

Specimen papers

Paper 3
Modern Depth Study

GCSE (9-1) History

Pearson Edexcel Level 1/Level 2 GCSE (9-1) in History (1HI0)

General marking guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the last candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the first.
- 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.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- 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.

How to award marks when level descriptions are used

1. Finding the right level

The first stage is to decide which level the answer should be placed in. To do this, use a 'best-fit' approach, deciding which level most closely describes the quality of the answer. Answers can display characteristics from more than one level, and where this happens markers must use the guidance below and their professional judgement to decide which level is most appropriate.

For example, one stronger passage at L4 would not by itself merit a L4 mark, but it might be evidence to support a high L3 mark, unless there are substantial weaknesses in other areas. Similarly, an answer that fits best in L3 but which has some characteristics of L2 might be placed at the bottom of L3. An answer displaying some characteristics of L3 and some of L1 might be placed in L2.

2. Finding a mark within a level

After a level has been decided on, the next stage is to decide on the mark within the level. The instructions below tell you how to reward responses within a level. However, where a level has specific guidance about how to place an answer within a level, always follow that guidance.

Levels containing two marks only

Start with the presumption that the work will be at the top of the level. Move down to the lower mark if the work only just meets the requirements of the level.

Levels containing three or more marks

Markers should be prepared to use the full range of marks available in a level and not restrict marks to the middle. Markers should start at the middle of the level (or the upper-middle mark if there is an even number of marks) and then move the mark up or down to find the best mark. To do this, they should take into account how far the answer meets the requirements of the level:

- If it meets the requirements *fully*, markers should be prepared to award full marks within the level. The top mark in the level is used for answers that are as good as can realistically be expected within that level
- If it only *barely* meets the requirements of the level, markers should consider awarding marks at the bottom of the level. The bottom mark in the level is used for answers that are the weakest that can be expected within that level
- The middle marks of the level are used for answers that have a *reasonable* match to the descriptor. This might represent a balance between some characteristics of the level that are fully met and others that are only barely met.

Indicative content

Examiners are reminded that indicative content is provided as an illustration to markers of some of the material that may be offered by students. It does not show required content and alternatives should be credited where valid.

Specimen assessment materials for
first teaching September 2016

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

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

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

Question	
1	<p>Give two things you can infer from Source A about coverage of the war in Vietnam by the US media.</p> <p>Target: Source analysis (making inferences). AO3: 4 marks</p>
Marking instructions	
<p>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.</p> <p>e.g.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The news media played an important role in encouraging opposition to the war (1). Actions by opponents of the war were supported by the news media (1). • The media misled the American public about the outcome of the Tet offensive (1). The North Vietnamese and the Vietcong suffered a military defeat. Reporting of the offensive gave the impression of an endless war that could never be won (1). • The media encouraged criticism of US action in Vietnam (1) – ‘I have no doubt in my mind that the media backed up the message that the war was ‘illegal’ and ‘immoral’” (1). <p>Accept other appropriate alternatives.</p>	

Question		
2		<p>Explain why US involvement in Vietnam increased in the years 1954–64.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; margin: 10px 0;"> <p>You may use the following in your answer:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Domino theory • Gulf of Tonkin incident (1964). <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 that 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:

- The USA wanted to prevent a communist takeover of South Vietnam; the USA feared that communist North Vietnam would inspire a communist takeover of South Vietnam, followed by Laos and Cambodia (the Domino theory)
- The belief that the Domino theory threatened the security of the US meant that, in the years 1954–64, all three Presidents were willing to increase US commitments in Vietnam in order to prevent the spread of communism.
- The US increased the amount of military aid and the numbers of advisers sent to South Vietnam because of the failure of the South Vietnamese army (ARVN) to deal adequately with communist threats, both from inside the country and the North.
- Involvement increased under Kennedy due to the threat from the Vietcong; successful Vietcong activity meant that the US set up heavily defended 'strategic hamlets' designed to protect South Vietnamese peasants from Vietcong influence.
- US involvement increased in response to specific events e.g. the apparent direct attack by North Vietnamese patrol boats on the US destroyer *Maddox* in the Gulf of Tonkin (1964) necessitated a response from the US.
- Johnson used the Gulf of Tonkin incident (1964) to persuade Congress to pass the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution that gave him the power to take any military measures he thought necessary to defend South Vietnam and increase US involvement.

Question		
3 (a)		How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into the significance of the Brown versus Topeka Case (1954)? Explain your answer, using Sources B and C and your own 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.

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:

- It suggests that black students are being integrated with white students.
- It may suggest that white students have accepted and even welcomed black students.
- It provides evidence that black students may have played a leading role in the lessons in the newly integrated classes.

