



Examiners' Report

June 2024

GCSE History 1HI0 32

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

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

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

June 2024

Publications Code 1HI0_32_2406_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

Introduction

Examiners commented that most students 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.

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 Interpretation 2. It is therefore important that candidates appreciate the difference between sources and interpretations, and the focus of the different parts of question 3.

In particular, there are still a number of candidates who do not understand the difference between question 3(b) and question 3(c). In question 3(b), candidates should identify the difference between the views offered in the two interpretations and support this with details from each interpretation. Most candidates found this straightforward but they sometimes repeated those points in question 3(c). 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 for the difference 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**'. This support does not need to be detailed but many answers included only quotations from, or references to, the sources or the interpretations but not both. 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; the date of publication is not significant unless it is assumed that everyone writing in a specific year shared the same view.

The focus of question 3(d) 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 of the interpretations and not just used to display knowledge. Candidates should be reminded that the content from the sources may also be used to provide contextual knowledge for the interpretations.

By question 3(d), candidates will have thought about the difference between the interpretations and will have recognised that both these alternative interpretations can be valid. A feature of strong answers in 3(d) 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, their decision of how to present their material, or their choice of emphasis. 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 is. This element of their argument is even more effective if it is integrated into the answer rather than left as a stand-alone comment. Incorporating this understanding can be seen in comments such as '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 suggests this paper was accessible to candidates of all ability and full answers were generally provided, showing that timing wasn't generally an issue on this paper.

The answer spaces provided are intended to be sufficient for the question to be answered in full and although some candidates did write on extra sheets, they were not always as successful as those who produced more concise answers. Where additional space is needed, it is important that candidates clearly state the answer is continued elsewhere and that this is done on paper, and not in the answer space for another question.

GCSE History specification and assessment changes

This note is a reminder that minor changes are being made to the Pearson Edexcel GCSE History specification content and assessment model. Assessment and language changes apply from the June 2025 exam series onwards, and content changes from the June 2026 exam series onwards.

We strongly recommend, if you haven't already, that you familiarise yourself with these changes in time for the start of the new academic year in September 2024. Some options are affected more than others, but all options are affected by the assessment changes.

Below is a link to the summary guidance document, which will help you to find all the specific information and guidance available to help you take on board these changes:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/GCSE/History/2016/Teaching-and-learning-materials/gcse-history-changes-for-2025-and-2026-summary-guidance.pdf>

If you have any queries, please contact Mark Battye, our History subject advisor, at TeachingHistory@pearson.com.

Question 1

This question requires candidates to make two inferences from a source. 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 (analyse, evaluate and use sources) and no marks are available for AO1 (knowledge and understanding). Candidates also need to ensure that the inferences they make relate to the enquiry in the question; many answers began by repeating part of the question to ensure that the inferences were valid. In some cases, the detail offered to support the inference was not properly explained and candidates should also recognise that details from the source can only be rewarded if they are provided as support for a valid inference. No marks are available for candidates who provided simple paraphrases, description, or comprehension of the source.

The most common inferences were that the Red Guard were violent, that people could be arrested or attacked without genuine justification, that not all the Red Guards wanted to be involved in violence, peer pressure acted on individual members to force them to participate in violence, and such actions were seen as demonstrations of revolutionary fervour. There were very few blank answers but occasionally the two inferences were too similar for both of them to be credited.

Complete the table below to explain your answer.

(i) What I can infer:

One thing I can infer is that, the Red Guards were violent.

Details in the source that tell me this:

~~They~~ The red guards were 'using their belts to beat her up'.

(ii) What I can infer:

Their actions were based off fear of being labelled rightists or anti-revolutionaries.

Details in the source that tell me this:

"If you didn't beat people, you were not showing enough hatred for the enemy"



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Two valid inferences are made and supported by references to the source.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Make sure the inferences are relevant to the question. The support does not need to be a quotation but it must be clear which part of the source supports the inference.

Complete the table below to explain your answer.

(i) What I can infer:

They arrested people

Details in the source that tell me this:

"Red guards arresting a young girl"

(ii) What I can infer:

They were violent

Details in the source that tell me this:

"were using their belts to beat her up"



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The first answer is comprehension rather than an inference; it has simply picked out a detail from the source. If the inference is invalid, no mark can be awarded for supporting detail from the source.

