

Examiners' Report

June 2025

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 <https://www.edexcel.com> or <https://www.btec.co.uk>.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our [contact us page](#).



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 <https://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: <https://www.pearson.com/uk>.

June 2025

Publications Code 1HI0_33_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Introduction

Examiners commented that most candidates seemed to find the paper accessible and were confident in tackling the various questions. They coped well with the range of question styles, which covered all four Assessment Objectives, and they responded particularly well to the enquiry 'package' in question 3.

This year, there was a change to the examination paper and candidates were able to choose from two options for question 2. This allowed for a wider range of content to be covered and allowed more candidates to attempt an answer.

Questions on this paper cover all the Assessment Objectives but over half of the available marks are for question 3, which focuses on sources and interpretations. These questions 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. It is therefore important that candidates appreciate the difference between sources and interpretations, and the focus of different parts of question 3.

In particular, there are still a number of candidates who find it difficult to explain why interpretations differ (question 3c). When they are asked about a reason for the different views, candidates should remember that the authors have constructed these interpretations and chosen to present them in this specific way. The most common explanation was that the authors had chosen to place weight on different sources, but it is important to support this with details from the interpretations and the sources in order to meet the mark scheme requirement that 'An explanation of a reason for difference is given, **analysing the interpretations**. The explanation is **substantiated effectively**'. It should also be noted that 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, unless it is assumed that everyone writing in a specific year shared the same view.

The focus of question 3d is on the interpretations and candidates who provide their own view of the issue in the question are unlikely to access the higher levels of the mark scheme. Similarly, every level of the mark scheme above Level 1 refers to 'interpretations'. There is no expectation that both interpretations are dealt with in equal depth, but both should be examined explicitly. Answers which only analyse one interpretation can score above Level 1 if they perform well in other strands of the mark scheme but are unlikely to achieve a high mark.

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 which are not relevant to the enquiry. Candidates should be reminded that the content from the sources provided may be used to provide contextual knowledge for the interpretations.

Candidates who have already explained the difference between the interpretations in question 3b will have used this knowledge in their answer to question 3c as they review the alternative views being offered. A feature of strong answers is to show an understanding of how the authors have conveyed their different views. This could be through their use of language, the tone of their

writing, their choice of details to include or omit, and their decision of how to present their material. Answers need to show an understanding that the author has chosen what language to use or what to emphasise; they do not need to judge how effective this. This is even more effective if it is worked into the answer rather than left as a stand-alone comment. For example, 'the author presents this as a positive aspect', 'the interpretation focuses on ... and omits ...', 'the language is very critical' or 'only including this at the end plays down its significance'.

A full range of responses suggest this question was accessible to candidates of all abilities and full answers were generally provided, showing that timing wasn't generally an issue on this paper.

Question 1

This question requires candidates to make two inferences from a source and it is sometimes regarded as an 'easy' question. However, candidates need to be sure that the inferences they make from the source are not based on their own knowledge as this question assesses AO3 and no marks are available for AO1 (knowledge and understanding). They also need to ensure the inferences they make relate to the enquiry in the question.

The focus of the question was about the Ho Chi Minh trail. There were two marks available for each valid 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 regarding the people using the trail being civilians, or that the terrain was tricky. However, a number focused on the fact that it was used as a supply route, which was stated, so could not be an inference. Quite a number of candidates focused on the people rather than the trail. It was also noteworthy that a significant number of candidates used their own knowledge about the Ho Chi Minh trail, rather than making an actual inference. It should be recognised that details from the source can only be rewarded if they are provided as support for an inference. No marks were available for candidates who provided simple descriptions of the source as inferences.

(i) What I can infer:

People who carried the supplies
were local people

Details in the source that tell me this:

They didn't have uniforms like
the American ~~armies~~ army

(ii) What I can infer:

the vietnam war was very
upsetting

Details in the source that tell me this:

the people's faces look really
distracted and unhappy.



The first inference is valid, as is the support, but the second is not about the Ho Chi Minh trail and is, therefore, not valid.



Candidates should ensure they understand exactly what the inferences need to be about, in this case the Ho Chi Minh trail.

(i) What I can infer:

I can infer it was well organised.

Details in the source that tell me this:

This is shown in the gods they are in a single file line carrying supplies one behind the other.

(ii) What I can infer:

I can infer it was remote.

Details in the source that tell me this:

This is shown in the way the trail is surrounded by trees and rocks.



Both inferences are valid and appropriate support from the source is provided.



Students should ensure that the inferences are genuine inferences and not just things they know about the Ho Chi Minh trail.

Question 2(a)

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 such 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.

The stimulus points in the question will often be useful reminders to candidates of specific areas of content about which they can write. Candidates do not need to use these stimulus points but there is an expectation that there will be some depth of knowledge at the higher levels, shown by three discrete aspects of content being covered, although this does not mean candidates need to identify three different causes or events.

A number of answers remained at Level 3, despite excellent knowledge, because they missed the focus of the question. The mark scheme's bullet point for Assessment Objective 2 (analysis) at Level 4 expects an analytical explanation, directed consistently at the conceptual focus of the question. Candidates who responded to the topic rather than the key idea were unlikely to achieve high marks. Those who did reach Level 4 realised that the topic provides the context but that there is a specific focus, which the analysis should address.

Question 2a was the most popular of the 2 options, and was focused on why the Montgomery Bus Boycott was successful. This question was answered well on the whole with less L1 answers than in previous series. Almost all candidates were able to write about Rosa Parks, the events of the boycott and provide detail about Martin Luther King and his involvement in the MIA. The level of knowledge in answers rarely went below Level 2 and in many cases the knowledge strand was the stronger of the two. Most answers which had 3 factors covered were able to get into L3 or L4 for AO1. The better answers included specific examples and developed their points. Candidates were able to sustain their focus on the question and include analytical explanations showing a variety of ways in which the events of the boycott could be seen as successful. For example, candidates were able to show both the ways in which the boycott led to legal change as well as focusing on psychological factors such as solidarity and community. Lots of candidates were able to focus on methods set up by the MIA which enabled the boycott to continue for the amount of time which was necessary for it to be a success. Less successful candidates tended to just describe what Rosa Parks did.

One reason why the Montgomery Bus Boycott was successful was of how long it went on for. After hearing that Rosa Parks got arrested many black people decided to do a 1 day Boycott of Buses. Then it had a bigger ~~market~~ impact than what they thought it would, so they decided to continue for a whole year and due to the longevity, the bus company had lost a lot of money. Therefore they allowed the desegregation of Buses in Montgomery.

A second reason why the Montgomery Bus Boycott was successful was that the boycotters found an alternative way of transport which was that they would get a car and take people where they wanted to go and ~~this~~ this is important for the success of the Boycott because without this alternative they wouldn't have been able to continue the

Boycott for as long as they did, which would of effected the ^{overall} impact that it had.

A Third reason for the Success of Montgomery Bus Boycott was the ~~involvement~~ involvement of Martin Luther King as ~~he~~ after seeing the Success potential after one day, He then became involved which ~~it~~ was important because people were inspired by him so therefore after seeing him taking part in the Boycott he influenced many others too which helped the Growth of the Boycott, As a result of so many people taking part due to being influenced this helped them in court as it got Surpassed to US Supreme Court who then granted the desegregation of ~~Montgomery~~ Buses in Montgomery.



This answer achieved a level 3 mark. Good knowledge and understanding of the features/period was shown and there was some analysis, mainly directed at the focus of the question.



Make sure you address the focus of the question and not just the topic.

One major reason why the Montgomery Bus Boycott was successful was due to the work and organisation of the MIA. The MIA (Montgomery Improvement ~~Assn~~ Association) was established in 1955, with Martin Luther King as its appointed leader. The MIA aimed to help those who boycotted by introducing systems such as carpools that allowed boycotters to use alternative methods of transport and stay strong with their aim of ~~desegregate~~ desegregating buses. Additionally, the MIA's organisation meant that boycotters and civil rights activists were always ^{one step} ahead of ~~the~~ racist systems. As a result of their work and organisation, the NAACP took the case to court and buses were desegregated after the Browder vs Gayle ruling. Therefore, the work of the MIA was the most significant reason because it's organisation gave the boycotters someone to rely on and kept them strong in their aims.

Secondly, a significant reason why the boycott was successful was due to the role of the media. The media played a large role in support for the boycott because it broadcasted the powerful message of non-violence. ~~Boycotters~~ The boycott ~~was~~ was a

peaceful approach to achieve segregation and the violent responses from white people created sympathy for the activists. For example, during the boycott, Martin Luther King's house was firebombed ~~but~~ by the KKK but he only responded with peace and non-violence. ~~The~~ This event was published by the media and showed the US public the brutality that black people faced. Consequently, it created sympathy for them and increased support for the boycott, ultimately leading to a success in the Browder vs Gayle case. However, whilst this event was significant, it is important to note that the MIA was more significant because without their aid and support, activists would have had no motivation to continue.

Finally, a minor reason why the boycott was successful was due to the dedication and commitment of the activists. 90% of black people in Montgomery boycotted buses, massively impacting the economy of bus companies. This meant that buses had to rely on white people for money and, considering that most people who took the bus were black, they lost out on a lot of money, damaging their businesses. However, it is important to consider that this is only a minor reason because without the support of the MIA or the media, the event would not have been publicised and

desegregation would continue. Therefore, the dedication of activists was only a minor reason because there were other more contributing factors.



This response received a high level 4 mark. An analytical explanation was given, it was coherent and logically structured and accurate and relevant information was precisely selected to address the question.



Make sure each point is explained (not just stated) and try to include precise details to support each point of analysis.

Question 2(b)

Question 2b was the least popular of the options, and was focused on why the Black power movement emerged in the 1960s. This question was significantly less popular than option 2a and was not answered as well overall. Many candidates who did attempt the question found it difficult to retain their focus and often wandered into telling a narrative of events which happened prior to the emergence of Black Power. It was clear from some answers that candidates were using the term Black Power as a catch all for the events of the 1950s and 1960s and so some of what was written at times was irrelevant to the focus of the question. Many candidates were aware of what was meant by the stimulus material term 'Black Culture' and were aware of Stokely Carmichael, but many were unclear on exactly what he had done and even fewer were able to link Black Culture successfully as a reason for the emergence of Black Power.

High-level responses went beyond the material provided, introducing additional relevant factors such as the 1968 Mexico Olympics protest, the emergence of the Black Panther Party, and growing frustration with the perceived ineffectiveness of non-violent protest — in particular using Stokely Carmichael as an example. The influence of Malcolm X was also used effectively to highlight a shift in attitude and tactics during this period. In some cases, candidates included references to Malcolm X, though a number of these responses simply provided a brief biography. Where responses were more analytical, they connected Malcolm X's criticism of non-violence and his emphasis on Black pride and autonomy to the rising appeal of more radical movements. This demonstrated a clear understanding of how his ideas resonated with those disillusioned by the slow progress of mainstream civil rights efforts. By contrast, weaker responses tended to rely on vague or overly general claims without providing supporting examples or linking their arguments to the specific context of the 1960s. As a result, these answers lacked the detail and relevance needed to fully address the question.

One reason black power emerged in the 1960s ~~and~~ was Stokely Carmichael, and He had gone to a march and witnessed James Meredith, the first who graduated college with great difficulty due to his race, getting shot at. This made Stokely Carmichael annoyed. He believed they were not gaining rights fast enough and that fire should be fought with fire.

Another reason black power emerged was the belief that black history should be taught in schools ~~and to~~

~~Another~~ reason black power started to emerge was the Mexico Olympics

Where two of the runners who placed Silver and gold stood on the podium and put their fists up wearing a black leather glove. This is the black power symbol. This was streamed everywhere and the whole world saw the display including the US citizens.



This answer achieved a level 2 mark. Accurate and relevant information was included, showing some knowledge and understanding and an explanation was given showing limited analysis.



Make sure you explain clearly how the points you are making answer the question.

One reason why the Black Power movement in the 1960s emerged was due to the influence of Malcom X as a Black Power representative. Malcom X was raised as Malcom Little and adopted the name Malcom X as an action of regaining power and distancing himself from his 'slave name' of Little. This presented Malcom as a strong activist, and he encouraged ~~the~~ taking pride in black culture, setting up black groups and being a part of the Nation Of Islam. Malcom believed that the peaceful means of the civil rights movement was proving unsuccessful and believed in achieving rights through 'any means necessary'. Members of society were also adopting this outlook, and so many Black-Americans started to follow Malcom X's movement. This gain in support of Malcom X and the newly adopted pride around black culture meant the Black Power movement ~~the~~ began to grow.

due to the new encouraged methods of achieving civil rights, ~~and~~ as well as a few people sharing Malcolm X's outlook that all white people are 'collectively evil', as he said in an interview.

Furthermore, another reason for the emergence of Black Power was the development of the Black Power Group, the Black Panthers. These were a militant ~~visual~~ Black Power group who campaigned for the end of segregation and encouraged black pride. Head of the Panthers, Stokely Carmichael wanted the black American community to gain political power, ~~and~~ so set up ~~the~~ a political party with the symbol of a black panther. They set up free breakfasts for black children and had volunteers offering schooling showing the benefits of the movement. However they gained awareness by openly showing up to an anti-gun protest armed with guns. This group was important for the emergence of black power as they campaigned without being afraid to retaliate with violence, as well as offering support and encouragement for the Black Power community. They helped the emergence additionally by ~~being~~ very frequently

winning their protests or campaigns, and brought many Black Americans to the Black Power Movement.

A final reason for the emergence of Black Power was the Mexico Olympics where ~~E~~ Tommie Smith and another medalist held their hands in a fist wearing a black glove and raised it as they stood on a podium. This ~~is~~ was very important for the emergence of black power as they brought awareness of the movement to field which hadn't yet been acted on in the Civil Rights Movement, sport. It faced much backlash from crowds who let out boos around the stadium, however it did encourage Black activists to join the movement, and significantly, gained media attention. This spread the knowledge of the Black Power movement nationally, making it important in the emergence of Black Power.



This response received a high level 4 mark. An analytical explanation was given, it was coherent and logically structured and accurate and relevant information was precisely selected to address the question.



You don't need to write down everything you know about a topic, just ensure that the material you select is appropriate and is focused on answering the question.

Question 3(a)

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 question 3 (a) students 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 this case the escalation of US involvement in the conflict in Vietnam in the 1960s. These strands in the mark scheme are linked and should be dealt with together, rather than in isolation.

Candidates found the sources accessible and were confident in showing that the content of the sources was relevant for the enquiry and therefore useful. They could also make a number of points about the significance of the provenance for the usefulness of the content, although sometimes this consisted of basic statements rather than a developed explanation. When considering provenance, generic comments about a source being biased (with no explanation of how that bias could be detected or why it occurred) or about the source being reliable because it came from the time under investigation, could be made without any reference to the individual source and therefore remained at Level 1. This type of generic assumption was seen when some answers assumed that the authors of the sources would be biased or that a source's accuracy would be affected by the passage of time.

At Level 2, developed comments were made about the content of the sources, for example, the evidence source B provided about the willingness of Kennedy to increase US involvement. This was often backed up by contextual knowledge about the reasons for this, including the Domino Theory.

There were also good comments made about the provenance of the sources, for example that Source B was from a top-secret document, thus giving a valuable insight into important decision making.

However, some very good answers could not access the higher marks because they did not include contextual knowledge. Contextual knowledge is mentioned at every level of the mark scheme and failure to include it limited a number of otherwise good answers. Candidates should recognise that it is not enough to repeat a detail from the source and assert that this can be confirmed from the candidate's own knowledge or to give generalised comments such as 'I know that Johnson increased US involvement' – some additional detail is needed as a demonstration of that own knowledge. Contextual knowledge should be relevant to the enquiry and used to assess the source, for example to add detail about something mentioned in the source, to add weight to an aspect of the provenance, to place the source in a broader context, or to assess whether the source gave an accurate view or showed a typical situation.

At Level 3, comments need to consider the effect of an aspect of the provenance on the usefulness of the source content, and contextual knowledge should be integrated into the process of reaching a judgement, not simply provided as information.

It is important to note that the question asks about the usefulness of the sources in relation to a specific enquiry. Sources should not be dismissed because they do not cover every detail that might be helpful in an investigation and candidates should recognise that unreliable sources can

be very useful.

Similarly, the focus should be on assessing the usefulness of what is in the source rather than listing details which are not mentioned. It can be valid to note the limitations of a source but these points need to be used in an overall evaluation of the usefulness of the source; an answer which focuses on 'missing' information without weighing the positive aspects of the source, is unlikely to score highly. If the answer identifies omissions from the source as limitations on its usefulness, this could be linked to a consideration of the provenance, showing whether this is the result of lack of knowledge or deliberate omission.

The question asks 'how useful' the sources are, so a judgement should be made on the usefulness of the source's evidence for the specific enquiry. Good answers made clear the criteria being used to assess the usefulness for the enquiry of the sources, weighing the value of the content in the light of the provenance and the candidate's own knowledge. Various criteria could be used, for example accuracy of detail, reliability, the relevance of the source, the way it could be used by the historian, and how representative the source is.

Very few answers only considered one source but it should be noted that every level of the mark scheme refers to 'sources' and therefore answers which do not consider both sources cannot access high marks.

Source B is very useful for an enquiry into the escalation of US involvement in the conflict in Vietnam in the 1960s because it entails a list of how JFK helped the South. ~~The~~ This is seen when it says 'USA will provide the following for South Vietnam' and includes things such as; 'training and equipment', 'increased economic aid' and 'increased air support'. I know that Kennedy believed in Eisenhower's 'domino theory' but wanted to stop threat from a war with China or Russia. Therefore, he tried to win the 'hearts and minds' of South Vietnamese people and only sent advisors to Vietnam and no ground troops. This was written in 1961 and was a top-secret US government to inform President Diem about their support. This shows that ~~is~~ it's useful as I know the

information is accurate and it was written by the US government. ~~As it was~~

Source C is very useful for an enquiry into the escalation of US involvement in the conflict in Vietnam in the 1960's because it shows how President Johnson increased US support in Vietnam. This is seen when it says 'which will raise our fighting strength from 74 000 to 125 000 men'. I know that under the leadership of Johnson the draft for the Vietnam war began. US troops were sent to fight alongside ARVN against the Vietcong. This was a speech from Johnson to the public, in July 1965, which is informing them about the government's decisions on the war. Therefore, this makes source C useful as it entails information about the increase of troops which contributed to the escalation of the Vietnam war.



Both sources are evaluated in terms of accuracy, using contextual knowledge to test the content of the sources. Both also make some comment about the provenance and a limited comment about how the provenance could impact the usefulness of the content, though this is not developed.



Evaluate the provenance rather than just repeating the attribution.

Source B is very useful for an enquiry into the escalation of US involvement in the conflict in Vietnam in the 1960s as it shows that support was increased, shown by the quote "Increased air support to the South Vietnamese armed forces". This alligns with my own knowledge as I am aware that, despite wanting to avoid direct involvement and fight a limited war, Kennedy increased supplies sent to South Vietnam and asked for a report on the ~~feasibi~~ possibility of sending troops, ~~highlight~~ highlighting the increase in US support. Furthermore, this source is taken from a top-secret US government document, written at the time (1961) meaning it is reliable as it was not intended for the public ~~eye~~ to see it, so is likely accurate. Additionally, this suggests that the increase of support may have been a secret from the public. Overall, this Source B is very useful as it

is likely a very accurate representation of increased US support in ~~the~~ South Vietnam.

Source C is moderately useful for an enquiry as it highlights the ~~a~~ huge escalation of US involvement. This is shown by the quote "raise our fighting strength from 74,000 to 125,000 men", highlighting the drastic increase of troops. This aligns with my own knowledge as I am aware that troops sent significantly increased due to the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution in ~~the~~ 1964, giving Johnson the power to send troops without the approval of congress. However, this source is slightly limited due to its nature as a speech, broadcast to the public, meaning it may be not fully truthful to make the increased involvement more popular ~~in~~ within the public. However, the speech was given at the time so the data used is likely ~~not~~ accurate. ~~representation~~ Overall, Source C is ~~even~~ moderately useful as it highlights the huge escalation of US involvement in Vietnam, but is limited as it was intended for the public.



Level 3 is achieved for both sources. The candidate uses contextual knowledge to effectively evaluate the content of the sources, not just as evidence of what they know. Reasoning takes into account how the provenance affects the content of the sources.



Rather than making several points about the source content, make sure you cover content, provenance and contextual knowledge.

Question 3(b)c

In this question, candidates are asked to identify a difference in the overall views being offered in the interpretations; these do not necessarily contradict each other but they do provide alternative views. The answers should identify the key difference but also provide support from each interpretation to demonstrate that difference.

Many answers recognised that the two interpretations offered different views about the escalation of US involvement in the conflict in Vietnam in the 1960s and could select detail from the two interpretations to support the explanation of that difference. The vast majority identified the difference as being who was responsible. However, some answers simply selected details from the interpretations without explaining how these demonstrated the difference in the overall 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 stayed in level 1.

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

It is important that candidates recognise the relationship between questions 3b and 3c. Having identified that the two interpretations offer different views, candidates are asked to suggest a reason why these different views have been reached. They should be able to support their answer with reference to the interpretations but they should also make sure that their answer to 3(c) does not simply repeat their answer to 3(b).

It is clear that candidates have become more confident in answering this question, particularly those who understood that historians use sources as the building blocks to form views and interpretations. These candidates often used Sources B and C to exemplify this historical process. However, a significant minority of candidates still do not answer this question effectively and are still making assertions about the publication date being of significance without being able to prove this.

The focus here is on the process by which the historian produces their interpretation. Where answers suggested that when carrying out research, the authors had placed weight on different sources, candidates could easily score the full 4 marks by linking details in the interpretations with details in Sources B and C. However, this should be explained with references to both the interpretations and the sources rather than simply stating that 'the author of Interpretation 1 might have used Source B'. They should also try to avoid statements such as 'Interpretation 2 supports Source C' as this suggests they have not understood the relationship between the sources and the interpretations.

Alternative explanations also recognise that the historian's approach may affect their research and conclusions. For example, whether an historian focuses on economic or political impacts. Here again, the explanation needs to be supported by the use of the interpretations. Therefore, speculation that the difference in interpretation is a result of their provenance, for example the

date that the interpretations were produced, is not valid as it cannot be supported with explicit details. The full reasons for this are explained in the *Getting Started Guide* on pp 43-44. 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.'

Interpretation 1 has the view of President Kennedy⁽⁴⁾ being the one mostly in charge of ~~the~~ US involvement in Vietnam, however interpretation 2 has the view that President Johnson being the one in charge for US involvement in Vietnam.

Interpretation 1 has the view President Kennedy was responsible for US involvement. This is because interpretation 1 uses ^{sources} like Source B. Interpretation 2 has the view President Johnson was responsible for US involvement. This is because interpretation 2 ~~has~~ uses sources like Source C.



In question 3b, the candidate has understood the difference but has not evidenced this understanding from the content of the interpretations. In question 3c, the candidate indicates that there is a connection between the sources and interpretations, but does not evidence this with details from both.



Make sure you are showing the difference in views about the enquiry and not simply the difference in individual details.

The main difference ^{expressed} is the difference in opinions on which President had more involvement. More specifically, Interpretation 1 states President Kennedy's decisions meant a key turning point in the war as he sent "military assistance" and "authorised the use of chemical weapons". However, Interpretation 2 suggests President Johnson was the most responsible for escalating US involvement as he ~~ordered~~ "burning raids" and ^{also} ~~he also~~ "Johnson approved of a secret plan that widened the conflict". This shows that both Interpretations suggest either President had large impacts as they made important decisions.

The interpretations may give different views about US involvement in the war because they may have got ~~a~~ their information from different sources. For example interpretation 1 may have used source B to gather information. Source B ~~is~~ says Kennedy would provide "individual administrators and advisers" and interpretation 1 says "the number of American 'advisers' was increased." This shows that President Kennedy ~~had~~ ^{provided} majority support. Whereas interpretation 2 may have used source C to get information about President Johnson. For example source C says ~~Johnson~~ "to increase ~~the~~ the number of men called up" and interpretation 2 says "American soldiers would soon be fighting in Vietnamese territory." This shows that President Johnson had escalated the US involvement. This shows the different use of sources led to different views and opinions.



The answer for question 3b shows clear analysis of the interpretations. A key difference in view has been identified and supported with evidence from both interpretations. The answer for question 3c has given a valid reason for the difference in view and has been able to evidence that reason from the interpretations.



Make sure you are able to evidence the reason you have given. It is not necessary to provide quotes as long as you are able to evidence clearly the content of the interpretations and sources as this answer does.

Question 3(d)

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 need to recognise that they are not being asked to treat the interpretation as a source and evaluate its reliability or usefulness but to explain whether they think the historian has offered a valid view.

The use of contextual knowledge is an important element in every level of the mark scheme but it must be precisely selected and linked to the evaluation of the interpretation rather than being offered as an answer to the enquiry question. At the same time, 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.

Candidates often used details from Interpretation 1 to counter the view in Interpretation 2. At all levels of the mark scheme answers are expected to analyse both interpretations and discuss the difference in the views being offered, so answers should be explicit in their references to the Interpretations rather than presenting this as their own knowledge. As stated above, the interpretations do not need to be dealt with in equal depth but both should be examined explicitly.

Examiners reported some impressive answers to 3(d) and many candidates were able to engage confidently with the interpretations, taking a range of approaches. In addition, some of the strongest answers were able to show how the differences of view in the two interpretations were conveyed, for example through the use of language, tone, selection or omission of detail, and emphasis created by the structure of the interpretation.

Some candidates, however, tried too hard to include own knowledge and sometimes strayed from the interpretations and question focus. Some tried to judge the utility of the interpretations which was not required by the question. Others made reference to both the My Lai Massacre and the Tet Offensive without linking these events back to the question. Sadly many candidates missed the obvious point that the USA's indirect military assistance to South Vietnam was being replaced by direct military intervention under Johnson.

It is expected that candidates will reach a judgement when answering this question and the strongest developed their evaluation throughout the answer, creating a consistently argued response. Less successful answers offered points to support the views expressed in interpretation 2, then used interpretation 1 and contextual knowledge to challenge those views, before reaching the view that interpretation 2 was 'somewhat accurate' or saying that they 'partially agreed' with the view in Interpretation 2. In these answers, there was little sense of evaluation, simply an explanation of the different views, with the acknowledgement that each had some valid points. The strongest answers to question 3(d), therefore, focused clearly on the interpretations themselves, integrating evaluation while 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. 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 three strands:

- the quality of the judgement based on reasoning
- the analysis of the provided interpretations
- the deployment of contextual knowledge to support the application of criteria.

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.

I do agree with interpretation 2 two about the escalation of the war. Interpretation two is very correct on the fact ~~that~~ about the gulf of Tonkin incident which was a very controversial decision that affected the war. The gulf of Tonkin incident was created as a result conflict between three vietcong torpedo ship and one US ~~Nav~~ navy ship that met in north vietnam's waters which resulted in the US ship sinking all three attacking ships. This led Johnson sending out a message to the vietcong about not attacking US ships and to not do it again. So when Johnson ~~heard~~ heard that the same attack happened again, Johnson went to congress to take action against north vietnam, but when Johnson's congress bill had been approved he heard that the attack never happened and that the crew on the US ship had just got excited or couldn't tell what was happening because of bad

weather. But president Johnson ignored this and like it says in Interpretation Two "

"Johnson decided on American retaliation, ordering bombing raids against the vietcong in south ~~vietnam~~ vietnam. This is a reason why I agree with interpretation two.

I agree with Interpretation two more than one because interpretation one isn't really a big escalation like it states, because no US men are actually fighting with the vietcong at this time, all that the US is doing is sending advisers and military assistance meaning they were more or less letting the south vietnamies do the fighting which is how the war should have been fought.

And another reason why I agree more about escalation of war with president Johnson in Interpretation two is because this is a newer source and ever since the war has ended more documents have been opened and we have got to know more facts that is why Interpretation two is more reliable and more agreeable.



This response achieved level 2 for every aspect of AO4. There is a simple judgement, some analysis of the interpretations and some relevant contextual knowledge linked to the evaluation.



Know what your judgement is before you start to write your answer. In this way, you can build up a coherent answer, with a consistent line of reasoning.

I fully agree with interpretation 2 about the escalation of US involvement in the conflict in Vietnam in the 1960s because of Johnson's involvement ~~some~~ Interpretation 2 says that 'after the Gulf of Tonkin incident, Johnson decided on American retaliation' this shows that Johnson directly got involved in Vietnam because he chose to fight. I also know from my own knowledge that the Gulf of Tonkin was a major event in US involvement. Johnson claimed that when patrolling in the Gulf of Tonkin the USS Maddox and USS Turner Joy were shot at by North Vietnamese army boats. He went to Congress and one ~~report~~ Supreme Court about this issue and they told him if it happened again they could do something about it. Coincidentally it happened for the second time and in the August Johnson was granted the Gulf of Tonkin resolution which meant that he could retaliate and fight back against the Viet Cong and NVA. This shows that Johnson is escalated the involvement in Vietnam because he caused there to be a hot war rather than fighting and made it more extreme without an ~~gu~~ Gulf of Tonkin resolution their only involvement would be trying to instil containment which stopped the spread of communism but Johnson caused there to be a war.

On the other hand, I disagree with interpretation 2 using interpretation 1. This is because although interpretation 2 says that President Johnson was most responsible for involvement, interpretation 1 argues that it was actually President Kennedy. It says that he 'authorised the use of chemical weapons' and that the 'American ~~military~~ military assistance doubled'. This shows that he had major involvement as it proves that he was fighting against Vietnam and trying to prevent them from spreading communism. I know from my own knowledge that Kennedy got more involved in Vietnam than Eisenhower as he ~~was~~ made things like the Strategic hamlet program. This created little villages in Vietnam where ~~some~~ Vietnamese citizens were placed, it had all of the necessities like schools and stores however it was surrounded by barbed wire and guarded by ARVN troops. This ~~program~~ was to stop the spread of Vietcong members in the south and the protection means that less could spread information. However, this had a negative impact as many Vietnamese citizens were outraged as their previous ~~villages~~ villages were their ancestral burial sites which were ~~also~~ important and sacred to them. Furthermore, Kennedy also was the first president to use chemical warfare in Vietnam such as Agent Blue which was damaging to Vietnam. This shows that it was in fact Kennedy who had more involvement in Vietnam as he was actively trying to change Vietnam and was causing them instead which would only lead to retaliation. He was also the first to attempt nuclear war.

