



Examiners' Report

June 2019

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 2019

Publications Code 1HI0_33_1906_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

Introduction

It was noted in this report last year that candidates were well prepared for this option and the examiners were pleased to see that this was again the case this year with candidates appearing to be comfortable in dealing with a range of political, economic and social aspects at play in the civil rights movement as well as the military challenges of the Vietnam War. Candidates were well prepared for the question styles and there was clear understanding of the demands of all questions ranging from an improved approach to inference questions as well as an increasing number of candidates able to access the higher levels on the interpretations questions.

The Modern World Depth Studies are designed to encourage 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 achievements of the Five-Year Plans. 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, when this was supported by relevant knowledge. 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. 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 usefulness of the content, taking account of the provenance of the sources and applying contextual knowledge in making judgements about the utility of the sources as evidence for the specific enquiry in the question. These strands are linked and should be dealt with together, rather than in isolation. There is no need to compare the two sources and, indeed, only a handful of students did attempt to do this.

Questions 3(b) and 3(c) examine the views expressed in the two provided interpretations. It should be recognised that the interpretations offer alternative views but do not necessarily conflict with each other. 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 the interpretations differed, could also support their

answers with direct references to, or examples taken from the interpretations. 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 3c 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 knowledge of 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 indicate 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, this question was accessible to all candidates and even those who did not score highly understood the need to offer evaluative responses leading to an overall conclusion. Only a few candidates were unable to identify the view being offered by the interpretations, so the majority were able to construct a response in relation to these views. 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 many candidates had of this depth study.

Question 1

In question 1 candidates are invited to make a valid inference about the opposition to the desegregation of Little Rock High School. 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, and most used the content of the source to provide support for the inference. Such candidates tended to make inferences about the degree of opposition to desegregation which could be referenced by the crowd of 300, or inferences about the potential violence of the opposition, which could be supported by the protection given by soldiers. A small minority of candidates made an inference which was not to do with the opposition to the desegregation of Little Rock High School, but was more to do with the events or people in the source. A sizeable minority of candidates did paraphrase sections of the source which were then presented as an inference. Such an approach is not rewardable. A small number of candidates also provided a genuine inference such as ‘lots of people opposed the desegregation of Little Rock,’ but then supported this with an inappropriate extract from the source, such as ‘6 white students walked out of school.’ Such responses were awarded for the valid inference but not for the support.

Most candidates made good use of the space in the table provided for the answers however, some candidates used additional space or took extra paper. This was generally used to explain **why** their supporting information helped to support the inference, which is not required and did not gain any extra marks but possibly wasted time.

- 1 Give **two** things you can infer from Source A about opposition to the desegregation of Little Rock High School.

Complete the table below to explain your answer.

(i) What I can infer:

I can infer that a lot of people didn't want the black students entering the school.

Details in the source that tell me this:

"300 people had gathered to protest"

(ii) What I can infer:

I can infer that people went to extreme lengths to keep the blacks out.

Details in the source that tell me this:

"There was a bomb in the school"



This candidate has made two inferences about the opposition to desegregation of the Little Rock High School supported by direct quotes 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.

- 1 Give **two** things you can infer from Source A about opposition to the desegregation of Little Rock High School.

Complete the table below to explain your answer.

(i) What I can infer:

That the ~~three~~^{nine} black students were hated by many.

Details in the source that tell me this:

'~~The~~ At 9:28 am, six students walked out of school to protest against the presence of the black students.'

(ii) What I can infer:

I can infer that the school thought there was a bomb.

Details in the source that tell me this:

'all students had to evacuate the building because it was believed there was a bomb in the school.'



The candidate has provided one valid inference but the detail provided does not support the inference. The second inference is a paraphrase of the source so neither the inference nor the support can be rewarded. This candidate achieved 1 mark.



Candidates should think carefully about whether the details they provide from the source really do support the inference.

Question 2

Many candidates had good knowledge of the Vietnam War as a whole, but were less sure about the specifics of Nixon's actions and the reasons for the changes he made. Most candidates were able to describe the stimulus points plus some other aspects of content such as the bombing of Cambodia and Laos, but many were unable to say why these changes happened, which was the focus of the question. A significant number of candidates were focused on **how** the involvement of the US changed under Nixon, rather than **why** it changed. Often these responses included good knowledge, but lacked the analytical focus which is also necessary for this question.