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 photograph was not typical of developments after the Brown v. Topeka. It only provides evidence of integration in one school.
- The photograph provides a very positive image of school integration because it was published in a national newspaper in order to promote the success of the Brown v. Topeka decision.

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

- Within a year of the 1954 decision, over five hundred school districts in the North and South had desegregated.

- By 1957 more than 300,000 black children were attending schools that had formerly been segregated.

Source C

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

- The source suggests that there was strong opposition to the Brown v. Topeka decision from a significant number of members of Congress.
- The source claims that these opponents will use any legal methods they can to prevent an end to school segregation.
- The source claims that the existing system of segregation had been successful, creating peaceful relations between black and white Americans.

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:

- It provides evidence of the depth of opposition to integration from leading politicians.
- The purpose of the manifesto was to encourage opposition to the Brown v. Topeka decision; its use of language exaggerates the achievements of the segregated system by distorting the effects of integration.

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

- In the two years that followed the Brown v. Topeka Case, southern state legislatures passed more than 450 laws and resolutions aimed at preventing the Brown decision being enforced.
- In 1957, there were 2.4 million black southern children still being educated in Jim Crow schools.

Question		
3 (b)		<p>Study Interpretations 1 and 2. They give different views about the significance of the Brown versus Topeka Case (1954). What is the main difference between these 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 that Interpretation 1 emphasises the positive effects of the Brown v. Topeka Case on the Civil Rights Movement and segregation in schools. Interpretation 2, on the other hand, emphasises the negative reaction to the Brown v. Topeka case, especially in the Deep South where there was strong opposition to integration. 		

Question		
3 (c)		<p>Suggest one reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the significance of the Brown versus Topeka Case (1954). You may use Sources B and C to help explain your answer.</p> <p>Target: Analysis of interpretations (why they differ). AO4: 4 marks</p>
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.
<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. The examples below show different approaches to explaining difference, any one of which may be valid. Other valid material must be credited.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The interpretations may differ because they give different weight to different sources. For example, Source B provides some support for Interpretation 1, which stresses the positive effects of the Brown v. Topeka Case, while Source C provides some support for Interpretation 2 which emphasises the negative reactions to the Brown v. Topeka Case especially in the Deep South. The interpretations may differ because they are partial extracts: Interpretation 1 deals with impact of the case outside the Deep South; Interpretation 2 deals with reactions to the case in the Deep South. The interpretations may differ because the authors have a different emphasis, with Interpretation 1 dealing with the positive outcomes of the Brown v. Topeka Case and Interpretation 2 focusing on the opposition that emerged as a result of the case. 		

Question		
3 (d)		<p>How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the significance of the Brown versus Topeka Case (1954)? Explain your answer, using both interpretations, and your knowledge of the historical context.</p> <p>Target: Analysis and evaluation of interpretations. AO4: 16 marks Spelling, punctuation, grammar and the use of specialist terminology (SPaG): up to 4 additional marks</p>
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 judgement 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, e.g. 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 were negative reactions to the Brown v. Topeka Case especially in the Deep South.

Relevant points from the provided material and own knowledge which supports the interpretation may include:

- Interpretation 2 supports the claim that there were negative reactions by providing evidence of opposition from public officials such as the governor of Georgia.
- Interpretation 2 supports the claim by showing that the Brown v. Topeka Case led to widespread local opposition in the South to the end of segregation in education and encouraged a terror campaign from the Kuk Klux Klan.
- That the Brown v. Topeka Case brought little progress in school integration is shown by the fact that by 1957 less than 12 per cent of the 6300 schools in the Deep South had been integrated.
- That the Brown v. Topeka Case encouraged widespread opposition in the Deep South is shown by the Massive Resistance campaign set up in Virginia to prevent school integration.
- The case encouraged widespread opposition in the Deep South as shown by events at Little Rock High School in 1957, where Governor Orval Faubus used National Guard troops to prevent the entry of nine black children to the school.

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

- Interpretation 1 states that the Brown v. Topeka Case led to the end of segregation in schools outside the Deep South.
- Interpretation 1 suggests that the Brown v. Topeka Case gave great encouragement to Civil Rights Movement and the use of legal methods to achieve their aims.
- The Brown v. Topeka Case brought progress because it led to the end of segregation in schools outside the Deep South in the years that followed the decision.
- After 1954, the Civil Rights Movement successfully used legal methods to challenge segregation in other everyday situations e.g. the Montgomery Bus Boycott of 1955–56.
- The Brown v. Topeka Case brought progress because it gave great encouragement to the use of legal methods, especially the subsequent use of the Supreme Court in later years to further challenge segregation.