However, another reason to agree with interpretation

2 that the involvement ~~in~~ of the VC in Vietnam

escalated was because of Johnson is because of the offensive

Interpretation 2 says that ~~the~~ Johnson 'widened the conflict'

and that 'this was only the beginning' is because of him promoting

and encouraging the fighting in Vietnam. One of the ways

the conflict widened and VC involvement escalated was because of

the Tet offensive. Tet was Vietnamese New Year and on this day,

the North Vietnam decided to attack the ARVN and American

troops. This was originally successful for the North Vietnamese

~~troops~~ however, as time went on the ~~army~~ American soldiers

ended up killing and slaughtering over half of the NVA and

Vietcong soldiers. This shows ~~is~~ American increased

involvement as they had an impactful and brutal

fight that ended up with many ~~NVA~~ North Vietnamese

soldiers dead including innocent people which would lead

to further retaliation. Not only that but the offensive

is known as the turning point of the war as the brutal

aftermath was broadcasted on American television so many

saw that America was losing and lost support which

even caused Johnson to not stand at the re-election. Further

proving that he had escalated the involvement in Vietnam and

disgraced America which agrees with interpretation 2 as

blame of Johnson being the most responsible.

in conclusion, I ~~agree with~~ mostly agree with

interpretation 2 that Johnson was the most responsible
for escalating US involvement in Vietnam because he was the
one who asked for and received the Gulf of Tonkin

Resolution which allowed him to physically fight in Vietnam

and allowed the war to happen which shows more involvement.

However Kennedy did play a big role and had already

incurred Vietnamese citizens by disrespecting their culture but

he didn't fight which makes Johnson's involvement more

impactful.



This is a high Level 4 response as Level 4 has been achieved in all of the strands of the mark scheme for AO4. There is a sustained evaluation and a substantiated judgement. The answer analyses both interpretations and deploys this material to support the evaluation. Relevant contextual knowledge has been precisely selected to support the evaluation.



Contextual knowledge should be integrated into the evaluation of the interpretation, not offered as information or as the candidate's answer to the enquiry.

Paper Summary

Examiners commented that there were a number of impressive answers where candidates seemed well prepared and demonstrated excellent knowledge being deployed to support thoughtful analysis and evaluation.

The following points should be noted:

- While there was good knowledge of some topics, candidates cannot rely on knowing just a few key topics and hoping to use that information whatever question is asked.
- Inferences are not the same as comprehension and candidates should avoid merely describing what they see or re-wording what they read.
- Candidates need to recognise the specific focus of the question so that the information being offered is shaped to meet the demands of the question rather than simply describing a situation or including irrelevant material.
- Candidates should appreciate the difference between sources and interpretations and be aware that interpretations are constructed by historians in order to offer their view of events.
- In all parts of Question 3, it is helpful to be explicit about the source or interpretation being discussed.

Spelling, punctuation and grammar were broadly accurate and many answers used specialist terms with confidence but a poor standard of handwriting made a number of answers difficult to mark and exacerbated the difficulty in understanding a badly expressed answer.

The SPaGST marks may be affected if there are weaknesses in these areas:

- Appropriate use of capital letters
- Correct use of apostrophes
- Weak grammar ('would of', 'based off of') and casual language, which is not appropriate in an examination
- Paragraphs: failure to structure answers in paragraphs not only affects the SPaGST mark, but may also make it difficult for the examiner to identify whether three different aspects have been covered in question 2, or how well analysis and evaluation is developed in question 3.

If extra paper is taken, candidates should state clearly in the answer space for the question that it has been continued elsewhere and it should be stated where the rest of the answer has been written; this should be on an additional sheet rather than elsewhere in the answer booklet and should be clearly labelled. However, in many cases where additional paper had been taken, the marks had already been attained within the space provided rather than on the extra paper and candidates should be discouraged from assuming that lengthy answers will automatically score highly. Indeed, candidates taking extra paper sometimes ran out of time on the final, high mark question and therefore disadvantaged themselves.

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:
<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