The second inference is a valid one and supported by relevant detail from the source.



Make sure the inference is based on the source and not contextual knowledge.

Question 2

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 are available to reward such evaluation, however strongly argued. Instead, the most successful candidates showed a consistent analytical focus throughout their answers and a pleasing number of candidates 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 focus of the question were unlikely to achieve high marks, despite producing detailed descriptions of Lysenkoism and backyard furnaces.

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. These answers explained how the consequences of Lysenkoism caused problems for the communes, or the way that farming was affected by the requirement to spend time on the backyard furnaces and that many tools were melted down. Answers also discussed the famine, the failure of the Four Pests campaign, the fear of reporting the failure of agricultural policies and the continued requisition of grain, and the complications caused by the layout and organisation of the communes.

Many candidates had excellent knowledge and examiners commented on the number of impressive answers. However, some knowledgeable candidates failed to score highly because they offered detailed descriptions of Lysenkoism and backyard furnaces without developing an explanation of how these caused problems for the communes. Although sometimes details were confused, there were few Level 1 answers.

Candidates should realise that any information in the sources and the interpretations for Question 3 is unlikely to be relevant in another question and furthermore, any attempt to use such details in this question is likely to mean that these sections of the answer cannot be rewarded and the answer, as a whole then lacks coherence.

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- Lysenkoism
- backyard furnaces

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

Firstly, The communes experienced a drastic decrease in crop harvest during the great leap forward. This was due to Mao's implementation and introduction of Lysenkoism. Now this was an idea developed by a Soviet scientist where he stated that if you ~~down~~ planted the seeds 6 feet underground, wet and very close to each other, then the crop yield would increase ~~a~~ greatly. Consequently to this new idea, farmers were now planting them the way that followed Lysenkoism. ~~As~~ This resulted in not many crops growing as clearly that way of farming was flawed and ineffective. Therefore, this led to a disastrous shortage of crops on the communes.

Additionally, along with Lysenkoism being a contributor towards the failures of the communes, backyard furnaces too played a key role of the failures of the communes.

Mao's intentions with the great leap forward was to get China's industrial technologies on par with that of the other powerful countries such as Great Britain. This led to the ~~and the~~ introduction of the back yard furnaces. This meant that farmers now had furnaces of their own to produce iron and other metals with in order for them to sell it, make money and help China's economy. This led to ~~the~~ farmers focusing more on the production of steel rather than cultivating crops. This resulted in the neglecting of crops which led to a disastrous shortage of food and crops. There were even some reports claiming that some farmers were burning their farming tools to meet the quota of the furnaces. This led to a lack of equipment.

Finally, Mao's introduction of the 4 pests campaign also contributed to the failure and problems of the communes. This campaign meant that the farmers were killing the birds that were eating the crops. Now for a while it seemed to work but later ~~some~~ ended up being disastrous. This was because the birds that were eating crops were also eating insects that too fed on crops. This lack of birds and

predator, lead to a population boom in insects. Consequently the crops were now getting eaten at an even faster rate than before. This ~~led~~ led to further issues and problems and again that led to a disastrous lack of crop to feed the population. As a result of this 10 million, or million of people started to die and led to the great famine.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

There is a clear focus on the question throughout the answer. Three aspects of content are used to explain why the communes experienced problems and the explanation of causation has been developed with accurate and relevant knowledge. It meets all the demands of Level 4 of the mark scheme.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

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

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- Lysenkoism
- backyard furnaces

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

One reason the communes experienced problems in the years 1958-62 was due to the unsuccessful farming techniques. Mao decided to test out a new farming technique called Lysenkoism. This was ~~said~~ supposed to produce super crops and increase the amount of crop growth. However, this was completely unsuccessful and did not increase or better crop growth. As a result, this ~~is~~ not only wasted a lot of time, but also meant that there was further reduced crop production. Therefore ~~communes~~ communes faced low crop production in the years 1958-62.

Moreover, communes faced more problems as the low crop production also resulted in a lack of food around the communes. This ~~meant that~~ also clashed with the fact that the population was growing meaning there was more to feed with insufficient food production. As a result, people in the communes were left hungry and some families starved. This led to even more problems in the communes as people had less energy and were only willing to put

in minimal effort. Hence, there were many problems experienced in the communes in the years 1958-62.

