AMERICAN HISTORY

Paper 0409/01

The Making of a Nation 1754-2010

Key Messages

- In order to gain full marks in part **(a)** questions candidates need to provide description containing some relevant factual material.
- 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. Candidates would benefit from using connective statements to signpost that they are 'explaining' e.g. 'This led to..', 'What this meant was..'
- The highest marks for part **(c)** responses are obtained by providing balanced ('for' and 'against') and developed arguments. As with responses to **(b)** candidates need to support their comments 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. There were far fewer rubric errors this year, though some candidates did not adhere to the rubric. A small number answered all eight questions and others answered only one question.

General Comments

- Examiners are pleased to report that there was a discernible improvement in the quality of scripts at the middle to top end of the mark range. There were a significant number of scripts that showed candidates had been well-prepared and were fully conversant with the requirements of the specification and examination.
- Many scored full-marks on part **(a)** questions by being precise and sticking carefully to date parameters.
- With part **(b)** questions most candidates seemed to know that they had to explain rather than describe. There was an indication that candidates understood that more than one reason/factor needed to be discussed to reach the higher mark levels and the best involved useful phrasing such as 'Firstly…' or 'Another reason for…'
- 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. It is acceptable, especially with part **(c)** responses, for candidates to write in the first person (i.e. informally). There was a pleasing improvement in the use of language to present balanced argument. However, many answers still contained too much assertion. Candidates need to discern between fact, opinion and judgement when approaching this type of question.
- An important 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 so that events and individuals can be placed in the correct decade, century or era. For example, many believed that the Emancipation Proclamation came after the American Civil War or Hoover's actions to deal with the Wall Street Crash were sometimes confused with those of Franklin D. Roosevelt. Martin Luther King was sometimes mentioned in the period 1877 to 1914 (**Question 3b),** whereas the Jim Crow laws were often discussed in the second half of the twentieth century **(Question 3c)**.
- Candidates would also benefit from greater awareness of geographical/ regional differences and definitions. Quite a few candidates seemed to think that Europe was/is a country. There was also confusion over what constituted/constitutes Japan, China and Korea.
- Good responses displayed accurate 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. The very best answers were able to apply these techn
consistently across the three questions.

Comments on Specific Questions

Section A: Government and the People 1754-2000

Question 1

(a) The majority of candidates focused on describing the main facets of the Emancipation Proclamation which indicated its importance and were thus able to gain full-marks. Others talked about why the Proclamation was made and a significant number provided broad generalisations only.

(b) Many candidates identified some of Lincoln's qualities and others were able to discuss Lincoln's ability to take advantage of the split within the Democrats, as well as the appeal of the moderate platform. Some of the answers to this question were rather vague, with some simply asserting that Lincoln was the best man for the job as he was a good orator and had a social conscience. Better answers considered Lincoln's political skill against the machinations of the political system which allowed him to score such a significant political victory.

(c) There were some very good answers to this question which provided balanced, well supported arguments and considered a range of factors (strategy, tactics, logistics, resource issues and leadership skills). However, many candidates appeared to have a limited knowledge of the course of the war and, in particular, the chronology of key events. A few candidates did not appear to realise that such a war actually happened and made oblique comments about regional conflict and the end of slavery.

Question 2

(a) Many answers showed an awareness that Reconstruction enabled the South to be reintegrated with the North; others gave good examples of how it impacted on the lives of African Americans. Good responses were able to describe key developments pertinent to the period such as the establishment of the Freedmen's Bureau, the setting down of the Black Codes and the activities of the Ku Klux Klan. Less effective answers confused the years of Reconstruction with the later introduction of Jim Crow laws

(b) There were some very good answers to this question where candidates confidently defined the Progressivism and then went on to focus on giving the reasons for its emergence. Some simple gave broad descriptions of what happened roughly during the period in question and a number had quite obviously never heard of the Progressive Movement.

(c) There were many candidates who were able to discuss the impact of the Wall Street Crash and how Hoover failed to respond effectively. Fewer went on to talk about the more successful measures which were put in place by the Hoover Administration. A significant number of answers referred to Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal which was not relevant in this context.

Section B: Who are Americans?

Question 3

(a) A number of responses displayed good knowledge of Booker T. Washington's contribution w many providing details of the Tuskegee Institute, his views on vocational education or his invitation to the White House. Some candidates were not fully aware of who Booker T. Washington was and what he achieved. A number of responses discussed the contributions Washington made to education but sometimes there was little realisation of the nature of this contribution (i.e. the focus on vocational provision).