Knowledge was generally strong on the way in which the war in Vietnam was fought and many candidates used this to try to explain why the war was changed under Nixon. Many candidates also knew about Vietnamisation and the bombing of North Vietnam, but struggled to give a clear explanation of why these changes happened.

A number of candidates did achieve the higher levels by showing an impressive awareness of the pressure of the opposition to the war at home, or the promises made by Nixon in his election campaign to achieve 'peace with honor.' Higher level candidates were clear about the way in which these factors led to changes in US involvement and were able to use the stimulus points as examples to support their reasoning.

Weaker candidates were often able to describe the way the war was fought and the opposition it provoked, but frequently these answers included material outside of the scope of the question such as Operation Rolling Thunder, or generalised points about the impact of Agent Orange and napalm. A significant number of candidates confused the actions of Johnson with those of Nixon.

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 in this question and it is not rewarded in the mark scheme at any level. In cases where candidates did prioritise factors, examiners were 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 changes made by Nixon 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 precise question and these were often rewarded with full marks.

Overall, it was clear that candidates were very familiar with this style of question, although the reliance on the stimulus points to structure many of the answers suggested that a significant number of candidates were not certain about the reasons why US involvement in the Vietnam War changed under Nixon.

The candidate has covered three areas of content (Vietnamisation, the bombing of Laos and Cambodia and the opposition to the war) and has, therefore, satisfied the requirements for AO1 at Level 4 to go beyond the stimulus points and to show wide-ranging knowledge. In terms of AO2, detail is used to support the analysis, which is evident in every paragraph, rather than being provided simply as information.

2 Explain why US involvement in the Vietnam War changed under President Nixon.

(12)

You may use the following in your answer:

- Vietnamisation
- bombing of North Vietnam

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

1. decreased → Vietnamisation
2. secretly increased → Cambodia (public attitudes)
3. Nixon doctrine.

One reason US involvement in the Vietnam War changed was because the aims of the war changed. This is clearly seen in Nixon's idea of Vietnamisation, which tried to decrease involvement of the US, by removing troops but also to switch over more involvement to the South Vietnamese and the ARVN. For example, in 1968 there was 585,000 soldiers in Vietnam, however this decreased to 303,000 in 1970. This shows the role of the President as key in the involvement, as because of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, Nixon was allowed to take all necessary steps in the Vietnam war. Unlike other Presidents, Nixon focused on an "honorable" end to the war and was a key policy in his election campaign. This meant that for Nixon one of the main aims was ending the war, and changing the original tactics and army. Therefore, he reduced the US involvement in the Vietnam War.

Another reason why the Vietnam War and US involvement changed was because of actions taken by Congress. In 1970, Nixon began to secretly bomb Cambodia because of fears of it turning communist, and also to maintain US power and control there (because of US general gaining control). However, because of the huge outrage expanding the war out of Vietnam would cause Nixon made sure that all bombing and the funding for the bombing was secret. When Congress eventually found out about this however they were outraged and in fact repealed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, as well as setting a final date for all soldiers in Cambodia to be removed. This act of Congress, however

meant that Congress would now have to be regularly updated and told about the war, as well as needing their permission for any more funding for the war. This meant that the US involvement significantly decreased in the Vietnam war as ~~the~~ ^{Nixon} ~~was~~ ^{was} ~~more~~ ^{was} more restricted with his actions, as Congress was able to decline more requests for money.

A further reason for the US involvement changing was ~~it~~ because of public opinions and increasing opposition for the war. For example in 1968, the US death toll was as high as c. 16,000 men, and with this grew more opposition and protests. This was because family members and friends were being increasingly sent off to fight in the war, and yet, more and more people were dying. An example of a protest is the Kent State shootings, on the 4th May 1970, in reaction to bombing in Cambodia. In this 4 unarmed students were shot dead. Protests such as these gained massive media attention, and therefore sparked more protests and opposition. Furthermore, the war was described as a "living room war", being one of the first wars to be widely watched on T.V. This not only increased opposition at home in the US, but also created a negative image of the US to other nations. This forced Nixon and Congress to reduce US involvement in the war, as their actions massively reflected public attitudes. If Congress members wanted to stay in power they had to take action to this opposition and reduce the US involvement in the war. Therefore the public attitudes and opinions also influenced the change of involvement in the US war, because their ~~opion~~ ~~opinion~~ ~~reflected~~ ~~&~~ ~~effected~~ Presidents, like Nixon, and Congress.



