



# Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2021

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced  
Level in History (WHI03/1D)

Paper 3: Thematic Study with Source  
Evaluation

Option 1D: Civil Rights and Race  
Relations in the USA, 1865–2009

## **Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications**

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk). Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at [www.edexcel.com/contactus](http://www.edexcel.com/contactus).

## **Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere**

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

Summer 2021

Question Paper Log Number P67052A

Publications Code WHI03\_1D\_rms\_20210604

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2021

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

## Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 3

### Section A

**Target: AO2 (25 marks):** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.</li><li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.</li><li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material, but mainly to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.</li><li>• Detailed knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria with some justification.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two sources may be uneven.</li><li>• Deploys well-selected knowledge of the historical context, but mainly to illuminate or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material. Displays some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may not be fully substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.</li></ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion.</li> <li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context with precision to illuminate and discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.</li> </ul>

## Section B

**Target: AO1 (25 marks):** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li><li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li><li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li><li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.</li><li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</li><li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li><li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although some mainly descriptive passages may be included.</li><li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li><li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li><li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li><li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li><li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li><li>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision.</li></ul>

<b>Level</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>21–25</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis and discussion of the relationships between key features of the period.</li><li>• Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</li><li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.</li><li>• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li></ul>

## Section A: indicative content

### Option 1D: Civil Rights and Race Relations in the USA, 1865–2009

Question	Indicative content
<b>1</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme.</p> <p>The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to investigate attempts to introduce anti-lynching legislation in the 1930's.</p> <p><b>Source 1</b></p> <p>1.The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The author was a leading and seasoned campaigner for the NAACP and so might be expected to be aware of the likely political difficulties</li><li>• Being an official letter on behalf of the NAACP, it might directly represent their policy position on the issue of lynching</li><li>• The date of the letter is from the start of Roosevelt's administration and might be seen as the NAACP trying to seize the initiative on lynching by promoting legislation.</li></ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about attempts to introduce anti-lynching legislation in the 1930's.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It indicates that the NAACP are being proactive in trying to get the issue of lynching addressed in Congress ('I am writing to inquire if you would be willing to introduce a federal anti-lynching bill to Congress.')</li><li>• It implies that the matter needs to be tackled as a matter of urgency ('that the situation is so serious')</li><li>• It claims that the issue needs to be viewed as one of basic civil rights ('violates whatever rights the lynched person has as a citizen of the state').</li></ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• As a result of their long-running campaign, the NAACP would have been aware of earlier attempts and the reasons for their failure, and would be hoping to avoid a similar outcome</li><li>• The NAACP consistently contacted those in positions of authority with the aim of gaining high-profile support for their campaigns</li><li>• The NAACP believed it was imperative to launch a new anti-lynching campaign in 1933, the first year of Roosevelt's presidency because the number of lynchings had trebled from the previous year to 28.</li></ul>



Question	Indicative content
	<p><b>Source 2</b></p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Crisis magazine, being the official magazine of the NAACP, might be expected to take a partial view on the issue of lynching</li> <li>• The tone and language reflects both sadness at the failure of the bill but also satisfaction at how well the campaign against lynching was conducted</li> <li>• The date is from after the failure of the bill to pass and so is reflecting back on the reasons for that.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about attempts to introduce anti-lynching legislation in the 1930's.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It indicates that, despite the failure of the bill, the NAACP campaign will go on ('magnificent campaign was fought and the battle is not yet over.')</li> <li>• It implies that their cause has effectively been betrayed by duplicitous politicians ('so-called friends of the negro... did nothing to break the filibuster.')</li> <li>• It suggests that the President has been damaging in his actions towards anti-lynching legislation ('great silence of the man in the White House.' 'when that crucial hour to support the bill arrived, he said nothing.')</li> </ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• As a result of his reliance on the support of southern Democrats President Roosevelt was unwilling to directly support anti-lynching legislation</li> <li>• NAACP campaigning in the 1930's consistently over-stated the extent of political support for anti-lynching legislation especially in the southern states</li> <li>• The Costigan-Wagner bill was subject to a two month filibuster in 1934, organised by Senate majority leader, Joseph Robinson of Arkansas.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sources 1 and 2</b></p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both sources, although from both the beginning and the end of the attempts to get the bill passed, adopt a positive stance that it will be achieved</li> <li>• Source 2, looking retrospectively, outlines actual reasons for failure rather than Source 1 which highlights the difficulties and arguments the campaign is likely to face</li> <li>• The language and tone of Source 2, by invoking the notion of a crusade, contrasts with the practical language of Source 1.</li> </ul>

## Section B: Indicative content

### Option 1D: Civil Rights and Race Relations in the USA, 1865–2009

Question	Indicative content
<b>2</b>	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate it is to say that the rulings of the Supreme Court were the most significant obstacle to the advancement of civil rights in the years 1865-1900.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Supreme Court Slaughterhouse decision 1873, opened the floodgates to state challenges to the rights of black citizens, thus negating much of the impact of the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment</li><li>• In 1876, the United States v Reese case ruled that the 15<sup>th</sup> Amendment didn't automatically grant the right to vote to anyone. This was used to slowly reduce the number of black voters in southern states</li><li>• 1883 Supreme Court judgements ruled that the 1875 Civil Rights Act was invalid, thereby negating many of the landmark changes brought about during the reconstruction period</li><li>• Plessy v Ferguson 1896, by embracing the concept of 'separate but equal', enabled legal segregation. It was quickly followed by state laws establishing separate facilities for black and white Americans</li><li>• Williams v Mississippi 1898 failed to overturn the changes made to the Mississippi State Constitution in 1890, which disenfranchised large numbers of black voters.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement and/or that other factors were more significant should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Supreme Court was not responsible for instigating legislative obstacles to civil rights; they were just the enabler of it</li><li>• The decisions of individual states to deprive black Americans of their political rights was the most significant obstacle to civil rights, e.g. Mississippi 1890</li><li>• The creeping and widespread proliferation of Jim Crow laws, extending social segregation throughout the southern states, was a serious obstacle to civil rights</li><li>• The hostility and obstruction of Presidents, such as Andrew Johnson, was a significant obstacle to black American civil rights</li><li>• Increasing support for white organisations, such as the Ku Klux Klan and the White League, hindered the advancement of civil rights for black Americans.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that the Montgomery Bus Boycott had the most impact on the civil rights movement in the years 1954-2009.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Boycott brought Martin Luther King to national prominence as a civil rights campaigner and he used this to become the figurehead of the movement over the next decade</li> <li>• The Boycott represented a more direct attitude to protest on behalf of the NAACP. Rosa Parks was deliberately chosen to test racial segregation on public buses with the aim of using this to dismantle the Jim Crow laws</li> <li>• The Boycott enshrined the principle of non-violent protest as the central platform of protest for the civil rights movement</li> <li>• The legal challenge to the Boycott culminated in the Supreme Court ruling, <i>Browder v Gayle</i>, which ruled that segregation on public transport violated the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment and so re-energised the civil rights movement</li> <li>• The Boycott led to the foundation of other campaigning groups, such as the Southern Christian Leadership Conference thereby broadening the civil rights movement.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact of Civil rights campaign groups, such as the NAACP and CORE, had existed before the Boycott and continued to do so afterwards</li> <li>• Landmark Supreme Court judgements such as <i>Brown v Board of Education</i> had profound effects on the movement by enabling legal challenges to segregation in all areas of society</li> <li>• The protests in 1963 in places such as Birmingham Alabama, were peaceful, yet deliberately provocative, with a view to mobilising television audiences to apply political pressure</li> <li>• The Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1968 as well as the Voting Rights Act 1965 gave encouragement to the movement to broaden their campaigns to target economic equality especially in the cities</li> <li>• The growth of a black middle class and increasing educational and political opportunities, especially after 2000, led to a decline in direct campaigning and organised protest</li> <li>• The 2008 election of Barack Obama, as President, was symbolically important, either being viewed as a culmination of decades work, or a springboard for more progress by the movement.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

