

Examiners' Report
June 2018

GCSE History 1HI0 33

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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 or 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.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

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.

June 2018

Publications Code 1HI0_33_1806_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

Introduction

Most candidates seemed well prepared for this option and they often took the opportunity to showcase an impressive knowledge of the social, political and economic factors at play in the civil rights movement as well as the military challenges of the Vietnam War. Candidates were generally well prepared for the question styles with a pleasing range of valid approaches to answering the interpretations questions as a particular strength.

The Modern World Depth Studies are designed to allow students to understand the complexity of a society within a short coherent period and the question styles reflect this. Section B provides a single enquiry based on two interpretations and two contemporary sources with the focus in this paper being the impact of the Tet Offensive on American attempts to win the Vietnam War. The questions in this section form a coherent package leading to a final question in which candidates, having explored the utility of the provided sources, analyse the different views presented in the interpretations and the reasons for those differences, and are then invited to judge the extent to which they agree with one of the interpretations. Because of the specific focus in Section B, the questions in Section A are designed to explore other areas of the specification which are not covered in B.

In question 1 candidates are asked to provide two supported inferences from Source A. No marks were available for candidates who either provided simple paraphrases of the source or ignored the specific focus of the question.

In question 2, the focus will always be on causation but the question does not require a judgement to be made or for the answer to prioritise or show interaction of factors and no marks were available to reward this evaluation, however strongly argued. Instead, the most successful candidates showed a consistent analytical focus throughout their answers and many were able to access Level 4 by doing so. In question 2 the stimulus points in the question will often be useful reminders to candidates of specific areas of content which they can write about. Candidates do not need to use these stimulus points but there is an expectation that there will be some depth of knowledge, shown by three discrete aspects of the question being covered, although this does not mean candidates need to identify three different causes or events. It was pleasing to see that candidates had understood this expectation and most answers were clearly structured in paragraphs, making it easy for the examiner to identify the different aspects being covered.

All of the sub-questions in Section B relate to either the two interpretations, Sources B and C, or both the sources and interpretations. Question 3 (a) targets the ability to analyse and evaluate source utility and, in doing so, introduces the enquiry which will be dealt with in further detail in questions 3(b), 3(c) and 3(d).

In 3 (a) candidates are expected to evaluate the content taking account of the provenance of the sources and apply contextual knowledge in making judgements about utility. These strands are interdependent and should be dealt with together, rather than in isolation. There is no need to compare the two sources although a few candidates took the unnecessary additional step of trying to determine which source was 'most useful' which is not the focus of the question and therefore is not rewardable.

Questions 3(b) and 3(c) examine the views expressed in the two provided interpretations. Candidates are expected to identify the main difference between the views in 3(b) and use the interpretations to support those claims. This question was generally well done and most candidates who were able to show how they differed could also support their answers. The focus in 3(c) is on why the interpretations might differ and this question was more challenging and the specific areas of weakness explained below should be read carefully. It is not possible to provide effectively substantiated reasons why the interpretations are different based on such things as where and when the interpretations were published although a number of candidates did attempt to do so without success. See specific information about 3(c) below.

Question 3 (d) carries the highest number of marks on the paper. Successful candidates will have already seen how the views in the interpretations are different, why this might be the case and, in completing 3(a), have understood that there is likely to be evidence in support of both interpretations. They are now asked how far they agree with one of the interpretations. The strongest answers to 3(d), therefore, focused clearly on the interpretations themselves, reviewing the alternative views and coming to a substantiated judgement. Candidates who focused exclusively on the view provided in Interpretation 2 and used this as a basis for an essay based on their own knowledge were less successful than those who considered the alternative views from both interpretations. There is no expectation that both interpretations are dealt with in equal depth but both should be examined explicitly. The use of contextual knowledge is an important element in this evaluation but it must be precisely selected to support the evaluation and not just used to display aspects of the topic which the candidate has revised but are not relevant to the enquiry. In addition, some of the strongest answers were able to show how the differences of view in the two interpretations were conveyed in reaching their overall judgements.

Examiners reported some impressive answers to 3(d) and many candidates were able to engage confidently with the interpretations, taking a range of approaches. However, even weaker candidates were able to access this challenging question and often provided evaluative responses leading to an overall conclusion. Candidates rarely seemed rushed and full answers were generally provided showing that timing wasn't generally an issue on this paper.

Sufficient space is provided in the exam papers for all questions to be answered in full and although some candidates did write on extra sheets they were not always as successful as those who produced more concise answers. It is of vital importance that candidates do not continue answers from one question in the space reserved for another and, if they wish to write more than the booklet allows, they should clearly identify this on the paper and ask for additional sheets. It is intended that the space provided is sufficient for the majority of the candidates to be able to construct a fully rewardable response.

Spelling, punctuation and grammar were assessed on 3(d) and the most impressive aspect of this strand was the use of specialist terms which perhaps reflects the detailed understanding most candidates had of this depth study.