The candidate has covered three areas of content (Vietnamisation, the bombing of Laos and Cambodia and the opposition to the war) and has, therefore, satisfied the requirements for AO1 at Level 4 to go beyond the stimulus points and to show wide-ranging knowledge. In terms of AO2, detail is used to support the analysis, which is evident in every paragraph, rather than being provided simply as information.



This candidate has not provided a conclusion, instead, Level 4 has been reached by the focus on the question which is evident in every paragraph.

2 Explain why US involvement in the Vietnam War changed under President Nixon.

(12)

You may use the following in your answer:

- Vietnamisation ✓
- bombing of North Vietnam
- bombing of Laos and Cambodia

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

One reason why US involvement in the Vietnam War changed under President Nixon was due to Vietnamisation. This was the policy when Nixon said he ~~was~~ planned to train the South Vietnamese fighters to be able to fight without the involvement of the US troops. This was a decision that occurred because of the growing US opposition to the war due to the US nature of fighting. ~~In 1969~~ Nixon removed ~~60,000~~ ~~troops~~ an initial 60,000 troops however he struggled to remove more. Vietnamisation was more popular with the US public so was a change that was endorsed.

Another reason why US involvement in the Vietnam War changed was due to the bombing of Cambodia (1970) and Laos (1971). The Ho Chi Minh trail ~~to~~ went through these countries where 40,000 Vietnamese supplied supplies through. To break this network was essential if the US wanted victory. In 1970 the US forces ~~are~~ deployed

3 million bombs on Cambodia which made 2 million homeless. During the bombing of Laos half of the ARVN were killed because China and the USSR had ~~to~~ send supplies to the Vietcong to attack when they arrived. This changed the US involvement because they were attacking other countries to win.

One more reason why the US involvement in the Vietnam War changed under President Nixon was due to the bombing of North Vietnam. Nixon knew that Congress would not allow more troops to be sent so he intensified the bombing. ~~The~~ B52s were used on North Vietnam that hadn't been used since 1969. This was a reason why involvement changed as they knew that they wouldn't be allowed any more troops.



The answer uses the stimulus points as reasons rather than as aspects of content to support reasoning and thus focuses on how the US involvement in Vietnam changed under Nixon rather than why. However, there is some analysis and an attempt to say why the changes happened despite some lack of coherence in places. The supporting evidence is accurate and relevant so this answer achieves a Level 3 mark.



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 question where candidates' performance was most unbalanced and few managed to display the analysis required to reach L3. Although many answers consisted of thoughtful comments about the content of the sources, there are three strands to the mark scheme that all need to be addressed. 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 achievements of the civil rights movement in the years 1960-65. The best responses were those that were able to address 'how useful' by establishing the strengths sources have as evidence before determining how far the limitations affect their usefulness. It is important for candidates to remember that judging utility may involve some comments about reliability but answers which focus solely on this criterion do not fully consider the value of the sources as evidence

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 is related to the content of the source. For example, the fact that the activist who is being interviewed about his experiences in Source C had actually experienced the dramatic events he is describing perhaps makes it more useful to an understanding of the impact of the actions of the police on the President. It might be true, as many candidates pointed out, that because this was written 40 years after the demonstrations in Selma 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 to do so, then proceeded to describe the source as useless because of the time gap between the events and the interview. Also, it was not enough to say that, as an activist in the civil rights movement, Lewis was likely to exaggerate without examining elements of the source which might show this to be true.

It was disappointing to see the number of generic responses when the provenance of the sources was commented on. This part of the response is only likely to gain marks at Level 1 for this element of the mark scheme. 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. There were some generalised comments made about Source B, stating that it was not useful as it could have been posed, or it wasn't useful as it was only a snapshot. Such comments were often made in isolation from the analysis of the content and added nothing to the answer. Many candidates dismissed Source B as not being trustworthy because it appeared in a newspaper and newspapers are 'biased'. 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 on the front page showed the significance of the signing of the Civil Rights Act.

Many answers made good use of contextual knowledge but some well-prepared candidates spent too much time talking about the events of the civil rights movement 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. 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 some 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 for this aspect of the mark scheme. Candidates should recognise that the sources were not produced in order to be used by historians and they cannot cover every detail that might be useful in an investigation. The primary focus for all candidates should be to judge the utility of what is there rather than what isn't there. A pleasing majority of candidates did test the content of the source against their own knowledge to assess how useful it could be. For example they applied their knowledge about the events leading up to the passing of the Voting Rights Act to support the evidence given in Source C about the events in Selma.

