Mark Scheme (Results)

November 2020

Pearson Edexcel GCSE
In History (1HI0)
Paper 33: Modern depth study (1HI0)

Option 33: The USA, 1954–75: conflict at home and abroad

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com 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.

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

Autumn 2020
Publications Code 1HI0_33_2011_MS
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2020

General Marking Guidance

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

Question	
1	Give two things you can infer from Source A about the March on Washington (1963). Target: Source analysis (making inferences). AO3: 4 marks.
Marking instructions	
Award 1 mark for each valid inference up to a maximum of two inferences. The second mark for each example should be awarded for supporting detail selected from the source. e.g. • *The march was multi-racial (1). There are both black and white people in the crowd (1).* • *The crowd appears to be united (1). Some of the marchers are holding hands (1).* • *The March on Washington involved people from different backgrounds (1). Some people are wearing suits while others are wearing less formal clothes (1).* Accept other appropriate alternatives.	

Question		
2		Explain why there was opposition to the civil rights movement in the years 1954–60. You may use the following in your answer: • Ku Klux Klan • Dixiecrats You must also use information of your own. Target: Analysis of second order concepts: causation [AO2]; Knowledge and understanding of features and characteristics [AO1]. AO2: 6 marks. AO1: 6 marks.
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	• A simple or generalised answer is given, lacking development and organisation. [AO2] • Limited knowledge and understanding of the topic is shown. [AO1]
2	4–6	• An explanation is given, showing limited analysis and with implicit or unsustained links to the conceptual focus of the question. It shows some development and organisation of material, but a line of reasoning is not sustained. [AO2] • Accurate and relevant information is included, showing some knowledge and understanding of the period. [AO1] *Maximum 5 marks for Level 2 answers that do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.*
3	7–9	• An explanation is given, showing some analysis, which is mainly directed at the conceptual focus of the question. It shows a line of reasoning that is generally sustained, although some passages may lack coherence and organisation. [AO2] • Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of the required features or characteristics of the period studied. [AO1] *Maximum 8 marks for Level 3 answers that do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.*
4	10–12	• An analytical explanation is given which is directed consistently at the conceptual focus of the question, showing a line of reasoning that is coherent, sustained and logically structured. [AO2] • Accurate and relevant information is precisely selected to address the question directly, showing wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of the required features or characteristics of the period studied. [AO1] *No access to Level 4 for answers which do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.*

Marking instructions

Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance (page 3).

Performance in AO1 and AO2 is interdependent. An answer displaying no qualities of AO2 cannot be awarded more than the top of Level 1, no matter how strong performance is in AO1; markers should note that the expectation for AO1 is that candidates demonstrate both knowledge *and* understanding.

The middle mark in each level may be achieved by stronger performance in either AO1 or AO2.

Indicative content guidance

Answers must be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. While specific references are made in the indicative content below, this does not imply that these must be included; other relevant material must also be credited.

Relevant points may include:

- The Ku Klux Klan were committed to violent resistance of the civil rights movement because of their beliefs in white supremacy and segregation. They frequently attacked and murdered civil rights campaigners.
- The civil rights movement faced strong political opposition in Congress because the 'Dixiecrats', who wanted to defend segregation in the South, opposed civil rights legislation.
- Whites in the South were strongly opposed to anyone challenging the status quo, making the South a dangerous place for anyone who did not accept its customs. Emmett Till was murdered in 1955 when he 'wolf-whistled' a white woman in a store.
- Opposition to the civil rights movement increased as a reaction against the desegregation of schools. White Citizens Councils were created to stop desegregation and oppose the civil rights movement.
- Many state authorities and white communities resented federal government interference in local matters.

Question		
3 (a)		How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into the reasons for the failure of the USA in Vietnam? Explain your answer, using Sources B and C and your knowledge of the historical context. Target: Analysis and evaluation of source utility. AO3: 8 marks.
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–2	• A simple judgement on utility is given, and supported by undeveloped comment on the content of the sources and/or their provenance[1]. Simple comprehension of the source material is shown by the extraction or paraphrase of some content. Limited contextual knowledge is deployed with links to the sources.
2	3–5	• Judgements on source utility for the specified enquiry are given, using valid criteria. Judgements are supported by developed comment related to the content of the sources and/or their provenance[1]. Comprehension and some analysis of the sources is shown by the selection and use of material to support comments on their utility. Contextual knowledge is used directly to support comments on the usefulness of the content of the sources and/or their provenance.
3	6–8	• Judgements on source utility for the specified enquiry are given, applying valid criteria with developed reasoning which takes into account how the provenance[1] affects the usefulness of the source content. The sources are analysed to support reasoning about their utility. Contextual knowledge is used in the process of interpreting the sources and applying criteria for judgements on their utility.