(b) Most had a good attempt at answering this question and effectively used the framework provided (economic, social and political). A common issue for candidates taking this paper is the need for a firmer grasp of chronology. A lack of understanding of what happened when was once more evident in a number of responses

(c) Comments pertaining to **Question (b)** are also relevant here. The vast majority discussed the contributions of Rosa Parks and Martin Luther King as their main, and sometimes only, focus. There were some good responses which referred to the successes of the Civil Rights Movement and how change was brought about through the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. A small minority of responses discussed slavery and the Jim Crow Laws.

Question 4

(a) There were many solid answers to this question. Most were able to say something about the origins of the Knights of Labor and the approaches used by this organisation to achieve its aims, however answers sometimes lacked specific details.

(b) The best answers gave clear expositions about how the Wagner Act legalized collective bargaining, its support from the National Labor Relations Board but also its struggle in getting companies to discuss the demands of unions. Some candidates displayed a limited knowledge of the Act.

(c) There were some sound answers that gave balanced, well informed comments. Most knew about key organisations (e.g. the AFL) and events (e.g. the Haymarket Affair) and were able to use such knowledge to discuss the successes and failures of Labor unions across the period. In this instance most candidates displayed a competent awareness of change over time.

Section C: Economic and Social Change 1754-2000

Question 5

(a) There were many excellent responses which clearly recognised Eli Whitney's role in the production of the cotton gin and the effects of this new machine. Few answers discussed his role in a wider context e.g. the concept of interchangeable parts.

(b) Most responses to this question contained some useful comment about hours of work, wages, danger in the work place and the 'new work discipline'. There was also some effective discussion of overcrowded living conditions and the impact of particular events such as the Triangle Shirtwaist Fire of 1911. The latter is a good example of where candidates had clearly been taught to use some interesting and relevant detailed material to support their answers and is to be commended. Weaker responses drifted to broad generalisation.

(c) Some candidates understood the implications of this question and made very useful comments specifically about the 1950s, with considered use of both the housing and consumer booms. Candidates had less secure knowledge on other reasons for the economic expansion and thus were not always able to give a balanced answer.

Question 6

(a) There were some very pleasing responses that understood the key characteristics o Movement but many provided rather generalised responses which simply linked the Social Gos Movement to a desire to help the poor.

(b) There were some rather vague and highly generalised answers to this question. There was some identification of the reasons for a religious revival, for example, the Second Great Awakening and the growth of the Baptist movement.

(c) There were a number of candidates who offered a balanced argument and used a range of issues such as youth, fashion, music and art as evidence to support their argument. Some candidates did not always have a clear understanding of the meaning of counter-culture in 1960's American society.

Section D: America and the World 1754-2010

Question 7

(a) This question was generally very well answered. Many candidates described isolationism and some of the reasons for this foreign policy. Some described U.S. foreign policy in the 1940s rather than the 1930s.

(b) Some candidates were fully aware of the importance of containment but tended to describe what it involved rather than explain why it was deployed.

(c) Again, many answers demonstrated that candidates clearly knew the importance of providing a balanced argument. There were some good explanations of how the U.S. helped to bring stability to Europe, though some were not able to use relevant evidence to indicate why the U.S. had not brought stability. Weaker responses sometimes talked about events in Europe after 1949 or discussed Korea and Cuba.

Question 8

(a) There were some good answers with references to the dropping of the atomic bombs and US occupation. Other answers to this question revolved around internment, the bombing of Japan and supposed trade embargos, much of which was not especially relevant.

(b) This was generally well answered. Most candidates were able to provide a range of reasons and make some judgement about relative importance. However, a number of answers clearly confused the Korean conflict with the Vietnam War.

(c) There were some rather vague answers to this question but most were able to offer a range of relevant comments. This was also a case where a number of answers lacked balance. The majority firmly believed that the resolution of the Cuban Missile Crisis was a victory for Kennedy and the USA.

AMERICAN HISTORY

Paper 0409/02
Defining Moments

General Comments

This was the second examination of the syllabus. There were indications in the scripts marked of improvement, with some remaining areas for development. As a result, the quality of the answers varied, with some doing very well and a few who found the paper challenging. Centres are advised to study the mark scheme to see how this was applied for each question. The examples provided for individual questions are just that: candidates are at liberty to interpret a source as they see it, to apply knowledge they think is suitable and to make their own judgements about the quality of the evidence.