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, how representative the source is etc. 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.

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. Very few candidates tried to do this. Candidates who use this approach should ensure that they come to a judgement about the utility of each source within the response. The focus of the question is usefulness of the individual sources.

3 (a) Study Sources B and C.

How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into the achievements of the civil rights movement in the years 1960-65?

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

(8)

Source B shows the exchange between ^{President} Johnson and Martin Luther King signing the civil rights act of 1964, this makes it useful for an enquiry ~~of~~ into the ~~the~~ achievements of the Civil Rights Movement (CRM) from 1960-65 because it shows the legal legislation that came into force ~~to~~ ^{another example is the voting rights act of 1965} due to the movement and its progress, while also showing the ~~effect~~ significance of CRM organisations and leaders in the movement due to the fact Martin Luther King has signed an act to ^{the source is also useful} improve the lives of black Americans in the U.S.A. As the source is from a national newspaper, we can infer that the CRM had, at this point raised a ~~too~~ large amount of awareness into the need for black rights in America, ^{such as the expansion of groups like the NAACP and CORE, and religion-groups such as the SCLC,} which showcases how an achievement of the movement was that it made civil rights an issue prominent in governmental politics in the years 1960-65. However the source does not ^{really} give ^{any} ~~a~~ ~~comprehensive~~ information of the achievements of the CRM within the general population, therefore restricting its usefulness in that area of the movement's achievements, but this by no means makes it

written //

As an ~~account~~ interview with somebody actually part of the CRM, source C would be useful for an enquiry into the achievements of the civil rights movement because it gives details on the movement from an ordinary person's ~~american's~~ point of view. The source is also useful for men on enquiry because it details the role non-violent direct action played in the CRM, and how it was ~~effective~~ effective at achieving better civil rights for black americans.

By detailing how non-violent protests helped lead to government reforms, source C becomes useful because it highlights how the actions of normal people defending their rights (which were often met with violence), often pushed the federal government into creating legislation to support black Americans, and therefore it is useful to find out about the movement's ~~success~~ ~~because~~ achievements because we can see evidence of the legal reform the CRM pushed the government to bring in new laws (however some laws such as the voting rights act often didn't go far enough in the deep south because racist violent gangs prevented black people registering and voting).

Also, ~~it cannot~~ as source C is recorded almost 50 years after the CRM, ^{the author may not recall} ~~it may have been~~ events as accurately, partially limiting its usefulness. However I do know that often peaceful protests were met with violence, such as Project C in Alabama where 'Bull Connor' responded with dogs and firehoses, causing national outcry and support for the CRM.



This makes many developed points about how the provenance might have an impact on the utility of the content of the source. For example, the fact that Source B appeared on the front page of a national newspaper showcases the huge achievement of the civil rights movement. The candidate also tests the content of the sources against contextual knowledge to make a judgement about usefulness.



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.

3 (a) Study Sources B and C.

How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into the achievements of the civil rights movement in the years 1960–65?

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

(8)

Source B is useful as it shows that the president supported the civil rights movement. The nature of source B is a picture. The origin of the source is that it was posted in a lot of newspaper front pages in July 1964. The purpose of the photograph was to show to the reader that the president supported Martin Luther King Jr and the civil rights movement. However, due to the fact that it is a picture, it could have been staged to make it look like the president agreed with the civil rights movement.

Source C is useful as we get an eye witness testimony from someone

was at the selma demonstrations march in 1965. It is useful as we are able to see how just after one week of the last protest the voting rights act was introduced. The nature of the source is a description of the demonstrations on the radio from someone who was there. The origin of the source is that the radio interview was in 2009 and the purpose of the interview was to show listeners the effect of demonstrations and marches.



At Level 2 candidates will make developed comments related to the content of the sources and/or their provenance. In this case the candidate states the provenance of each source without fully explaining how this affects its usefulness. Contextual knowledge is not used at all in evaluating the sources. This answer achieves a level 2 mark.



Generalised statements about provenance, eg it is a picture and could have been staged, without reference to contextual knowledge to check this assertion have little value.