Notes
1. Provenance = nature, origin, purpose.

Marking instructions

Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance (page 3).

No credit may be given for contextual knowledge unless it is linked to evaluation of the sources.

No credit may be given for generic comments on provenance which are not used to evaluate source content.

Indicative content guidance

Answers must be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. While specific references are made in the indicative content below, this does not imply that these must be included; other relevant material must also be credited. The grouping of points below does not imply that this is how candidates are expected to structure their answers.

Source B

The usefulness could be identified in terms of the following points which could be drawn from the source:

- The source indicates that the US government knew that the bombing of North Vietnam and other military targets was not helping to win the war.
- The source claims that the American attempt to break the determination of North Vietnam was failing.
- The source states that the American bombing could not prevent military supplies being transported to South Vietnam to be used by communist forces.

The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe usefulness to material drawn from it:

- These confidential documents were not published at the time so they are likely to be an honest appraisal of the American strategy in Vietnam rather than the more positive comments made available to the public.
- The purpose of the documents was to provide realistic information of the true situation in Vietnam in 1966 to the US government.

Knowledge of the historical context should be deployed to support inferences and/or to assess the usefulness of information. Relevant points may include:

- Operation Rolling Thunder involved the sustained bombing of targets in North Vietnam and along the Ho Chi Minh Trail from 1965 until 1968, costing over $900 million and the loss of over 900 US aircraft.
- Attempts to disrupt the Ho Chi Minh Trail failed because the VC and North Vietnamese were able to repair the trail or find alternative routes. Provision of supplies from China and Russia also meant that the bombing of industrial areas had a limited effect.

Source C

The usefulness could be identified in terms of the following points which could be drawn from the source:

- The source suggests that the effectiveness of American soldiers was weakened by poor discipline and drug use.
- The source indicates that American soldiers were so undisciplined that they killed their own officers if they did not like them.
- The source suggests that infighting and weak morale among American soldiers caused them to lose commitment.

The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe usefulness to material drawn from it:

- The soldier is describing his first-hand experiences of the loss of morale in the latter part of the war.
- The soldier was able to speak honestly about his experiences because he was no longer in the army and the war was over.

Knowledge of the historical context should be deployed to support inferences and/or to assess the usefulness of information. Relevant points may include:

- Cases of the 'fragging' of officers, who risked the lives of their men, peaked towards the end of the Vietnam War.
- Most American soldiers were in Vietnam for a 12-month 'tour of duty.' Many 'counted the days' until they were able to go home.

Question		
3 (b)		Study Interpretations 1 and 2. They give different views about the reasons for the failure of the USA in Vietnam. What is the main difference between these views? Explain your answer, using details from both interpretations. Target: Analysis of interpretations (how they differ). AO4: 4 marks.
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–2	• Limited analysis of the interpretations is shown by the extraction or paraphrase of some content, but differences of surface detail only are given, or a difference of view is asserted without direct support.
2	3–4	• The interpretations are analysed and a key difference of view is identified and supported from them.

Marking instructions

Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance (page 3).

Indicative content guidance

Answers must be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.

- A main difference is that Interpretation 1 suggests that US tactics, such as bombing operations, failed to bring the Americans victory in Vietnam. Interpretation 2, on the other hand, emphasises that the American army was weakened by a lack of morale.

Question		
3 (c)		Suggest one reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the reasons for the failure of the USA in Vietnam. You may use Sources B and C to help explain your answer. Target: Analysis of interpretations (why they differ). AO4: 4 marks.
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–2	• A simple valid explanation is offered but displaying only limited analysis. Support for the explanation is based on simple undeveloped comment or on the selection of details from the provided material or own knowledge, with only implied linkage to the explanation.
2	3–4	• An explanation of a reason for difference is given, analysing the interpretations. The explanation is substantiated effectively.

Marking instructions

Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance (page 3).

Indicative content guidance

Answers must be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive. The examples below show different approaches to explaining difference, any one of which may be valid. Other valid material must be credited.

- The interpretations may differ because they have given weight to different sources. For example, Source B provides evidence for the strategic failures of US bombing, which provides some support for Interpretation 1, while Source C provides evidence for the deteriorating morale of American soldiers, which provides some support for Interpretation 2.
- The interpretations may differ because they take different viewpoints. Interpretation 1 focuses on the resilience of the communist forces, while Interpretation 2 focuses more on the weaknesses of the Americans.
- They may differ because the authors have chosen to place an emphasis on different details. Interpretation 1 is dealing with the details of military operations, while Interpretation 2 focuses on the experiences of American soldiers in Vietnam.