Additionally, the communes also faced problems because



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The first section demonstrates Level 3 analysis, while the second paragraph makes a valid point but does not develop it in depth (AO2 low Level 3). There is limited detail used to support the analysis (AO1 L2) and only two aspects of content are covered.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

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

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) candidates are expected to evaluate the usefulness of the content of the sources, 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 Mao's health reforms. These strands in the mark scheme are linked and should be dealt with together, rather than in isolation.

Answers suggested that candidates found the sources accessible and were confident in showing that the content of the sources was relevant for the enquiry and therefore useful. The best answers were explicit about how the information could be used by the historian, for example using the content of Source B to explain that barefoot doctors were welcomed in rural areas, or that they seemed to use traditional remedies.

Candidates should read the attribution of the sources carefully. Many recognised that Source B was produced by the government and therefore probably propaganda. Some also realised that the author of Source C had personal experience as a barefoot doctor and, writing in the UK, would not be subject to Chinese censorship.

Many candidates use the acronym NOP (Nature, Origin, Purpose) when discussing provenance but it should be remembered that they only need to discuss one of these aspects and they should think carefully about which is the most relevant. Good answers might make points about the significance of the provenance for the usefulness of the content, or use own knowledge to discuss the provenance. When considering provenance, candidates should try to avoid 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. Such comments could be made without any reference to the individual source and therefore remained at Level 1.

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 the barefoot doctors did not receive proper training' – some additional detail is needed as a demonstration of that own knowledge. In relation to Source B, answers mentioned the Patriotic Health Movement, and the eradication of cholera, plague and smallpox. Source C prompted comments about Mao's distrust of Western medicine and the limits on higher education during the Cultural Revolution.

Yet additional information should not be added as a stand-alone point. 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. Nevertheless, examiners felt that more candidates than previously made an effort to include contextual knowledge and therefore accessed Level 3.

Many lengthy answers make a number of points about content and/or provenance but without contextual knowledge. Candidates should realise that an answer consisting of several points about content will remain at Level 2, while an answer making one point about each of content, provenance and using contextual knowledge, has the potential to reach Level 3. Some answers use a checklist approach, offering brief comments about content, provenance and contextual knowledge. At Level 3, comments should be able to link these three elements in an overall evaluation of the usefulness of the sources, considering the effect of an aspect of the provenance on the usefulness of the source content, and integrating contextual knowledge in the process of reaching a judgement.

It is important to note that the question asks about the usefulness of the sources in relation to a specific enquiry, in this case, an enquiry into Mao's health reforms. 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 if this leads to a distorted impression or if the limitations are linked to a consideration of the provenance, for example whether the limitation is the result of the author's lack of knowledge or a deliberate omission. However, 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.

Good answers made clear the criteria being used to assess the usefulness of the sources for the enquiry, weighing the insight provided by 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, or how representative the source is.

There is no requirement to compare the sources or to use them in combination and no marks are available for this. Candidates who focused on comparisons between the sources often failed to develop their judgement on each source properly.

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. There are also no marks for candidates' own views of Mao's health reforms.

3 (a) Study Sources B and C.

How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into healthcare reforms in Mao's China?

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

(8)

Firstly, Source B is useful because it showcases us a government poster regarding healthcare in rural areas. It is reliable as it illustrates to us government objectives about the Chinese healthcare ~~set~~^{care} system, as during the 70s, Mao introduced ~~got~~ healthcare reforms which aimed to render healthcare for all Chinese people regardless of their location; ~~whether~~^{thus} whether urban or urban, ~~also~~ also emphasising the source's accuracy. Overall, Source B would be useful as it provides us with an insight of the ~~government's~~ CCP's objectives to make healthcare accessible to the whole population.