Question 3 (b)

In this question candidates are expected to identify the main difference between the views presented in Interpretations 1 and 2. In this case the interpretations provided different views about the achievements of the civil rights movement in the years 1960-65. In order to access Level 2 marks candidates are expected to provide some support from the given interpretations which many did in the form of well-chosen, short quotations. It should be noted that the interpretations do not necessarily offer contrasting views, merely different views.

It is important for candidates to remember that the focus of this question is to identify the differences between the views rather than identifying differences of surface detail as the latter can only be awarded marks in Level 1. Responses which asserted differences without support, for example stating that Interpretation 1 stated that the Civil Rights Act was the most important law passed whereas Interpretation 2 stated that the Voting Rights Act was more important, stayed in Level 1. To access Level 2, the explanation needed to show that different views of each act as an achievement of the Civil Rights movement were being offered rather than simply recognising that the interpretations named different acts.

Level 2 was achieved when the candidates indicated a clear difference of view and supported it with detail from the extracts. Most candidates were able to score full marks.

Candidates' success in question 3d may be influenced by how well they identify the views given in the interpretations. Therefore, those who did identify the differences of view about the achievements of the civil rights movement here were able to build on this more successfully when it came to answering 3d. A small number of 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 and failed to gain additional marks.

(b) **Study Interpretations 1 and 2. They give different views about the achievements of the civil rights movement in the years 1960–65.**

What is the main difference between these views?

Explain your answer, using details from both interpretations.

(4)

The main difference between these views is that they believe in two different important ~~the~~ Acts being passed as the most ~~important~~ important. ^{Interpretation} Interpretation 1 believes that "The Civil Rights Act 1964 was the most important law passed by Congress in the 20th century" whilst Interpretation 2 believes that "The Voting Rights Act was the greatest achievement of the Civil Rights Movement"; both believe that there is a different ~~base~~ great achievement of the Civil Rights Movement.



This answer clearly states the main difference of view between the interpretations and supports this with extracts from the interpretations and as a result gets full marks.



It is not necessary to write a lengthy answer to achieve full marks.

(b) **Study Interpretations 1 and 2. They give different views about the achievements of the civil rights movement in the years 1960–65.**

What is the main difference between these views?

Explain your answer, using details from both interpretations.

(4)

The main difference between interpretation 1 & 2 is that in interpretation 1 it is about the Civil Rights Act of 1964 while the other is about the voting rights Act.

Also the two interpretations were published in different dates and it is also published by different people with different views about segregation.



This candidate identifies that the interpretations are about different acts but does not explain the difference of view. There is no support given so this answer achieves 1 mark.



Candidates do not need to consider the provenance of the interpretations.

Question 3 (c)

There was a much stronger understanding of the demands of this question this year and many candidates were able to provide convincing explanations why the interpretations may differ. The majority of candidates gaining marks at Level 2 explained that the historians might have relied on different types of sources in forming their opinions and used Sources B and C to support this explanation. Other candidates were able to access Level 2 by clearly explaining how, for example, the authors had chosen to show the achievements of the civil rights movement from different perspectives. In order to gain marks at Level 2 it is also essential that the explanation is substantiated effectively and this might be in information taken from either the sources or the interpretations themselves depending on the approach taken.

In trying to give an explanation for a reason for difference between interpretations some candidates are still attempting to use the provenance of the interpretations to provide this explanation and this is unlikely to provide a valid basis for a response to this question. The full reasons for this are explained in the *Getting Started Guide* on pp 43-44. There is also some additional guidance in the 2019 Examiners' Report on p.25. As stated in *Getting Started*: 'Students should distinguish between their comments on contemporary sources and on these texts. Responses based on matters such as the origin or time of production of these secondary works are unlikely to be valid for this question.' However, it is very pleasing to note that many fewer candidates than last year tried to provide explanations for difference on the basis of such factors as the titles of the books. There were still a small number of candidates who 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 achievements of the civil rights movement in the years 1960–65.

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

Interpretation 1 focuses on the effects of the act to ^{civil rights (4)} everyday life for black Americans, it talks about how it ended 'banned discrimination' ^{in the workplace} and therefore places emphasis on the effects of the act in terms of the segregation between black and white it helped close.

Interpretation 2 instead focuses on the effects the Voting rights act 1965 on the political rights of black Americans, rather than desegregation. The interpretation ~~is~~ gives weight to the fact that the act legally protected black Americans' right to vote and how this was an improvement to the voting rights of blacks in the south.