The basis of all answers is the content. Candidates should make full use of the sources. This is a source-based paper and the content of the sources must be at the heart of the answer. 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 2-4** and **Questions 7-9** knowledge or evaluation must be linked to content to reach the next level, with the highest level reserved for answers that use the source(s), provide supporting knowledge and attempt to evaluate. To reach the top level of **Question 5** and **Question 10** it is necessary to do the same but also to provide an argument.

***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. Some candidates simply summarised the contents of the source(s) or referred to the source(s) in general terms. Many of those who did use the content would have benefited from making more than one point before going on to the next question. Some candidates missed 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 alone can only score 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). It should be applied selectively so 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.

A minority of candidates attempted all ten questions. Candidates need to be prepared for a specific topic, to use the time as advised and to tackle each question in turn and carefully. All candidates answer the questions chronologically which is, undoubtedly, the best approach.

***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). To do this candidates might consider some of the following criteria: 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. By doing so, candidates will be able to assess fully the reliability, usefulness, significance, accuracy or value of a source or reach a judgement about the source(s). Candidates need to adopt a sceptical stance about source material which was not evident in all answers. They need to ask sufficient questions about its quality as evidence. Candidates need to be prepared to test the evidence and have confidence in their own judgements. If a source is reliable/useful/convincing etc. candidates should then demonstrate why that is the case. In some respects evaluation is possible only with knowledge and the application of knowledge and comments of evaluation should not be regarded as discrete aspects of the answer. The attribution of each source is intended to help all candidates and give them something on which to develop points of evaluation. Candidates should be encouraged to study a source carefully and to think about its qualities before writing.

Nonetheless, the quality of responses this year suggests that *there was more awareness of th* *of evaluation*. Many answers showed that candidates were trying to assess the provenance. At the range were candidates who noted who made a speech, wrote a diary entry or was responsi picture, but then could have improved their answers by drawing judgements from this. At the other e the range were candidates who challenged the credibility of a source rather than accept it at face va Candidates should have the confidence to challenge the material with which they are presented with historical fact, reason and logic. Further comment on the date of a source would have been helpful.

Specific Questions

1. The mark scheme provides guidance on how candidates may have answered the questions. It is not prescriptive.
2. More candidates tackled ***Section B*** on the 1920s than ***Section A*** on the Causes of the American Revolution from 1754.

***Section A*: The Causes of the American Revolution from 1754**

Question 1

Most candidates seemed to understand the basic message and commented on the 'Join, or Die' strap line. Though most appreciated the sections of the snake represented the colonies some were confused by them. The majority assumed the danger facing the colonists came from the British but the better informed were aware that it was the French and Native Americans that were the target.

Question 2

Most candidates were able to make something of the content of the source. A large proportion identified economic grievances and moral concerns about freedom. However, responses could have been elaborated with either knowledge or evaluation.

Question 3

Most candidates gave a brief summary of the content, although some were more specific in identifying particular activities mentioned in the source. Some struggled to expand on the source and explain the other activities of the Sons of Liberty. A minority offered a comment of evaluation on the nature of a diary extract and some were able to say something about John Adams.

Question 4

The sources offered scope for comparison on many points and some candidates took full advantage of the opportunity to explore a range of similarities and differences. The better answers referred explicitly to details from the source and compared the sources in an engaged way. There were very few answers which treated each source discretely or merely summarised them. There was a reasonable attempt at evaluation of the sources by many candidates where they were able to make a basic point about the defensive nature of Source D and the propaganda of Source E. Candidates could have added knowledge to strengthen their responses.

Question 5

A majority of candidates realised that Sources F and G were written from opposing perspectives. If candidates explained that Source F was helpful in explaining the position of the colonists and Source G was helpful in explaining the position of the British government they were providing an argument. By linking these two sources to Sources A-E candidates were credited with offering some evaluation, though assessment of the provenance of F and G was expected to be the focus of the evaluation. Many candidates were able to add some knowledge of events from the previous 20 years. However, some of those who were aware of the argument produced imbalanced answers weighted to one source, rather than both in even measure.

***Section B*: The 1920s**

Question 6

This question was about the film industry, however, some candidates did not read the question prope Instead of focusing on the film industry they concentrated on jazz and music. Some assumed that the theatre in the picture was being used for a concert rather than to show a film. Candidates could have improved their answers by drawing more detail from the source. There were many points in the source from which one might learn about the film industry. A significant number focused on racism as a feature of the film industry, either regarding it as a business that perpetuated negative attitudes about African Americans or one that challenged these attitudes.

Question 7

This question is an example of one where some candidates used it as a prompt to focus on certain aspects of immigration, rather than to assess the attitudes of the 1920s which was being asked. Some candidates preferred to show what they knew on immigration, touching on measures introduced to check immigration, the KKK, the link to communism and, in some cases, the Sacco and Vanzetti case. However, answers based on knowledge alone confined candidates to Level 2. Some answers would have been improved by valid evaluation.

Question 8

Some of the points made about **Question 7** apply to responses to this question. Many candidates provided a lot of information on women in the 1920s or about 'flappers' but some struggled to make links to the source content itself. If they commented on the dress and fashions of 'flappers' they could then have made the point that the photo showed these things. There were plenty of answers that did link knowledge to the content of the source and some were able to evaluate in the same way explaining, for example, that the antics of the two women on the hotel roof may epitomise the risks women were prepared to take but that such stunts were the actions of the most daring only.

Question 9

The majority of candidates simply stated that the sources confirmed that Prohibition was a failure. In doing so they made good use of the considerable detail in the two sources. Knowledge about gangsterism was often applied and those that did expand in this way could achieve higher marks. A few went further and commented on the provenance. If they did, it tended to be a brief comment on Source E rather than Source D. There were those who thought the sources showed that Prohibition achieved some success and of those many were very good. Candidates who recognised the dual value of the sources were rewarded.

Question 10

Most answers to this question were one-sided with candidates asserting that the two sources do give a full picture of life in the 1920s. A number of candidates relied on the sources used in **Questions 6-9** to reinforce this point of view, however, answers were therefore a run through of all the sources. Candidates should ensure they give themselves time to focus on the two main sources which were at the heart of the question. Candidates should read the last question carefully before answering it. Some candidates added knowledge, not least those who argued the sources did not give a full picture of life in the 1920s. They picked up on the omissions in the sources – the farmers, life in the West etc. - and effectively filled the gaps with their knowledge.

AMERICAN HISTORY

Paper 0409/03
History Around Us

The number of Centres increased this year as did the range of topics covered by the coursework. Where different Centres are using the same site, the approach has sometimes been very different. This can serve to highlight the strengths and drawbacks of particular approaches, as well as the extent to which candidates need to receive substantial teacher-support in preparation for writing their papers. The remarks in this report are designed to help teachers support their candidates further in producing work that can be rewarded highly. Examples are drawn from a range of tasks. It is always worthwhile to review coursework tasks and amend them in the light of experience and Moderator's comments made to each Centre.

Administration

In general Centres are to be congratulated on following the guidelines more closely than was the case last year.

There is still some scope for improvement. Internal moderation is an area for development. The class teacher should be the initial marker. Where more than one teacher has taught and marked the work there must be evidence that internal moderation has taken place. Ideally this should be evident because one or more of the scripts selected for moderation has had a mark altered during the process. If no marks are altered, then at least one script should display evidence that it has been assessed by two or more teachers.

Centres are encouraged to seek accreditation for one or more of their teachers using the procedures in ***Section 5*** of the Coursework Training Handbook. However, until this has been done the Centre should devise a suitable method of ensuring that the work of all the candidates is assessed using a common understanding of the criteria in the generic mark scheme and the Centre's own question-specific mark scheme. If the initial marks are changed at internal moderation stage then the agreed moderated mark is the one that the candidate receives and the one which must be entered onto the forms. In addition, the comments and marks on the Individual Candidate Record Card must be adjusted to reflect the moderated marks. It is acceptable to write up these comments and marks after the internal moderation has taken place.

Annotation of work

There was some variation between Centres regarding the extent of annotation and the nature of comments on the Individual Candidate Record Form. Annotation of the script itself is useful for the marker and both the internal and external Moderator as it indicates where the initial marker thinks that a candidate is displaying qualities that correspond with the requirements of the mark scheme. In some Centres the comments on AO2 were in the left-hand margin and those on AO4 were in the right-hand margin. This worked well. Comments are most useful where they relate to the descriptors in the generic mark scheme. For example, note where a candidate identifies a criterion for judging significance and where there is supporting evidence for this judgment. These marginal notes can be very useful as a basis for discussion when internal moderation takes place.

The comments on the Individual Candidate Record Form should summarise what the candidate has done, again using the points in the generic mark scheme. They should also note criteria that have not been met. While the various points in each level of each Assessment Objective in the generic mark scheme should not be considered as mastery criteria (the candidate does not have to achieve all of them to be awarded in the level), the mark awarded within the level should reflect what has not been done as well as what has been done. For example, a candidate who has failed to assess the limitations of their work should not be awarded the highest mark in a level in AO2.

Choice of sites

Centres have largely chosen appropriate sites. Where the coursework was less successful in candidates the opportunity for showing that they could meet all the criteria, this could be explained b choice of sources and the direction given by Centres. Some proposals were presented in outline only, a where advice on additional sources or the devising of a question-specific mark scheme did not appear to have been acted on, problems sometimes followed. For example, some candidates studying the Hoover Dam wrote excellent papers assessing its significance. However, while very interesting, sources on the facts and figures and the methods used in construction, allowed little scope for evaluation as understood by historians. It would have been more beneficial to allow candidates to consider the social and economic significance of the dam, which is open to debate.

The use of promotional material, placing a strong emphasis on the positive and beneficial aspects of a site has its place. However, Centres should ensure that candidates are provided with material that can generate a counter-argument and therefore be used to evaluate sources presenting a positive interpretation of the site.

Structure of writing.

Many Centres had fostered a sense of enquiry by encouraging learners to start with the questions they wanted to ask about the site and its significance, or by suggesting that the learner's opening paragraph was in the form of a thesis about the site's significance. Both were effective ways of approaching the task which helped learners to give their work a structured argument. What is important is that the paper is presented as a single piece of prose which is marked as such.

AO2: Significance

There was variation in the extent to which significance, as opposed to impact, was addressed in candidates' work. Some work over-emphasised significance at the time, at the expense of long-term historical significance. This was particularly the case in some lengthy descriptions of the construction of the Hoover Dam and in some work on Phoenix Indian School. Others achieved a better balance. For example papers on the Corinth railroad crossing considered the significance during the Civil War and also the economic significance for Corinth, including the impact of Civil War tourism. Some papers considered developments over time at Phoenix Indian School in terms of changing educational aims in the context of policy towards Native Americans, and significance for the local community. In other cases significance was taken to mean impact. In these cases there was too little about 'before' to be able adequately assess historical significance.

Evaluation of the study was mixed. In some cases, candidates did not complete any evaluation. In other instances candidates were very honest about the problems created by the source-pack provided or the constraints of visiting a site. Candidates should not be prevented from undertaking further research, although it is important that they start by making good use of the materials the Centre has provided. The candidates' focus was on missing information. However, they should be encouraged to reflect in a more sophisticated manner. Some successful evaluations of the studies were linked to source evaluation. The omission of sources about the impact of irrigation projects on Native Americans was seen as an issue, because in ignoring this group, assumptions were made about what is important economically and socially.

AO4: Use of Sources in Research

Aspects of this assessment objective are far more of a challenge. Learners can and are being supported in the selection, organization and deployment of relevant evidence. What is far less in evidence is the critical use of sources. There were some Centres where this aspect of AO4 had clearly been addressed and in these Centres the candidates had a clear focus on evaluating sources and the evidence they contain before using that evidence. However, some accepted what they read as reliable. Additionally, where candidates had been encouraged to look critically at sources, they were sometimes rewarded for undeveloped ideas.

Evaluation of sources, as in Paper 2, also involves consideration of how the historian (candidate) will use the source. That is, he/she will consider its context. A historian would consider the importance of who said/wrote/created the source and why they did it in the way they did, in its context. Why were statements about the importance of Corinth railroad crossing made during the Civil War? At what stage was this in the war? How was the war progressing for each side? Did the Generals wish to rally their troops? Or were they making a point to their political superiors about the need for reinforcements at this location? You are not asking your candidates to find a counter argument - that the railroad crossing was unimportant - but to explain why they have accepted the claims made by the generals. Clearly the corroboration of generals on

both sides saying the same thing offers some evaluation, but it is limited unless the context an considered.

Sources that simply provide data or description may be included in the pack given to candidates. How is essential to include some sources that express views that need to be explained and/or challenged in o to provide candidates with the opportunity to demonstrate their critical skills.

The comments on the use of sources in the report on Paper 2, as well as the June 2013 Moderator's report and the relevant section of the Coursework Training Handbook all give further advice on what is expected of candidates.

Finally, while the inclusion of a bibliography and use of footnotes was much improved on last year, there is still some variation. This needs to be addressed: a bibliography is a requirement, but candidates should only include in it what they have used.