Whilst Source B is useful because it illustrates government objectives, Source C is useful because it showcases us a personal experience of the reformed Chinese healthcare system from an unqualified doctor. It is reliable as it is an autobiographical piece which portrays the experience of a person which has been sent to the

country side for expanding healthcare practice regardless of their unqualified status, which is accurate because one of Mao's ~~own~~ healthcare reforms saw some people living in the urban areas of China being sent off to the countryside to provide care, which however reduced in the inadequate care of patients, which showed that the reforms were not carefully considered and were used as a hasty method to resolve the lack of adequate healthcare in rural regions. Therefore, source (2) is useful because it provides us an insight from a personal experience of the reality of the healthcare reforms.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer covers all three elements (content, provenance and contextual knowledge) for each source in a concise evaluation of the sources' usefulness. Notice especially how relevant contextual knowledge is woven into the evaluation instead of being presented as additional information.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Make sure the contextual knowledge you include is relevant to the enquiry.

3 (a) Study Sources B and C.

C
R
A
C

How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into healthcare reforms in Mao's China?

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

Bare foot doctors
basic training
(8)

Source B is useful in showing the success of the healthcare reform. Source B was published by the CCP government. Source B shows the village leaders looking happy and healed which suggest that the ~~barefoot~~ barefoot doctors were a success. However, source C is useful in showing the challenges that occurred as a result of the healthcare reforms. Source C is written from a woman who was a barefoot doctor. Source C says 'Same needle to inject several different patients'. This shows the lack of hygiene that occurred due to these ~~peep~~ doctors being inexperienced as they were given the most basic training before being sent out to the villages.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer makes brief comments about the content and provenance of the sources but does not make a valid point about the content of Source C. However, the lack of contextual knowledge means the answer is limited to mid-Level 2.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

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

Question 3 (b-c)

Question 3(b)

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 rather than minor differences in detail but should also provide support from each interpretation to demonstrate that difference.

Many answers recognised that the two interpretations offered different views about Mao's health reforms and could select detail from the two interpretations to support the explanation of that difference. Answers identified a positive view of progress being offered in Interpretation 1, citing the reduction in disease, improvements in hygiene or the increase in life expectancy, while Interpretation 2 was critical of the barefoot doctors scheme, mentioning the costs of the scheme, and a poor standard of health in the countryside.

However, some answers simply selected details from the interpretations or described the views of each interpretation in turn, without explaining how this 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 overall views rather than identifying differences of surface detail as the latter can only be awarded marks in Level 1. Similarly, responses which asserted differences without support, 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.

Question 3(c)

It is important that candidates recognise the relationship between questions 3(b) and 3(c). Having identified that the two Interpretations offer different views, candidates are asked to suggest a reason why the authors have offered different Interpretations about the focus of the enquiry. 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). The best answers have a clear understanding that the Interpretations are the result of decisions made by the authors.

Examiners commented that candidates have become more confident in answering this question, particularly those who understand that historians use sources as the building blocks to form views and Interpretations. Where answers suggested that when carrying out research, the authors had placed weight on different sources, candidates could 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' or 'Interpretation 2 and Source C are both about problems with the barefoot doctors scheme'. They should also try to avoid statements such as 'Interpretation 2 supports Source B' as this suggests they have not understood the relationship between the sources and the Interpretations. The question is about the Interpretations as the end-product of the research process and Level 2 of the mark scheme refers to answers analysing the Interpretations and substantiating their explanation. However, the support does not need to be quotations, as long as the reference to the Interpretations or Sources can be identified.

Alternative explanations also recognise that the historian's approach may affect his or her research and conclusions. For example, whether an historian focuses on Mao's policies or their impact on society. The difference could also be accounted for by the authors' focus on short-term, immediate events or on more long-term developments. Here again, the explanation needs to be supported by the use of the Interpretations and an explanation of why the different focus of the authors led to different views. It is not enough to merely state that the author of Interpretation focused on the overall impact of Mao's reforms or the situation at the end of Mao's rule – details from the Interpretations must be used to exemplify the different approaches of the authors of the Interpretations.

Speculation that the difference between the Interpretations 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. There is also some additional guidance in the 2019 Examiners' Report on p.25. As stated in *Getting Started*: 'Students should distinguish between their comments on contemporary sources and on these texts. Responses based on matters such as the origin or time of production of these secondary works are unlikely to be valid for this question.'