Question 1

In question 1 candidates are invited to make a valid inference about the aims of the Black Panther Party. There are two marks available for each inference – one for the inference itself and one for the supporting information. Most candidates seemed to understand how to make an inference although a disappointing number made inferences about matters which were not related to the specified enquiry, i.e. the *aims* of the Black Panther Party. These candidates made points about aspects of the source like the general plight of black Americans, the anger of the Black Panthers or other aspects of the *status quo* and these did not gain marks. Candidates who performed well on this question made valid inferences which were specifically about the aims of the Black Panther Party such as a desire for greater security, improved employment prospects or better living conditions. However, those candidates who were able to provide an inference were almost invariably able to support it with a relevant quote, paraphrase or description of an aspect of the source.

Candidates used the table provided for the answers well and only those who also explained *why* their supporting information helped to support the inference (which is not required) had to use additional space for their answers.

A very limited number of candidates attempted to use the provenance of the source to make inferences but the target of this question is to make inferences from the content.

1 Give **two** things you can infer from Source A about the aims of the Black Panther Party.

Complete the table below to explain your answer.

(i) What I can infer:

The black panthers want to ensure safety for the black people.

Details in the source that tell me this:

It says 'we want all black men to not have to do military service' and asks for 'an end to 'police brutality', to reduce harm for black people

(ii) What I can infer:

They aim to improve quality of life living for black people.

Details in the source that tell me this:

It states 'we want decent housing' and 'all black people to have a job' which will ensure financial security.



This candidate has made two inferences supported by direct quotations from the source. Only one quotation is required to support an inference, although this candidate has used two to support the first inference.

Candidates should read the whole question to make sure that their inferences relate to the specific question – in this case the aims of the Black Panther Party.



Candidates should read the whole question to make sure that their inferences relate to the specific question – in this case the aims of the Black Panther Party.

- 1 Give **two** things you can infer from Source A about the aims of the Black Panther Party.

Complete the table below to explain your answer.

(i) What I can infer:

I can infer how the Black Panther Party aim to have all Black people in employment.

Details in the source that tell me this:

I know this because the source states how 'we want all Black people to have a job'.

(ii) What I can infer:

I can infer how the Black Panther Party aim to stop violence ~~to~~ from the police towards black people.

Details in the source that tell me this:

I know this because the source states how they want 'to end police brutality' and 'the murders of black people'.



The candidate has provided two inferences with direct support from the source so gains full marks.



Think about the space provided – inferences do not need to be explained in great detail and a single sentence is enough. In terms of support, the relevant quote only needs to be written in the space provided and candidates don't need to explain why they have chosen it.

Question 2

Candidates performed well on this question and the topic of the Montgomery Bus Boycott appeared to have been well taught. The majority of candidates were able to provide three aspects of content and relate these to the question and it was noteworthy that even candidates with more limited knowledge of the content were often able to provide a clear structure in their answers, if not a clear analytical focus. The stimulus points are provided to help candidates to link the question they have been asked with the material they have studied and to provide a prompt to the analysis of the process of change. Knowledge was generally strong on the actions of the Montgomery Improvement Association (MIA) although some candidates simply read this as a reason to discuss the personal qualities of Martin Luther King rather than focusing on the reasons why the wider campaign brought about success. Some candidates showed good understanding of the importance of the Supreme Court's role but there was less detailed knowledge on the specific reasons why this led to the desegregation of public transportation in Montgomery. Candidates achieving the higher levels often showed an impressive awareness of the changes in the Supreme Court during the 1950s which had allowed them to step away from the doctrine of 'separate but equal' and be more forceful in interpreting the 14th Amendment. Many candidates went beyond the stimulus points by examining the roles of Rosa Parks and Martin Luther King. In many cases candidates started to tell the story of Rosa Parks but did not clearly relate her actions to the idea of success, instead describing the bravery of her stand and becoming bogged down in details about whether or not she intended to create such a widespread dispute. Some candidates also investigated the importance of Martin Luther King's promotion to a position of leadership in the broader civil rights movement but this tended to be focused on the significance of Montgomery rather than an explanation of its success. High level answers tended to explain why the specific actions of these important historical figures brought about the success of the boycott. Candidates who possessed specific knowledge of the economic impact of the boycott and the reasons why it could be sustained for such a long time were often able to use this information to access the higher levels.

Candidates did not need to provide a conclusion to show a sustained line of reasoning and those who were most successful showed a sustained focus on the question in every paragraph. Candidates who only really attempted any analysis in a conclusion struggled to meet the AO2 requirements at the higher levels. Candidates are not expected to prioritise or link factors at Level 4 and few attempted to do so. In cases where candidates did prioritise factors examiners were sometimes able to reward some aspects of the candidate's argument as showing a clear line of reasoning but it was not a strategy that automatically gained levels 3 and 4.

At Level 2, candidates often described the actions of the boycotters which left links to the question too implicit to meet the AO2 focus on analysis. At Level 3 candidates were mainly focused on the conceptual focus of the question but sometimes lacked the wide-ranging knowledge required at Level 4. At Level 4 there were many sustained analytical responses supported by well-chosen examples which displayed clear understanding of the topic and these were often rewarded with full marks.

