political development. While the most able candidates showed that they could tackle themes addressing different aspects of human endeavour, sites where different groups had been affected in different ways provided more opportunity for candidates to show what they could do at a range of levels. Examples of sites that were accessible to most candidates were the US–Mexican border with its impact on migrant workers and white Americans amongst others, and Phoenix Indian School with its impact on Phoenicians and Native Americans. The Yuma Territorial Prison also worked well as, like the Phoenix Indian School, it had different impacts for inmates and the town's residents. All these sites also gave scope to see the site in the context of long term government policy.

AO2 Historical significance

It is important that Centres distinguish in their marking between candidates who assess the intrinsic, contemporary and historical significance. They should also distinguish between claims or assertions about significance and substantiated statements. Intrinsic significance means what is interesting or unusual about a site, but does not make an appreciable difference to historical developments. The engineering problems encountered in constructing the Hoover Dam or the Yuma Siphon might come into this category – they mattered at the time in terms of holding up construction, but unless the candidate is studying the development of engineering technology they are not of long-term, historical significance. Similarly, the novelty of having young British airforce personnel in Mesa was important to people at the time but only has historical significance where it changed the lives of those involved. Claims about significance that do not address long-term developments, before and after the construction of a site, or the main event there, should not be rewarded at Level 3.

Some Centres adopted a strategy of asking candidates questions about the impact of a site at different periods, and this was successful in encouraging candidates to construct long-term accounts and assess historical significance. However, the work should be marked as a whole, looking for the understanding of both Assessment Objectives across the work submitted in its entirety.

AO4 Use of Sources in Research

Much of the work seen concentrated on the mechanics of citing sources and under-played the content of the evidence. The mechanics of citing sources can be readily understood by candidates and it is easier to recognise the level at which they are performing than is the case with other elements of this Assessment Objective. While a bibliography and footnotes should be included, it should be noted that the mark scheme for this component differentiates between candidates on the basis of how well they provide references. There was significant variation in the way the mark scheme was applied. In some Centres no candidates provided a bibliography, although it was clear whence they had derived their evidence. An alternative approach was for the Centre to provide all candidates with the same bibliography. It was clear that some candidates had not used all these sources and therefore the bibliography was not a true reflection of the sources used in their own work. Footnotes are a useful tool, but candidates are not expected to cite the source of every fact. It is appropriate to use footnotes where the evidence used is obscure, and where a point in the argument represents the view of a particular person or organization.

The most important aspect of AO4 is the way in which candidates use the sources. Candidates should aim to demonstrate that they understand the nature of the sources they encounter and the weight that should be given to the evidence that can be inferred from the sources. They should use the sources critically. To reach the highest level they need to do more than claim that the evidence in a source is correct or reliable (or incorrect and unreliable). The instruction to 'use' the sources was generally understood by the candidates to mean simply that they should use the sources to construct and exemplify the argument. Where they understood that they should offer evaluative comments, these did not go beyond asserting that the source was true or reliable or the opposite. Historians do not simply accept sources at face-value or make simple inferences about what the source shows. 'This source tells me that ... From this I learn that ...'. Likewise, candidates should use evaluative techniques where appropriate. They should consider questions of who, when, why and for whom a source was made when using evidence from the sources.

Many candidates confirmed statements in sources by providing supporting evidence. However this does not constitute a full evaluation unless an attempt is made to challenge the statements in the sources and thus attribute value to them in reaching conclusions about the significance of the site.

There was some limited awareness of the strength of cross-referencing sources – for example using a map to explain the statement in a written source about the significance of the Corinth railroad crossing. This can be rewarded as a more sophisticated use of sources, but does not constitute full evaluation.

In general candidates should be encouraged to read more critically, that is, to look for the flaws and weaknesses in the sources they use. This can be done by ensuring that contrasting or even contradictory views are represented. Candidates who studied the Yuma Territorial Prison cross-referenced the prison regulations with the comments of the locals about the luxuries of the prison. These could be evaluated with reference to usual prison conditions at the time, living conditions for the inhabitants of Yuma, and the aims of the prison authorities.

There were good examples of critical use of sources by candidates studying the Airbase at Mesa. They were aware of the tendency by former cadets, both American and British, to provide positive feedback about their experiences at the base. Besides this, the nature of the sources in which these accounts were published meant that the more positive experiences were the ones included, while the deaths of some young men was underplayed or regarded positively as 'death in the call of duty'.

Candidates should also be encouraged to make their evaluation of sources more explicit. It could be inferred that by quoting or citing a source the candidate has already established that the evidence contained in it is reliable. However, where there is the possibility to question the evidence, candidates should show that they have taken steps to check the validity or reliability of statements.