While it is very pleasing to note that fewer candidates than previously tried to provide an explanation of the difference on the basis of such factors as the titles of the books, their origin or date of production, there was still a small number of candidates who gained no marks on this question as they merely repeated what had been said in question 3(b), asserting that the authors were biased (sometimes suggesting they were living under Mao's regime) or making statements that did not explain why authors might reach different conclusions.

Some candidates are still not clear about the different focus of questions 3(b) and 3(c) and find they have pre-empted question 3(c). These candidates need to repeat their answer in the question 3(c) answer space and write a fresh answer to question 3(b) on separate paper.

(b) Study Interpretations 1 and 2.

They give different views about healthcare reforms in Mao's China.

What is the main difference between these views?

Explain your answer, using details from **both** interpretations.

(4)

Interpretation 1 focuses on the positive effects of the barefoot doctors and how they were 'cheap to introduce' and increased life expectancy dramatically, highlighting 'Mao's life expectancy had risen to 65 years'. However, Interpretation 2 focuses on the negative effects of the barefoot doctors. It highlights how peasants had to pay for medical services by 1971 as the services was 'too high'. As well as no money was provided to help with disease or to give detailed medical examinations.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The difference between the positive and negative views in the Interpretations is clearly identified. Support is provided in the form of brief quotations and references to details within the Interpretations.



Remember to identify the difference in the overall views and then support this with clear references to each Interpretation.

(b) **Study Interpretations 1 and 2.**

They give different views about healthcare reforms in Mao's China.

What is the main difference between these views?

Explain your answer, using details from **both** interpretations.

(4)

A
~~The~~ main difference is that both
historians used evidence from different sources.
For example Interpretation 1 clearly speaks about
the CCP's progress in bettering healthcare for
peasants.
However, Interpretation 2 speaks about the
reality of healthcare and barefoot doctors.
~~They~~ The peasants were charged ~~therefore~~
causing them too much which increased ~~the~~
bad health.



The answer makes a comment about the two Interpretations but is not explicit about the difference between them. There is a reference to the content of Interpretation 2 but it is not used to explain the difference between the Interpretations.



The support being offered to explain the difference between the Interpretations does not need to be in the form of quotations but the answer does need to include clear references to each Interpretation.

(c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about healthcare reforms in Mao's China.

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

The reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about healthcare reforms is because they used different evidence. Interpretation 1 may have used Source B as it states that "the CCP made progress in healthcare". Source B shows ~~CCP pro~~ a CCP poster about this same advancement. Interpretation 2 may have used Source C as it states "the barefoot doctor scheme was not working". Source C shows the experience of a previous barefoot doctor and she states, "with my formal medical training, I went to work as a barefoot doctor". (4)



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer accounts for the difference between the Interpretations by stating the authors may have based their views on different sources. This is then supported by clear references to the views in the Interpretations being linked to details from the Sources.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

If you are using this approach, make sure you provide clear references to each of the Interpretations and both of the Sources.

(c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about healthcare reforms in Mao's China.

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

(4)

One reason interpretations 1 and 2 give different views is because they were written at different times in society. Another reason is the historians use different ^{sources} parts of the text. Evidence which would give the different ^{views} ~~views~~. Finally one ~~good~~ historian could hate Mao and try and make him look bad whilst the other would try to glorify him.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer offers three reasons for the difference between the views in the Interpretations. The first reason – that the Interpretations were written at different times – is not a valid reason why the authors have come to different conclusions about Mao's health reforms. The second reason – that they used different sources – is a valid reason but it is not developed or supported with evidence from the Interpretations and Sources. The third reason is not clearly expressed – does the candidate think the authors lived in Mao's China? If the answer means that the authors are setting out to present different impressions, that could be a valid reason for the difference in views but it would need to be supported with details from the Interpretations.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Make sure that whatever reason is given for the difference in Interpretations, it is supported by details from each Interpretation.

Question 3 (d)

Question 3(d) carries the highest number of marks on the paper. There seemed to be fewer blank answers than previously, which is particularly important as marks for Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar cannot be awarded if this answer is left blank.

Successful candidates will have already seen how the views in the Interpretations are different, thought about 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 Interpretation 2. The strongest answers to 3(d), therefore, focus 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 convincing view.

A number of answers were trapped at the lower level of the mark scheme because they saw this as a straightforward question on Mao's healthcare reforms. Although their comments were clearly inspired by the arguments in the Interpretations, they offered their own views on Mao's healthcare reforms, without reference to the Interpretations, often prefacing their comments with phrases such as 'Some people may think... however, some people may disagree'. Some students also considered a third factor, apparently treating this as a Paper 1 or B Paper 16-mark question. This approach misses the focus of the question, which is about making a judgement on the view offered in Interpretation 2.

While the use of contextual knowledge is an important element in every level of the mark scheme, it must be precisely selected and linked to the evaluation of the interpretation rather than being offered as an answer to the enquiry question. Some lengthy answers included extensive sections of additional knowledge about medical clinics being set up in communes, new hospitals being built and the fact that there were fewer than 2 million hospital beds for a population of over 900 million but lost the focus on the Interpretations; in contrast, a number of successful answers were relatively concise, integrating brief details from contextual knowledge into an evaluation of the Interpretations. 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.

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. In a number of cases, details from an interpretation were presented as independent confirmation that the interpretation is accurate. The analysis of the Interpretations was most successful if quotations or explicit references were included at various points rather than merely being used as an introduction or conclusion to a section on barefoot doctors or hygiene in rural areas. As stated above, the Interpretations do not need to be dealt with in equal depth but both should be examined explicitly. Candidates often successfully used details from Interpretation 1 to counter the view in Interpretation 2. Candidates who examined precise details from the Interpretations and then used their own knowledge to support these points were more likely to gain the higher levels. When answers focused exclusively on the view provided in interpretation 2 and used this as a basis for an essay based on their own knowledge, they were less successful.

There is no expectation of a specific structure to answers but it may be helpful to remember that the question asks how convincing Interpretation 2 is, not which interpretation the candidate finds most convincing. It is expected that candidates will reach a judgement when answering this question and the strongest candidates 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 offer a different view, before reaching the judgement 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, merely an explanation of the different views, with the acknowledgement that each had some valid points.

A number of answers explained that both Interpretations could be true, for example saying that the reforms had an immediate positive impact but that the reforms had limited significance overall. This approach was built on a consistent line of argument throughout the answer and an explanation of the criteria being used, which is different from an answer saying the interpretation is 'somewhat accurate'.

Examiners reported some impressive answers to 3(d) and many candidates were able to engage confidently with the Interpretations, taking a range of approaches. It was pleasing to see there seemed to be an increased awareness that the difference in the views in the Interpretations can be conveyed through selection/omission or emphasis as well as language and tone.

The focus should remain on the Interpretations and candidates who examined precise details from the Interpretations and then used their own knowledge to support these points were more likely to gain the higher levels than those who focused on the enquiry and included extensive sections of contextual knowledge.

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 analysis of the provided Interpretations
- The deployment of contextual knowledge to support the application of criteria
- The quality of the judgement based on reasoning and the evidence presented.

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about healthcare reforms in Mao's China?

Interp 1
Interp 2
concl

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

(16)

I partially agree with interpretation 2 about the healthcare reforms as it gives some good points about the economic issues of the reforms however it fails to mention the social problems that came with it, ~~and~~ also the successes of it.

Interpretation 2 has some very good information about how it didn't take long for the reforms to decline and how by 1971 it cost large amounts of money for large parts of the countryside. In the "up to the mountains, down to the villages" campaign (which Mao launched in the late 1960s) one of its goals was ~~it~~ to make healthcare affordable and in some areas free. However it didn't work and interpretation 2 shows very well the effects of this failure. For example interpretation 2 says how the cost of

the healthcare was too high so many had to go without which led to disease spreading and death following. In the ~~the~~ healthcare campaigns Mao also ~~was~~ set the goal of spreading knowledge and more understanding of illness so people could help one another without the need of a bourgeois doctor. Mao succeeded in this, which interpretation 2 fails to show.

Interpretation 1 is very good and gives good views on the healthcare reforms as it shows the success from the reforms. This is very good as overall the healthcare reforms ~~were~~ ^{were} a positive thing and it led to many lives being saved by the increased ~~efforts~~ ^{efforts} to raise standard health care. Interpretation 1 shows the progress made by the CCP such as the increased number of health clinics and increased awareness. Prior to the reforms and ~~even~~ especially during The Great Famine disease awareness was so poor that even a slight illness like a cold could kill

hundreds of thousands. Interpretation 1 also shows off how before 1949 the life expectancy was an ~~average~~ ^{average} ~~of~~ 36 years but by 1976 it had almost doubled to 65 years. This shows how while most of the CCP's campaigns were catastrophic and led to ^{around 80} millions ~~of~~ deaths, the healthcare reforms ~~was~~ ^{was} ~~was~~ something Mao did well. However that's not to say they were perfect as the quality of the healthcare wasn't brilliant and interpretation 2 shows the economic problems.

Overall, I partially agree with interpretation 2 about the healthcare reforms because it is ^{honest} very good at showing the financial issues ~~it~~ does only that. Adding to that, the healthcare reforms ~~was~~ ^{were} overall positive. So I agree more with interpretation 1 as it shows the important success of the reforms which interpretation 2 does not.



The candidate's judgement is explained at the start of the answer and a consistent line of reasoning runs throughout the answer. Both Interpretations are analysed, incorporating contextual knowledge but staying focused on the interpretations. The answer is concise yet it meets the demands of Level 4 of the mark scheme.

It also shows how the selection of detail and use of emphasis conveys different views, for example 'Mao succeeded in this, which Interpretation 2 fails to show', 'Interpretation 2 is very good at showing the financial issues, however, it does only that', 'the healthcare reforms were overall positive... Interpretation 1 shows the important success of the reforms, which Interpretation 2 does not'. Using phrases such as 'fails to show', and 'does only that' recognises that the impression created is the result of the authors' deliberate choices.



Link your contextual knowledge to regular references to specific points in the Interpretations. This will help you to stay focused on the evaluation.

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about healthcare reforms in Mao's China?

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

(16)

I agree with Interpretation 2 to a large extent. Due to Mao's health care reforms, China ultimately experienced poor national health which could have been prevented had he not purged intellectuals such as doctors due to him viewing them as nationalists.

Firstly, one of Mao's healthcare reforms was introducing barefoot doctors.

Firstly, one of Mao's health reforms was purging doctors as he believed they were rightist which opposed his revolutionary beliefs. As a result, people were not given the correct medicines or diagnosed with the correct illness. Some people were not even treated. The lack of doctors caused ill health and diseases to spread quickly causing health care to become poor and futile.

Additionally, another healthcare reform was introducing bare foot doctors. These doctors had basic first aid training but not enough medical knowledge or experience to know what they were treating and how to actually treat it. As a result, diseases spread quickly causing bad health. This is reinforced in Interpretation 2: "bad health was usual ~~in~~ in large areas". This was a result of lack of education towards proper sanitation/hygiene, and ~~the~~ bare foot doctors not being able to accurately treat people. This ultimately led to bad health care, as suggested by Interpretation 2, caused by Mao's healthcare reforms.

Furthermore, another reason healthcare was poor in Mao's China was due to the over exaggeration and propaganda from the CCP which masked the ~~true~~ true entirety of the situation. Interpretation 1 states 'health care reforms were cheap to introduce'. Although this appears as beneficial as it is an advantage to the economy, it suggests that there was a lack of funding put into healthcare. This would ultimately cause it to become poor as less medicines are being made, less people are ~~going~~ treated. Additionally, Interpretation 1 states 'young people were trained to recognise and report diseases'. However, in Mao's China

bare foot doctors lacked medical training which meant they couldn't correctly treat diseases. This propaganda ~~or~~ indoctrinated society to believe that the health care was ~~ok~~ alright when in reality it was far from it. As a result, health care in Mao's China suffered.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer offers valid points, agreeing with Interpretation 2, but it is not focused on evaluating the Interpretations. It is a discussion of Mao's healthcare reforms, using the Interpretations as evidence, for example 'this is reinforced in Interpretation 2', 'this ultimately led to bad health cures, as suggested by Interpretation 2'.

There is some analysis in the selection of detail from the Interpretations and relevant contextual knowledge is included, but a line of reasoning not established.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Remember that the question asks how far you agree with Interpretation 2; it is not an essay on Mao's healthcare reforms.

Paper Summary

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

Based on their performance in this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

- 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.
- 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>