Overall, candidates were very comfortable with this style of question and produced a range of impressive answers.

2 Explain why the Montgomery Bus Boycott succeeded in achieving its aims.

(12)

You may use the following in your answer:

- Montgomery Improvement Association (MIA)
- Supreme Court

You **must** also use information of your own.

One reason that the Montgomery bus boycott was successful was because the bus companies had little choice but to concede and remove segregation on their buses. At this time, over 75% of their clientele were black, and so when almost all black customers, as well as some white customers boycotted their buses, they suffered heavy financial losses. This meant that after over a year of massively reduced customers, the bus companies either had to meet the demands of desegregation or go bankrupt. The former was the more favourable, and so the boycotts successfully forced bus companies to desegregate their bus service.

Another reason it was successful was because of the assistance of the MIA (Montgomery Improvement Association). Charred by Martin Luther King, the MIA provided assistance that enabled the Black community to sustain the bus boycott. One way in which

they did this was by negotiating cheaper fares from black cab drivers.

This meant that cabs cost the same as bus fares, and so the people could afford public transport without using buses. It was this sustained boycotting that then led to the Supreme court ruling.

Another reason the boycott was successful was the Supreme court ruled the desegregation of buses. Following the Brown vs Topeka success in 1954, it became apparent that the 'separate but equal' system was ~~not~~ not racially fair. Though that case was only about the segregation of schools, many judges later found that 'separate but equal' was unconstitutional. This included the ruling of desegregation of buses, as the judge felt this separation broke the 14th amendment. As a result, the boycotters aim of desegregating buses was achieved, and they resumed using the newly desegregated buses following the court ruling.



The candidate has covered three areas of content (economic impact, the role of the Montgomery Improvement Association and the Supreme Court) and has, therefore, satisfied the requirements for Level 4 answers to go beyond the stimulus points and to show wide-ranging knowledge. In addition, detail is used to support the analysis, which is evident in every paragraph, rather than being provided simply as information.



This answer is quite concise but still satisfies all the criteria for Level 4. Covering three aspects of content and using specific examples to illustrate the points made is enough to show the wide-ranging knowledge required at Level 3.

2 Explain why the Montgomery Bus Boycott succeeded in achieving its aims.

(12)

You may use the following in your answer:

- Montgomery Improvement Association (MIA)
- Supreme Court

You **must** also use information of your own.

Firstly, the Montgomery Bus Boycott of 1955, sparked huge attraction and attention particularly from the media regarding the event and how segregation on public transport needed to be made illegal. The event occurred on the 15th of December, when Rosa Parks, a black female activist refused to give up her seat to a white person when asked to move. At the time, this was what was expected as segregation of black and white Americans on public transport was normal therefore giving up your seat to a white American was expected, however when she rebelled against this it ~~lead to her~~ sparked huge "sit-in" campaigns and also led to the bus system in Montgomery, Kansas facing serious ~~loss~~ financial deprivation as most of the customers of the system were black Americans. Despite her arrest and being fined no one could criticise Parks as she was a middle-aged married woman.

~~The~~ In result to the events, of Rosa Parks, the Montgomery Improvement Association helped non-violently demonstrate against the segregation black Americans faced on public transport and therefore led to the boycott as the system began to collapse due to the lack of funding within the system. Furthermore the MIA also helped stage multiple ~~a~~ peaceful interventions on public transport.

which eventually lead to the abolishment of segregation on public transport which consequently meant the boycott succeeded in achieving it's aims.

Lastly, the Supreme court was also involved with in the Montgomery bus boycott in 1955 as due to the widespread attention from the media that the event attracted this lead to a Supreme court ruling which ordered segregation to be banned on public transport which meant that the boycott achieved it's aims.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This candidate displays good knowledge of the topic with some aspects showing wide-ranging knowledge of the period. However, although the explanation is mainly directed at the focus of the question the first paragraph generally consists of a description of the events. The third paragraph is well-focused but doesn't show a strong enough understanding of the role of the Supreme Court.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Organising the answer into paragraphs makes it clear to the examiner that three aspects of content have been covered. A sentence at the end of each section showing how it helps to answer the question can help to raise the AO2 level in an answer.

Question 3 (a)

This was probably the most challenging question on the paper for many candidates and very few managed to display the analysis required to reach L3. Candidates need to approach the utility question bearing in mind that judgements about utility should be based on the usefulness of the sources for the specified enquiry, in this case the effects of the Tet Offensive on American attempts to win the Vietnam War. It is also important for candidates to remember that judging utility may involve some comments about reliability but answers which focus solely on this aspect tend to be extremely negative towards the source material.

Reliability can only ever be a small element of utility because an unreliable source can still be very useful. It is also important that in judging utility provenance of the source is related to the content of the source. For example, the fact that the journalist who is writing about his experiences in Source B had actually experienced the dramatic events he is describing perhaps makes it more useful to understanding the impact of the Tet Offensive on the American army. It might be true, as many candidates pointed out, that because this was written 30 years after Tet he might have forgotten details of the events. However, those same candidates often could not point out areas in the source which displayed this forgetfulness. In addition, many candidates who had stated that the information in the source matched their own historical knowledge, often providing useful detail about the unexpected nature of the attack on Saigon in order to do so, then proceeded to describe the source as useless because of the time between the events and the interview. Also, it was not enough to say that, as a journalist, the writer was likely to exaggerate without examining elements of the source which might show this to be true.

Many candidates made basic judgements about the reliability of the two sources which simply did not match with their wider analysis. For example, many candidates dismissed Source C as not being trustworthy because it appeared in a newspaper and newspapers are 'biased' or tend to exaggerate. More sophisticated answers looked at the significance of such a photograph being featured in a newspaper. These candidates offered suggestions about how such a photograph might have had an impact on public opinion in the USA which was such an important factor in the failure of the war.

The provenance of the source was often dealt with on a generic level and this is only likely to gain marks at Level 1. Many candidates who offered otherwise quite interesting analysis of the content and applied excellent subject knowledge to the interpretation of the sources still had a tendency to fall back on simplistic judgements about provenance. Again, in the case of Source C these comments tended to fall back on such ideas as the photograph being staged without any analysis of how, why or to what end. Candidates often referred to such things as the photograph being 'a snapshot in time' or being more reliable than other forms of evidence because it could not be exaggerated or dramatised. Some candidates were dismissive of Source B because the author was a reporter and, therefore, likely to exaggerate. Not only are these statements too basic to be considered analytical but they are also demonstrably untrue.

Many answers made good use of contextual knowledge but some well-prepared candidates spent too much time talking about the wider military problems in Vietnam without using that material to support reasoning about the sources' utility, becoming stuck in Level 2 at best for many of their points. In addition, it is not possible to gain credit for simply asserting that the candidate knows an aspect of the source to be true without using specific knowledge to demonstrate this. Knowledge of the problems faced by the USA in Vietnam was good and a number of candidates displayed some very specific knowledge about the Tet Offensive itself. It is also worth noting that simple comprehension – it states, it shows – based on the assumption that such information is useful, remains low level. Developed statements about the usefulness of the content can reach Level 2 but answers consisting solely of such comments are unlikely to progress beyond mid-Level 2,

irrespective of the length of the answer, because the other strands of the Assessment Objective have not been addressed.

In attempting to analyse utility many candidates have obviously been encouraged to describe what is missing from the source and this led to some answers which could only be marked at Level 1. The primary focus for all candidates should be to judge the utility of what is there rather than what isn't there. For example, many candidates claimed that Source C was not useful because it did not show the fighting in other cities in Vietnam but this is not something that the photograph could be reasonably expected to show. Some candidates criticised the journalist's evidence in Source B because he only witnessed one part of the attack. Candidates should recognise that the sources were not written in order to be used by historians and they cannot cover every detail that might be useful in an investigation. It is important to focus on what *is* there and judge its utility rather than explaining what the source does not cover.

Answers reach Level 3 by assessing the usefulness of the content in the light of the provenance and the candidate's own knowledge; the criteria used to make the judgement could be its accuracy (this is not the same as reliability), the relevance of the source, the way it could be used by the historian, and how representative the source is, for example. An evaluation of a source's utility should be explicit about the criteria being used, for example an answer should be able to explain that while the language may be emotive, the facts included can be supported from the candidate's own knowledge so the source is very useful despite any loaded language. Similarly, the answer might show an awareness of the different uses of a source for this enquiry: an eye-witness account by one journalist might only show one person's experience but its usefulness might be found in indicating the general confusion facing the American military at this time.

Although a judgement should be reached on the overall usefulness of each source, there is no requirement to compare the sources or to use them in combination and no marks are available for this. Doing this wastes time that could be used to explain the judgement made with regard to utility.

3 (a) Study Sources B and C.

How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into the effects of the Tet Offensive on American attempts to win the Vietnam War?

Explain your answer, using Sources B and C and your knowledge of the historical context.

(8)

Source B is an eyewitness account of the unfolding events in Saigon during the Tet offensive. The newspaper article tells us about the devastation it caused for US fighters and it seems to have put a setback for them to win the Vietnam War.

The source tells us that the 'scale of the Communist Tet offensive' destroyed 'every other town and major US base'.

The source views the event as a big drawback for the US ~~but~~ so it is useful for an enquiry into the immediate effects of the Tet offensive. The eyewitness account could be exaggerated and it doesn't reflect on the entire event. It only focuses on one day so this source is only useful to an extent.*

Source C is ~~is~~ a photograph by an American Press photographer. ~~is~~ The picture shows a wounded, bloody beaten

vietcong soldier surrounded by 5 us troops. The source infers that there were more ~~off~~ US soldiers compared to vietcong soldiers and we can imply that the US didn't take the event too badly as none of the US soldiers appeared injured. So the source shows that the Tet offensive didn't effect the chances of the US winning the vietnam war. It is photographed by an American Press photographer who used these images back in the USA to convince the US citizens and the rest of the world that the US was winning so this source is a distraction from the disasters happening ~~back~~ so the source ~~is~~ is useful to show how Americans wanted to view the situation but the photograph does not show the negative impacts it had so we can't compare if the event was overall a success ~~of~~ or failure for the USA.

* It is taken from a British person's perspective who was not indoctrinated by the propaganda being shown to the Americans. This is the best source to show the reality of the situation.



This candidate applies some valid criteria to the sources, such as accuracy, and makes some developed points about how the provenance might have an impact on the utility of the content of the source. For example, considering the perspective of a British journalist and concluding that as well as an eye-witness he might be displaying quite a neutral perspective. The candidate is not quite as convincing in this respect when dealing with Source C. However, the candidate has used developed reasoning which is supported by contextual knowledge in such a way as to meet the criteria for Level 3.



At Level 3 candidates will always have a clear focus on the utility of the source for the specific enquiry – in this example the candidate is focused on how useful the source is for an enquiry into the impact of the Tet Offensive on American attempts to win the Vietnam War.

3 (a) Study Sources B and C.

How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into the effects of the Tet Offensive on American attempts to win the Vietnam War?

Explain your answer, using Sources B and C and your knowledge of the historical context.

(8)

Source B is partially useful because it shows us that there was 'heavy fighting' ~~that looked~~ that 'terrified' the police. ~~During the tet offences,~~ ~~media made the~~ ~~soldiers~~ were in fact shocked and taken by surprise because they were not expecting the attack due to the festival of new year where they kept peaceful. However the source is not very reliable because it is something one person has experienced, he is stating what he saw which would not be very helpful if we're looking at the effects of the Tet Offensive on American attempts. Because it doesn't talk about them much, he is only stating what he see's. (Also more than 4000 troops attacked).

Source C is partially useful because it shows us ~~the~~ American troops remaining the "last Vietcong soldiers" which shows us that

the police and troops were in fact successful at taking things under control. Even though the police and troops were taken by surprise, they did manage to get rid of Vietcong very very quickly (within a few hours). This shows us that ~~Americans~~ the American troops did seem weak at the start, because people were ~~surpr~~ surprised as to how such a 'weak' army broke ~~into~~ in, ~~however~~ it also had great media influence, influenced American soldiers as well. However this source is not reliable because it is taken by an American press photographer, who would obviously want his ~~own~~ own country to look good and powerful.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

At Level 2 candidates will make developed comments related to the content of the sources and/or their provenance. In this case the candidate has made some developed comments about the utility of the content. Their attempts to analyse the provenance of the source are not convincing. Despite this, the criteria for Level 2 are still met.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Candidates using precise knowledge to support points about the specific aspects of the source will always perform better than those who just use this question to write about the topic in general terms.

Question 3 (b)

In this question candidates need to identify the difference between the views given in Interpretations 1 and 2 about the specified enquiry, in this case the effects of the Tet Offensive on American attempts to win the war in Vietnam. Candidates are expected to identify a difference and support this by selecting relevant points from the interpretations.

Responses which asserted differences without support, for example stating that Interpretation 1 suggests the Tet Offensive was a failure for the communists, whereas Interpretation 2 suggests the offensive led to the withdrawal of the United States, stayed in Level 1. Some candidates gave differences of detail, for example in Interpretation 1, 58,000 communist troops were killed but in Interpretation 2 they had even attacked the US embassy in Saigon. Candidates who did this without also showing how these details convey a difference of view also stayed in Level 1.

Level 2 was achieved when the candidates indicted a clear difference of view and supported it with detail from the extracts. Most candidates were able to score full marks and those that didn't fell into one of the 2 categories mentioned above.

Candidates' success in question 3(d) is influenced by how well they identify the views given in the interpretations. Therefore, those who did identify the impact of the Tet Offensive on American attempts to win the war in Vietnam in 3(b), were able to build on this more successfully than those who failed to, when it came to answering 3(d).

Candidates' success in question 3(d) is influenced by how well they identify the views given in the interpretations. Therefore, those who did identify the differences of view about the effects of the Tet Offensive on American attempts to win the Vietnam War in this question, 3(b), were able to build on this more successfully than those who failed to, when it came to answering 3(d).

Some candidates tried to use extra space in the booklet to write very full answers but in many cases these were simply lengthy paraphrases of the interpretations which did not identify the main difference between them.

This response was awarded four marks.

(b) Study Interpretations 1 and 2. They give different views about the effects of the Tet Offensive on American attempts to win the Vietnam War.

What is the main difference between these views?

Explain your answer, using details from both interpretations.

(4)

Interpretation 1 shows the Tet Offensive as a positive towards America winning the Vietnam War because out of the 84,000 communist troops in the Tet Offensive, nearly 58,000 had been killed, almost wiping out the Vietcong as an effective fighting force. Whereas Interpretation 2 shows the Tet Offensive was a negative outcome for America. This was because the US public turned even more strongly against the war. After the Vietcong attack on Saigon, it was clear to the public that the war wasn't being won by the USA.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

As well as identifying a main difference between the interpretations this candidate has provided quotations to support the points being made which means that this answer is placed in Level 2.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Once a difference has been identified, short quotations from the interpretations or a paraphrase of some of the points made will be enough to provide the support required for Level 2.

- (b) **Study Interpretations 1 and 2. They give different views about the effects of the Tet Offensive on American attempts to win the Vietnam War.**

What is the main difference between these views?

Explain your answer, using details from both interpretations.

(4)

Interpretation 1 believes that American troops should continue pressure on the enemies where as in Interpretation 2 suggest its time for America to withdraw soldiers out of there and try negotiate peace



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The candidate has clearly identified a major difference between the interpretations. However, without support from the interpretations the answer is limited to Level 1.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Candidates should always try to offer a difference in the overall view presented by each interpretation rather than just focusing on differences of surface detail.

Question 3 (c)

Moving on from identifying the differences in view in question 3b, candidates need to explain reasons for those differences in question 3c. Only one reason, effectively substantiated, is required to get into Level 2. Successful candidates were able to show an understanding of why historians come to different conclusions, or have different emphases. This might be due to a variety of factors such as the weight given to different sources, in this case candidates might refer to the support given by Source B for Interpretation 2 and by Source C for Interpretation 1. Some candidates also discussed the different emphases of the Interpretations, with Interpretation 1 concentrating on the military impacts of Tet while Interpretation 2 was focused on the political and social impacts.

Successful candidates selected one of the above approaches and evidenced their reasoning with specific support from the Interpretations. The majority of candidates were able to do this, with most opting for explaining the differences in terms of the weight given to the selection of sources by the historians. Those who stayed in level 1 did not fully understand the nature of the question. Some gave a valid reason for the difference in view, but failed to support this reason, stating for example that the views differ because the historians have used different evidence but not providing evidence for this.

A significant minority of candidates attempted to speculate as to the background motivations of the historians which is not a requirement of this question. Candidates who did this tried to use the date of the interpretation or the title of the book from which it came as the reason for the differences in view. Candidates who did this stayed in level 1 as they were unable to support their ideas with evidence from the Interpretations. There is no requirement in the specification to address the historiography and the views being presented are alternative views not directed towards a controversy or specific debate. Candidates should appreciate that historians legitimately have differences of view and come to different conclusions when they conduct their enquiries into the evidence. The question is rooted in the interpretations that have been provided and therefore speculation about possible reasons for differences cannot be rewarded here if it is based on the provenance or what else might or might not have been said; candidates must be able to support their comments with evidence from the provided interpretations.

A small number of candidates gained no marks on this question as they merely repeated what had been said in question 3b.

(c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the effects of the Tet Offensive on American attempts to win the Vietnam War.

You may use Sources B and C to help explain your answer.

(4)

One reason they are different is because each author focused on a different topic; one the US public, the other, the Vietcong Army. This means that they would have used different sources to come up with that view. Also, the sources could be biased, which will change the authors view. Overall, focusing on different topics meant using different sources, leading to the different views.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This candidate has identified two possible reasons for the interpretations providing different views and they have gained marks at Level 1.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

To move an answer from Level 1 to Level 2 candidates need to provide some form of substantiation. For example, this candidate could have used Sources B and C as examples when they talk about the writers using different source information.

(c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the effects of the Tet Offensive on American attempts to win the Vietnam War.

You may use Sources B and C to help explain your answer.

(4)

One reason why interpretations 1 and 2 give different views is because they both concentrate on different focuses within the outcome of the Tet offensive. For example, interpretation 1 focuses on tactical outcomes, and how that, by looking at figures of 58000 out of 84000 Vietcong troops defected, the offensive did seem a great success for the US. However, interpretation 2 focuses on public opinions for the outcome of the Tet offensive. The negative public opinion that the US troops received from the offensive made it seem like it wasn't a success for US troops and didn't get them any closer to winning the war.



This candidate has gained full marks by explaining how the writers have used a different emphasis in writing their interpretations and the answer is substantiated by references to the interpretations.

Question 3 (d)

This was the most challenging question of the paper, requiring students to show how what they had identified in 3 (a),(b) and (c) could be effectively used to explain why they agreed and disagreed with Interpretation 2. This is the only time candidates will be tested on AO4: Analysis and evaluation of interpretations. Three elements were necessary for candidates to be successful: evaluation and judgement of the given interpretation, the analysis of the provided material, i.e. the two interpretations, and the deployment of contextual knowledge to support the evaluation.

The second strand of A04 required an analysis of the Interpretations. In order to be successful candidates needed to correctly identify what Interpretation 2 was saying, in this case that the events of the Tet Offensive had shown the American public that the war could not be won. Pleasingly, most candidates were able to do this, identifying the gist of the interpretation clearly. Less successful candidates showed an awareness of the gist but did not analyse the interpretation effectively. Successful candidates were able not only to identify the gist but also to pick apart the details of the interpretation and show how these details were valid using their own knowledge, for example candidates might support the point given in Interpretation 2 about President Johnson giving in to public pressure by showing that he decided against running for another term as president partly because of the pressure US failures in the war had caused for him.

Candidates were also expected to use Interpretation 1 to provide an alternative to the view given in Interpretation 2. In this case Interpretation 1 suggests that the defeat of the Tet Offensive showed that America could win the war. Again, successful candidates provided good analysis of the interpretation and provided contextual knowledge in support of the points made.

A significant minority of candidates were less successful in terms of answering this question because they failed to use Interpretation 1. From level 2 upwards this is a requirement of the mark scheme in terms of analysis of the provided material. A small number of eloquent and analytical responses were unable to be awarded highly due to their failure to use Interpretation 1.

A very small number of candidates failed to use either interpretation and proceeded to approach the question as if it were simply asking about the reasons for the failure of the USA in the Vietnam War. Candidates who did not engage with either interpretation, no matter what the quality of their contextual knowledge, failed to get out of Level 2. The target AO for this question is AO4, not AOs 1 and 2.

Most candidates were able to provide a degree of contextual knowledge to help answer the question. The most successful candidates used precise evidence to support both interpretations, including other aspects of content that may not have been specifically mentioned, for example the divided nature of public opinion in the USA. Candidates who used more generalised details were not as successful as candidates who used precise and well selected details to support their evaluation. A few candidates did not display any contextual knowledge, preferring to repeat bits of the Interpretations to support assertions made. Merely asserting agreement with points in the interpretation by saying 'from my own knowledge I know this to be true' is not sufficient evidence of contextual knowledge.

Most candidates were able to at least assert whether they agreed or disagreed with the view given in the interpretation. Many were able to justify their evaluation by explaining how their contextual knowledge supported this. An encouraging number of candidates were also able to provide a line of reasoning that was coherent and logically structured which led to a supported judgement. However, only a handful of candidates were able to successfully address the requirement of level 4 to be able to 'indicate how the differences of view are conveyed', beyond the selection of information. 'Best-fit' marking means that candidates can get into level 4 even if they are not able to

show how differences of view are conveyed. It is worth remembering that this is the only part of the qualification which focuses on AO4 which requires candidates to analyse and evaluate interpretations, explaining how and why they differ. These differences may be conveyed in a variety of different ways, including language and tone, selection of information and points of emphasis, dependent upon the specific interpretations provided. Further information may be found in *Getting Started* p 43, 45, 47-9.

Some candidates considered Interpretation 1 which states how Johnson 'sensed the war was nearing an end' and that 'continued pressure would make victory certain', and compared it to the choice of language in interpretation 2 which highlights how the Johnson '*gave in* to public pressure.'

The existence of the strands which make up AO4 leads to 'best-fit marking'. All strands are considered before a final mark is decided upon. The most successful candidates therefore were able to display evidence of a clear understanding of all 3.

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the effects of the Tet Offensive on American attempts to win the Vietnam War?

Explain your answer, using both interpretations and your knowledge of the historical context.

(16)
Interpretation Two (I2) supports the view that the Tet Offensive was detrimental to American attempts to win the war. It implies that the public was already starting to doubt the war, ^{prior to the event} but then the Tet Offensive caused them to "turn even more strongly against the war." This suggests open opposition, which would certainly be supported by historical evidence. Prior to Tet, the public had believed that they were winning the war, ~~but~~ as they had been told by their government. Now, upon seeing the media images of the capture of the US Embassy, and more fighting in the streets, horror and outrage spread among the public, who felt cheated by their government. The Tet Offensive also reflected badly on President Johnson, and when his term came to an end he did not stand for re-election. The statement at the end of the source that "America was ready to negotiate peace" is also supported by the beginning of the Paris Peace Talks not long after. The mention of the "withdrawal of American troops" is also accurate, as the Nixon Doctrine also followed, with President Nixon encouraging Vietnamisation and reducing the number of troops in Vietnam. This was all

arguably caused by the ~~attack~~ Tet Offensive, and this ~~attack~~ incident acted as a catalyst for anti-war opposition from the US public, such as groups of students, war veterans, and individuals like Martin Luther King. Therefore I ~~agree~~ generally agree with I2

However Interpretation ~~one~~ ^{one} challenges the view that the Tet Offensive had a negative impact on US attempts to win the war. Instead, it states that it was a "total failure for the communists" and was in fact a notable US victory. It states that nearly "58000 [V.C.] had been killed" and indeed by comparison, US deaths and casualties were relatively low at around 2500. This is also supported by the fact that the Vietcong were also depleted of numbers for some years afterwards, ~~supporting~~ indicating that the VC being "wiped out as an effective fighting force" may have been at least partially true.