This candidate has gained full marks by explaining how the writers have focused on different aspects, e.g. political and social and the answer is substantiated by references to the interpretations.

(c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the achievements of the civil rights movement in the years 1960–65.

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

(4)

one reason why interpretation 1 and 2 give different views is because they were published in different years. ~~source B and C show that the civil rights act was~~ interpretation 1 was published in 2014. interpretation 2 was published in 2001. interpretation 2 could be more accurate as it was closer to the event.



This candidate has tried to evaluate the interpretations as if they were sources and has not fully understood the nature of the question. No marks were awarded.

Question 3 (d)

Examiners were very pleased to read many responses to this question which consisted of clear attempts to evaluate the different views about the achievements of the civil rights movement presented in the two interpretations and that these answers were well focused on the AO4 target for this question, namely the analysis and evaluation of interpretations. . These views are not a controversy. This is the only time candidates will be tested on AO4: Analysis and evaluation of interpretations. The overall quality of a response to this question is determined by reference to the three strands presented in the mark scheme:

- the quality of the judgement based on reasoning
- the analysis of the provided material
- the deployment of knowledge of the historical context to support the application of criteria.

The second strand of A04 requires 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 Voting Rights Act was the most important achievement of the civil rights movement. 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 the 'Act banning literacy tests' by discussing the significance of this for black Americans.

Although some candidates produced responses which were solely based on the consideration of one interpretation, which will limit the candidate's performance particularly on the second strand (analysis of the provided material), most candidates were able to establish some form of discussion based on the different views which they had established in 3(b).

Many candidates produced responses which considered the view presented in Interpretation 2 and then contrasted it with the view given in Interpretation 1 and this structure produced some good responses. Some candidates looked to compare the different views more directly and used both interpretations throughout the response and this was often used to very good effect. At Level 4 candidates are expected to demonstrate precise analysis of the interpretations indicating how the differences of view are conveyed. Candidates who successfully met this element of the mark scheme could do so in a range of different ways but those candidates who examined the different points of emphasis in the two interpretations were often able to make a very convincing case; others were able to examine how the selection of information in the two interpretations influenced the views presented. There is additional guidance provided in *Getting Started* pp43, 45 and 47-9.

The selection of contextual knowledge to support the evaluation was often a strong aspect of candidate responses with most candidates showing a good awareness of how to deploy their knowledge as well as being in possession of an appropriate level of detail. It was pleasing to note that there were very few responses which focused primarily on providing contextual knowledge for its own sake and that candidates showed an awareness of how to use their knowledge to help them decide on the validity of views selected from the interpretations. A small number of candidates were unable to apply their own knowledge effectively. 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.

In addition, most candidates were able to provide full and structured responses with very few

appearing to be rushed or running out of time.

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.

Spelling, punctuation, grammar and use of specialist terminology will be assessed in part (d).

Yes - allowed for the biggest obstacle to go.

No - other achievements of CRA were notable than this.

No - no vote taken as still cracked and

No - South democratic

lots of SP wasn't campaign for the black people, so to keep the rights on that side.

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the achievements of the civil rights movement in the years 1960-65?

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

overlook

line to 12.

(16)

Part of me is led to partially agree with interpretation one; The Voting Rights Act could be recognised as the "greatest achievement", due to its banning of literacy tests. These were arguably the biggest obstacle a black, potential voter could face - there was a heavy bias towards the tests given to black people, which were littered with questions that were either too ambiguous to gauge, or very specific and ~~therefore~~ therefore hard to have knowledge to answer. These tests, undoubtedly, led to a reduction in registered voters, and even those who did well on tests were scored harshly. Therefore, the ~~removal~~ ^{banning} of these literacy tests was a massive achievement, allowing for the potential of the democracy, a notorius achievement of the Civil Rights movement from not only 1960-65, but overall.

However, it is difficult to fully side with this interpretation, as it can be argued to be very reductionist. The achievements of the Civil Rights movement from 1960-65 was not limited to Voting Rights. No, it excelled this - as the interpretation one notes, the Civil Rights Act of 1964 allowed for banned discrimination in the workplace,

before this black people had faced threat of unemployment for using their ~~rights~~ rights to vote / send their children to desegregated schools (out of the 25 ~~ad~~ accepted to leave Rock high school, only 9 registered and attended due to threats like these - this act of 1964 allowed for opportunities like this to not go amiss). It allowed for the government to withdraw funding from state-funded projects that advocated inequality, it allowed for segregation to be banned in public spaces, and lots more. This Act was revolutionary - it eradicated Jim Crow Laws that had been around since the 1896 abolition of slavery, and that had been the main defect of black people trying to live a regular, integrated life. Contrary to Interpretation 2's view of the Voting Rights Act being the 'greatest achievement in the movement, let alone 1960-65, I would argue that this is a reductionist and belittling approach to how civil rights activists prompted eradication of segregation, a massive shift in attitudes, and law.

Furthermore, I disagree with the same specific aspects of ~~the~~ Interpretation Two - it claims "The Voting Rights Act gave the vote back to black Americans" - to this I would argue that perhaps legally, black Americans gained control with regards to ability to vote, however literally and physically, they did not.

back progression for some time however, I am more inclined to side with Interpretation One overall, disagreeing with Interpretation Two's view that the main achievement was solely the eradication and ban on voting literacy tests.

It would be much more accurate to say that the real achievement of this era laid with the Civil Rights Act of 1964, an act that brought about historic change, not the banning of one limiting factor.



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. Level 4 has been met for all 3 strands and there is clearly an attempt to show how the differences of view have been conveyed. This answer achieved full marks.



Candidates who examine 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 achievements of the civil rights movement in the years 1960-65?

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

(16)

Interpretation 2 suggests that the Voting Rights Act was ~~was~~ an important achievement because it stopped literacy tests. It states that "The Act banned literacy tests which had been used to keep the number of registered voters low." This is agreeable because I know that in Mississippi ~~at~~ at the beginning of the 1960's only 8% of the black population ~~couldn't~~ could vote due to the difficulty of passing the literacy tests, due to poor education and discrimination. The interpretation 2 also suggests the Act played a large role in enabling black people voters to vote. This is because it states "The Voting Rights Act gave the vote back to black Southerners. This is agreeable because after the voting rights act I know that over 50% of applications to vote had to be accepted by Southern States to ~~enable~~ ~~the~~ avoid federal control. Overall I largely agree with interpretation 2

into the achievements of the Civil Rights movement between 1960-65. This is because it rightly highlights the dramatic change once the Voting Rights Act 1965 was introduced.

Interpretation 1 suggests that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was the ^{significant} most important achievement of the 20th Century. It states "The Civil Rights Act of 1964 was the most important Law passed" However, I partially disagree with this statement. This is because I know that the Civil Rights Act of 1964 didn't fully improve the lives of black Americans. This was because ~~was~~ there were still restrictions on voting which prevented black Americans from ~~not~~ being able to register. For example, only 2.5% of 15, Selma's 15,000 ^{black} population ~~could~~ were registered to vote. In addition, the interpretation suggests the Civil Rights Act achievement was pushed by Kennedy. It states "The Act had been proposed by Kennedy." This is agreeable because I know that the Civil Rights Act

had passed the ~~for~~ it's first stages
~~by 1963 through Kennedy~~ through
president Kennedy, before his death
in November 1963. Overall, I partially
agree with the statement. This is
because it correctly identifies Kennedy's
role in the Civil Rights Movement
achievements. However, it fails to
identify flaws in the Civil Rights Act.

Overall, I largely agree with
interpretation 2. This is because it
correctly highlights the importance
of the Voting Rights Act's achievements
for black Americans.



The candidate achieves a level 3 mark for this answer. They have missed the point that interpretation 2 states the Voting Rights Act was the most important achievement and therefore cannot fully engage with the interpretations as a debate. However, there is a judgement given, there is good analysis of each interpretation and some relevant contextual knowledge is used to support each interpretation.



Successful candidates do not just repeat the content of the 2 interpretations. They evaluate the points made in interpretation 2 using their contextual knowledge and the content of Interpretation 1.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance in this paper, candidates should:

- make sure that the inferences are based on the content of the source when asked to make inferences in question 1
- focus on using the provenance to evaluate the usefulness of the content of the sources in question 3
- focus on their content when analysing the reasons for the different views in the interpretations – candidates should not be concerned with the book title, the author or the type of publication
- review the alternative views in both interpretations in question 3(d) as well as using specific knowledge to support the points made
- in question 3 all the sub-questions 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>

