

Sample assessment materials for first
teaching September 2016

Paper 3: Modern depth study (1HI0/33)

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

Modern depth study: The USA, 1954–75: conflict at home and abroad

Question	
1	Give two things you can infer from Source A about civil rights for black Americans in the 1950s. 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. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Separate facilities were not equal facilities (1). The café building for black Americans is more basic than that for white people (1).</i>• <i>Segregation was a way of life for black Americans (1). Many aspects of ordinary life are shown to be separate - transport, entertainment, dining (1).</i>• <i>Segregation as a whole was being challenged by the WPC (1). The poster invites protesters to reject injustice and inequality in the range of situations shown in the photographs (1).</i> Accept other appropriate alternatives.	

Question		
2		<p>Explain why there was progress in the civil rights movement in the years 1961–65.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p>You may use the following in your answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • President Kennedy • the Washington Peace March, 1963 <p>You must also use information of your own.</p> </div> <p>Target: Analysis of second order concepts: causation [AO2]. Knowledge and understanding of features and characteristics [AO1]. AO2: 6 marks. AO1: 6 marks.</p>
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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] <p><i>Maximum 5 marks for Level 2 answers that do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.</i></p>
3	7–9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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] <p><i>Maximum 8 marks for Level 3 answers that do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.</i></p>
4	10–12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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] <p><i>No access to Level 4 for answers which do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.</i></p>

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:

- Kennedy brought progress because he sent 23,000 government troops to ensure that James Meredith could study at the University of Mississippi.
- Kennedy encouraged progress because he introduced the Civil Rights Bill to Congress in February 1963 which was eventually passed under Johnson the following year.
- The Washington Peace March brought progress because it brought national and international publicity for the civil rights movement.
- The Peace March encouraged progress because it led to a meeting between King and Kennedy which encouraged the president to introduce the Civil Rights Bill.
- There was progress because of the Birmingham March of 1963 which showed the violence of the authorities, especially the Police Chief 'Bull O'Connor.
- The Selma marches brought peace because they provided publicity for the civil rights campaign for voting rights for black Americans.

Question		
3 (a)		How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into attitudes in the USA towards involvement in the Vietnam War? 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A simple judgement on utility is given, and supported by undeveloped comment on the content of the sources and/or their provenance¹. 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 provenance¹. 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Judgements on source utility for the specified enquiry are given, applying valid criteria with developed reasoning which takes into account how the provenance¹ 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.
<p>Notes</p> <p>1. Provenance = nature, origin, purpose.</p> <p>Marking instructions</p> <p>Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance (page 3).</p> <p>No credit may be given for contextual knowledge unless it is linked to evaluation of the sources.</p> <p>No credit may be given for generic comments on provenance which are not used to evaluate source content.</p> <p>Indicative content guidance</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Source B</p> <p>The usefulness could be identified in terms of the following points which could be drawn from the source:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The source is useful because it suggests that there were supporters of the war who took an active role in campaigning for it. It is also useful because it shows that some people supported the war because they thought that communism was evil and went against their beliefs in God. It is useful because it suggests that people supported US involvement in Vietnam because it would stop the further spread of communism. <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The photograph was published in a national newspaper, suggesting its importance, but that does not indicate how large or typical the demonstration was or how often they took place. The photograph was taken in 1967 when there was still strong support for US involvement in the conflict in Vietnam. 		

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

- There were many Americans who supported US involvement in the conflict in Vietnam because of the domino theory, the belief that if one country fell to communism, others would soon follow.
- There was strong support in the early years of the war, especially after the Gulf of Tonkin incident of 1964 which seemed to confirm the aggressive intentions of North Vietnam.

Source C

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

- The source is useful because it suggests that the Tet Offensive encouraged the growth of opposition to US involvement in the war in Vietnam.
- It is also useful because it shows that television played an important role in encouraging opposition to the war in Vietnam.
- The source is useful because it gives evidence that there were people who felt so strongly that they were prepared to make considerable sacrifices in the cause of stopping the war.

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 interview was given many years after the war in Vietnam when history has proved him right, and this may have influenced his recollections.
- The interview was for an oral history of Vietnam, and we don't have enough information to know if they have selected the more extreme reactions to the war.

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

- The introduction of colour television heightened the impact of the coverage of the bloody nature of the conflict.
- There was growth in opposition to the war as many students believed that the US government was fighting to support a corrupt regime in South Vietnam.

Question		
3 (b)		<p>Study Interpretations 1 and 2. They give different views about attitudes in the USA towards involvement in the Vietnam War. What is the main difference between the views? Explain your answer, using details from both interpretations.</p> <p>Target: Analysis of interpretations (how they differ). AO4: 4 marks.</p>
Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	1–2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The interpretations are analysed and a key difference of view is identified and supported from them.
<p>Marking instructions</p> <p>Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance (page 3).</p> <p>Indicative content guidance</p> <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A main difference is Interpretation 1 emphasises the growth and extent of opposition to US involvement in the war by mentioning the impact of the Tet Offensive. Interpretation 2, on the other hand, emphasises the enthusiastic support that there was for the war due to the concern about the spread of communism. 		

Question		
3 (c)		Suggest one reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about attitudes in the USA towards involvement in the Vietnam War. 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 C provides support for Interpretation 1 which stresses the growth and extent of opposition to the war, while Source B provides some support for Interpretation 2's emphasis on those who supported the war.
- The interpretations may differ because they are partial extracts, and in this case they do not actually contradict each other – there were both opponents (Interpretation 1) and supporters (Interpretation 2) of the war which, as late as 1970, as suggested in Interpretation 2, were 50% each way.
- They may differ because the authors have different emphases: Interpretation 1 focuses on the growth of opposition, especially after the Tet Offensive of 1968. Interpretation 2 deals with the strong support for the war, especially in its early and later years.

Question		
3 (d)		How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about attitudes in the USA towards involvement in the Vietnam War? 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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, for example errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar severely hinder meaning.
Threshold	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 there was strong support for the war in the USA.

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

- Interpretation 2 supports the claim because it says that as many as 85 per cent supported the war in 1964 and 50 per cent in 1970.
- Interpretation 2 supports the claim because it says that supporters of the war were concerned about the spread of communism.
- There was strong support for the war at first because of concerns about the threat to American interests in South-East Asia.
- There was support for the war because of the belief that communist countries such as China and the Soviet Union were supporting North Vietnam and the Vietcong.
- Many Americans believed in the domino theory and were convinced that if one country in Asia such as Vietnam fell to communism others would follow very quickly.

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

- Interpretation 1 suggests that there was strong opposition to the war especially after the Tet Offensive.
- Interpretation 1 shows that there was growing opposition to the war due to the impact of television which showed the fighting in Vietnam.
- There was growing opposition to the war because of the use of chemical weapons such as napalm in Vietnam.
- Massacres such as that at My Lai in 1968 when a number of Vietnamese villagers were murdered by American troops increased opposition to the war.
- Opposition to the war grew with the number of casualties which increased from 2,000 in 1965 to 14,000 in 1968.