Military figures such as "General Westmoreland" also hoped that ~~the~~ "continued pressure" would destroy the VC altogether. However despite the initial ~~great~~ ^{great} victory for the USA, the Tet Offensive was far from being "a great tactical victory." Despite their losses, the VC remained unbeaten, and as they were strengthened by popularity among the peasants and by help from North Vietnam, they continued to be a threat to the USA.

It seemed that they had an inexhaustible supply of men and women, all wanting to oust the USA, which was surely damaging to US attempts to win the war. ~~It was~~ I-1's claim of a "great tactical victory" was also undermined by the capture of the US Embassy, which was a huge propaganda victory for the V.C and the Communists. Fighting in their own country, they could raise more numbers and attack again, which is not mentioned in I-1's claim of victory. President Johnson may have "sensed the war was coming to an end" but this seems to have been ~~more~~ due to reasons that ~~impacted~~ ^{impacted} negatively on the US, and not because of the military victory. Hence despite the outward appearance of ~~the~~ success for the US war effort, I agree more with I2 than I1.

Ultimately, despite US attempts to win the war after Tet, they were hindered by opposition in their own country that was a result of the offensive as well as other factors. The anti-war movement, fuelled by the media coverage of Vietnam as well as the immense social and economic cost on the USA, was a factor leading to the withdrawal of troops, which ultimately resulted in failure for the US as Vietnam was re-united under Communism. ~~Tet was~~ The Tet offensive was arguably a turning point for the social attitudes towards the war, as suggested by Interpretation 2, as it was made apparent to

the public that the Vietnam war "was not being won" and chances of success looked slim. Although Interpretation 2's focus on the immediate military victory is supported by the blow against the VC, they were not "wiped out" as the interpretation suggests, and as well as winning a propaganda victory, they had shown that they were indeed a force to be reckoned with. ^{as they had taken the US by surprise.} Despite attempts to present it through the media as positive, the public viewed it as otherwise, and this opposition would also undermine the American effort to win in Vietnam. Hence I agree with Interpretation 2 over Interpretation 1 - that any military victory gained was swiftly overpowered by the change in public opinion against the war, making the government unpopular, with only 33% still supporting Johnson's methods. The conflict in its own country was damaging to American attempts to win the Vietnam war as the ~~draft~~ draft was resisted, and the government was unpopular - and as Tet sparked off this outrage through a visible show of US weaknesses, it ~~was~~ had a negative effect on the attempts to win the war, as shown in Interpretation 2.



This candidate reviews the alternative views presented in the interpretations and comes to a substantiated conclusion. Contextual knowledge is used to support the analysis and there is a clear line of reasoning throughout. All aspects of Level 4 are met and the analysis of the interpretations is very precise – even to the extent that there is some analysis of the language used to convey the points in each interpretation although this could be more explicit. This answer is clearly a high Level 4.



Candidates who compare and contrast precise details from the interpretations and then use their own knowledge to support these points are more likely to gain the higher levels.

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the effects of the Tet Offensive on American attempts to win the Vietnam War?

Explain your answer, using both interpretations and your knowledge of the historical context.

(16)

Interpretation 2 says that "President Johnson gave into public pressure and announced that America was ready to negotiate peace." Agreeing with this I know that the media was very influential in public opinion, which then put pressure on the government to pull out of Vietnam. However disagreeing with this I know that there was a significant number of people in the United States who supported the war, the 'silent majority'. Also the interpretation says that "It was time to begin the withdrawal of Americans from Vietnam." Agreeing with this I know that after the Tet offensive there was large scale removal of US forces from Vietnam. This influenced the later Nixon Doctrine, and the process of Vietnamese Vietnamisation. Overall, ~~this interpretation~~ I agree with this interpretation to quite a large extent. Interpretation 1 says that "The Tet offensive had been a total failure for

communists". Agreeing with this I know that ~~it~~ ~~the~~ the Tet Offensive dramatically decreased the communist forces' reputation as powerful. It showed that ~~the~~ large scale assault on US defenses would end up in ~~huge~~ ~~loss~~ both huge human and economic costs. Overall, I ^{agree with} ~~think~~ ~~that~~ Interpretation 1 to a small extent because it doesn't take into account the losses of the Americans.

In conclusion, I agree with Interpretation 2 more because it considers the profound effect of public opinion on American attempts to win.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The candidate does provide an explained evaluation with some good analysis of interpretations shown which suggests an answer in Level 3. The final judgement isn't fully justified and needs to be developed further, perhaps by taking more time on the conclusion. However, this would still reach the bottom of Level 3.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance in this exam, candidates are offered the following advice:

- When asked to make inferences in question 1 make sure that the inferences are relevant to the specified enquiry
- In question 3(a) focus on linking the provenance to the content of the sources
- When analysing the reasons for the different views in the interpretations focus on their content – candidates should not be concerned with the book title, the author or the type of publication
- In question 3(d) candidates must review the alternative views in both interpretations as well as using specific knowledge to support the points made
- All the sub-questions in question 3 should be seen as part of the same enquiry with each question guiding candidates towards the final analysis in 3(d)

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