Question		
3 (d)		How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the reasons for the failure of the USA in Vietnam? Explain your answer, using both interpretations, and your knowledge of the historical context. Target: Analysis and evaluation of interpretations. AO4: 16 marks. Spelling, punctuation, grammar and the use of specialist terminology (SPaG): up to 4 additional marks.
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–4	• Answer offers simple valid comment to agree with or counter the interpretation. Limited analysis of one interpretation is shown by selection and inclusion of some detail in the form of simple paraphrase or direct quotation. Generalised contextual knowledge is included and linked to the evaluation.
2	5–8	• Answer offers valid evaluative comment to agree with or counter the interpretation. Some analysis is shown in selecting and including details from both interpretations to support this comment. Some relevant contextual knowledge is included and linked to the evaluation. An overall judgement is given but its justification is insecure or undeveloped and a line of reasoning is not sustained.
3	9–12	• Answer provides an explained evaluation, agreeing or disagreeing with the interpretation. Good analysis of the interpretations is shown indicating difference of view and deploying this to support the evaluation. Relevant contextual knowledge is used directly to support the evaluation. An overall judgement is given with some justification and a line of reasoning is generally sustained.
4	13–16	• Answer provides an explained evaluation reviewing the alternative views in coming to a substantiated judgement. Precise analysis of the interpretations is shown, indicating how the differences of view are conveyed and deploying this material to support the evaluation. Relevant contextual knowledge is precisely selected to support the evaluation. An overall judgment is justified and the line of reasoning is coherent, sustained and logically structured.
Marks for SPaG		
Performance	Mark	Descriptor
	0	• The learner writes nothing. • The learner's response does not relate to the question. • The learner's achievement in SPaG does not reach the threshold performance level, e.g. errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar severely hinder meaning.
Threshold	1	• Learners spell and punctuate with reasonable accuracy. • Learners use rules of grammar with some control of meaning and any errors do not significantly hinder meaning overall. • Learners use a limited range of specialist terms as appropriate.
Intermediate	2–3	• Learners spell and punctuate with considerable accuracy. • Learners use rules of grammar with general control of meaning overall. • Learners use a good range of specialist terms as appropriate.
High	4	• Learners spell and punctuate with consistent accuracy. • Learners use rules of grammar with effective control of meaning overall. • Learners use a wide range of specialist terms as appropriate.

Marking instructions

Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance (page 3).

No credit may be given for contextual knowledge unless it is linked to evaluation of the interpretations.

In all levels, the second sentence relates to analysis and while the rest relate to evaluation. The following rules will apply:

- In Level 1, answers that meet the requirements only in relation to analysis without evidence of evaluation should be awarded 1 mark.
- In other levels, answers that meet the requirements only in relation to analysis (but that also fully meet the descriptors for evaluation of the level below) should be awarded no more than the bottom mark in the level.

Indicative content guidance

Answers must be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. While specific references are made in the indicative content below, this does not imply that these must be included; other relevant material must also be credited. The grouping of points below does not imply that this is how candidates are expected to structure their answers.

The interpretation to be evaluated suggests that a reason for the failure of the USA was the loss of morale among American soldiers.

Relevant points from the provided material and own knowledge which support the claim made in the interpretation may include:

- Interpretation 2 states that conscripted soldiers were not sufficiently determined to fight in Vietnam.
- Interpretation 2 suggests that the American army was weakened by a range of problems such as drug use and desertions.
- The Americans had to supply so many soldiers to fight in Vietnam that they could not rely on volunteers. Around one-third of men serving in Vietnam were conscripts.
- American ill-discipline led to events such as the My Lai Massacre which weakened the American position in Vietnam.
- Tensions in the army reflected some of the struggles going on at home in the USA, especially the growth of the anti-war movement.

Relevant points from the provided material and own knowledge which counter the view may include:

- Interpretation 1 states that the failure of Operation Rolling Thunder meant that the US could not cut off supplies to communist fighters in the South.
- Interpretation 1 shows that although the USA had assumed that bombing would succeed in bringing about a communist defeat, however many bombs were dropped during the campaign, they could not break enemy resistance.
- Operation Rolling Thunder was a very costly campaign with the Americans spending approximately $10 on bombs for every $1 dollar of damage to North Vietnam.
- US officials continued to believe that increased bombing would be decisive in bringing about an end to the war but they could not target Chinese and Russian aid to the North in case the war escalated.
- Other reasons included the strength of North Vietnam and the impact of the opposition to the war in the USA.

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom