



Examiners' Report **June 2023**

Int GCSE History 4HI1 02

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 2023

Publications Code 4HI1_02_2306_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

Introduction

General Comments

The paper has two sections, Section A and Section B

Section A questions have three sub-parts:

Question Part A focuses on Assessment Objective 1, testing knowledge and understanding of the characteristics of the period studied.

Question Parts B and C address Assessment Objectives 3 and 4 with candidates asked to consider two historical sources and a modern extract before answering questions based on cross-reference and evaluation of a historical interpretation.

Part A is well-answered by most candidates, and the practice of writing two separate paragraphs beginning 'one feature'... 'a second feature', continues to be the best approach to answering this question. However some candidates feel the need to write at length in response to this question rather than focusing on factual information. Lengthy responses are not needed; what is needed is precise detail in order to receive high marks on this objective one question. Obviously candidates do not lose marks for over-lengthy answers, but they do use up valuable time which could be better used on other questions.

It is now rare to see candidates identifying just agreement or disagreement in Question Part B and most candidates demonstrate a high level of skill in supporting their answers, either by quoting or paraphrasing the sources. Where centres may want to concentrate their efforts in preparing candidates is on considering the extent of agreement or disagreement in the two sources. Some candidates attempt to demonstrate this by repeating what they have already said in their response, so as to emphasise that there is some agreement and some disagreement. What they should be doing is considering each source as a whole and then considering the overall impression given by that source. They will then be able to carry out matching to see agreement and disagreement but should be able to explain that there are areas where agreement/disagreement is strong and other areas where it is weak or non-existent. This should lead to a final conclusion that whatever the agreements/disagreements, essentially the sources largely agree/disagree.

In Question Part C candidates are becoming increasingly skilled at matching information in Sources A and B with what is said in the extract and also noting any internal contradictions within that extract. They must not forget however, that they are required to use their contextual knowledge to support their arguments. Part C is not an exercise in matching information between the sources and the extract, though obviously that work has to be done. Candidates should ask themselves whether what they are reading is in keeping with what they already know about the topic and use their knowledge to support their arguments.

A minority of candidates choose to answer the question solely from their own knowledge, ignoring the sources and extract. This is poor exam technique, as reference to the generic mark scheme will show that one of the criteria in awarding marks is 'analysis of the provided materials'.

Centres are reminded that to reach the highest marks candidates need to reach a judgement on the validity of the interpretation. Many candidates leave this aspect of their answer until a concluding final paragraph, but best responses are often those which state their position at the beginning of their response and follow it through in each paragraph.

Section B questions have three sub-parts:

Part A asks for a candidates to explain two ways in which an aspect of a country's history in one period was different from (or similar to) another period. There was clear evidence of candidates adopting a more comparative approach in this year's examination, rather than just giving details from each of the two time periods. Following last year's report it was pleasing to see a continuing increase in the use of 'comparative vocabulary', such as 'similarly' or 'whereas' in helping demonstrate similarity or difference.

Part B continues to be answered well, with the best responses clearly demonstrating a link between the chosen factors and the given outcome. There was a tendency in some less successful answers to write 'around' the topic, rather than focus on the context given in the question. For example B2b was a question on medical treatment, not problems faced by soldiers and B7b was about the success of Shuttle Diplomacy, rather than Shuttle Diplomacy itself.

Part C asks candidates to consider the extent of change or the causes of that change. The evidence from this year's paper suggests that centres have fully understood the need for candidates to introduce a least one factor in addition to those given in the question. Most candidates showed good examination technique in answering Part C questions, though they sometimes failed to provide an explanation of how the hypothesis could be supported and opposed.

Example Responses

This report provides examples of a top-level responses for each of the three question sub-parts. Examples have been provided from the most popular options in the expectation that centres will be able to apply the approach shown in each example to their own chosen option. Examples have also been provided of responses to questions on the new topic '*Diversity, Rights and Equality in Britain, (1914-1920)*', as centres may find this of interest.

Question (A)1

Life in the trenches proved the most popular option and candidates displayed good knowledge on this topic. Candidates who answered on the Triple Entente scored less well, with some answers tending to give detail of the formation of the Triple Alliance rather than concentrating solely on the Triple Entente.

In Part B, candidates had little difficulty identifying similarity and difference between Source A and Source B and responses were well supported. There were also some impressive analyses of the extent of support and difference between the two sources. Part C was also well answered, though there was a tendency among some candidates to approach the question as if it were simply a question of matching sources A and B against Extract C to validate the hypothesis. Candidates were not expected to have a detailed knowledge of the sinking of the Lusitania, but they were expected to have an understanding of the impact of the sinking and the context in which it took place. The use of contextual knowledge to support analysis of the sources and extract is vital if responses are to reach the highest level.

Part A: This candidate has chosen to answer on the Triple Entente.

(a) One feature of the Triple Entente was that it set to further divide Europe and the Great Powers into 2 groups. This is because France, Britain and Russia signed it in 1907 following the events of the 1st Moroccan Crisis where the Kaiser's militant moves to oppose imperial authority of France because of their long-standing rivalry from the occupation of Alsace Lorraine in 1871. The Triple Entente highlighted how ~~intimidated~~ intimidated Britain was from Germany and the inevitability of war.

Another feature of the Triple Entente was the fact it was not a military agreement. Like the Entente Cordiale 'friendly understanding' between Britain and France in 1904 the Triple Entente made no pledges to go into war for the other unlike the Triple Alliance where Germany handed a 'blank cheque' to Austria Hungary (AH). This meant Britain was not obligated to fight if war broke out between France and Russia instead willing to stay in 'splendid isolation'.

((b) continued) German reactions were overall 'delighted' ^{or positive} ~~in response~~ to the news.



Part A: Two features are covered, with each containing specific information to demonstrate good understanding of the pre-war period.

This is clearly a top level response.

Part B: This response considers the degree of support.

Source A agrees with source B in some aspects: as source A agrees that the sinking of Lusitania ~~was~~ was justified 'as part of its submarine blockade of Britain, the German reaction ~~at~~ to the sinking of Lusitania ~~was~~ is conveyed, which suggests that on German side, they considered the attack as a self-defence. Likewise in source B, it states that 'Germany sank the Lusitania in self-defence to protect the lives of our armed forces', which suggests that Germany attacked in the suspicion of Lusitania carrying arms, which can be proven from the fact that its ~~army~~ ^{army} cargo was modified before its sailing, as well as the pre-warnings delivered by the Germany's government that crossing the sea would result in firing. Thus, source A agrees with source B that Germany had its own justifications about the attack brought.

However, source A disagrees with source B in many aspects: as source A portrays that 'the world was shocked reacted with horror to the loss of life on Lusitania', the loss of lives, which was recorded approximately ~~to~~ 1200, and the international anger brought is delivered, especially USA, which had 120 ^{and delivered} ~~and~~ deaths from the ~~the~~ event, which provoked the countries ~~in~~ ⁱⁿ contrast in newspapers at the time. In contrast, source B conveys that 'The Lusitania sank so quickly because its cargo of ammunition exploded when struck by the torpedo', which suggests that the U-20 torpedoed the ship, as it was not 'innocent' as the British government claimed, but rather used as a weapon

delivery weapon. Thus, Source A disagrees with source B about whether Lusitania was purely for carrying weapons or not.

Overall, Source A mostly disagrees with Source B, as it ~~is~~ Source A blames Germany for carrying out attack on innocent lives, while Source B states that it was merely the deaths of the innocents.

Source A agrees with ~~source~~ extract C: as Source A states that 'The world reacted with horror to the loss of life on Lusitania', the international anger caused by the German attack is brought, which suggests that it provoked many countries because of its attack on civilians. Likewise, extract C states that ~~the~~ German attack killed '1198 people, including many women and children', which suggests ~~that~~ that many civilians who weren't ~~to~~ directly related to the war had died, which implies an anger caused by such a killing, as it emphasises women and children. However, Source A disagrees with extract C in some aspects: as Source A states that 'the Lusitania was an unarmed passenger vessel', it suggests that Germany was not justified about its reason for such an attack, so as ~~see~~ it seen such by many other countries, especially the USA. ~~Thus, Source A mostly in~~ ~~disagree with~~ contrast, ^{extract} ~~source~~ C states that 'Germany was justified in sinking the Lusitania', the justification for German attack is implied, which suggests that Germany had its all rights to have suspicions about Lusitania shipping secretly the US weapons to help the Allies of Britain and France. Thus, Source A mostly disagree with ~~source~~ extract C, as it says that German attack was unjustifiable, as it killed innocent civilians, ~~to~~ ~~of how~~ ~~the~~ ~~it~~ and used just for that ~~purpose~~ purpose, as later claimed by the British Government.



Part B: Note the use of the terms 'in some respects' and 'in many respects' to show agreement and difference but also to evaluate the degree of support.

Although the conclusion is not strong, this is a sound top-level response.

Part C: A well-written, persuasive response.

The sinking of Lusitania was a major turning point for WWI as it is the a reason for the US entry to war. In this essay I will be discussing the events and why the sinking was not justified, ^{unlike what extract C says.} ~~according to extract C~~.

In 1915, when the Lusitania was sunk, it killed 1198 people, including 128 americans. ~~There~~ In particular, the americans were not there ~~under war orders~~ or unrelated to war, and so were killed, resulting in american ~~outcry~~ outcry. This is supported from Source A that says "the world has reeled with horror to the loss of life", conveying how people believed it was unjust. Conversely, Source A says "Germany was justified in sinking the Lusitania." They then write that this was due to ~~type~~ ~~Britain~~ ~~ignoring~~ ~~warnings~~ the British navy ignoring warnings to change the course. This tells us that extract C is ~~depicting~~ justifying German's actions by writing about the Britain's faults that lead to the sinking. They also justify by saying "they had to prevent Britain from receiving supplies". However, this was the same ^{for} both countries. In particular during the naval race, each country

((c) continued) Was in competition to build ^{the} best ships, and navy. This led to the release & making of HMS Dreadnought. A ship unlike anything seen before. It would fire shells 32 km away, and had a top speed of 5 knots. Enemy ships were unable to get close without getting sunk. Germany responded with ~~Big Bertha~~ HMS Renard, a ship with ~~similar~~ similar capabilities. This was all due to the hunger and desire to gain control of the channels to stop supplies from one - another. Source K suggests that patrolling the channels was a act exclusively done by Britain, but Germany were just as involved. They each wanted to stop supplies. Thus, Source C can't effectively use this as a justification as it ~~presents~~ ^{shows} a hypocritical opinion. This illustrates how Source B & C believes it was very much justified. Source B supports this as they state "exploded when struck by torpedo", conveying how Germany would use torpedos as a defense, ~~or patrolling the water~~ patrolling the waters, ~~a key~~ another key feature of the naval race. ~~Because the~~ The Naval Race is ~~one~~ a reason as to why I do not support extract C's views, as battle for supplies across seas was something occurring for Germany and Britain.

An F. Moreo Extract C also suggests that also states that "Bath Lusitania sank, killing 1198 people including many women & children". This again ~~could~~ is contradictory as the women and children did not have a ~~major~~ part in the war fighting on a ^{British} navy, therefore would have no reason to be on the ~~boat~~ ^{they were on}, so ~~conveying~~ ^{conveying implying} that it was a more likely passenger liner. This is also supported by A because it ~~se~~ writes "it was an unarmed passenger vessel". Realistically, a vessel with women and children would not have been used to ~~threaten~~ ^{threaten} Germany as that would have been done by the ^{newly} established and strong ^{British} navy. This implies that Source C is ~~at~~ attempting to justify the loss of life by claiming it posed a threat to Germany ~~claiming~~, even though ~~by~~ despite saying there were "many women and children". Moreover, if there ~~were~~ ^{were} not as many ~~unarmed~~ Americans killed as claimed then ~~it~~ ^{it} ~~would not justify~~ ^{would not justify} ~~it~~ ^{would not justify} ~~it~~ ^{would not justify} a country not ~~wanting~~ ^{wanting} to get involved, to ~~join~~ ^{to join} the war in 1917. ~~The~~ ^{This} further suggests how Extract C supports Germany's actions to a significant extent, despite the discrepancies within their account. This interpretation I do not

Source B ~~say~~ narrates the opinion that Germany sunk the boat in self defense. This is seen in "Germany sunk the Lusitania in self defense to protect the lives of our armed forces". This supports Source C that writes "British navy ignored Germany's warnings" which tells us that Germany knew that they British posed a threat and so warned them in advance. These both depict the view that Germany to the attack was not out of Germany's control, and that they were both doing this for the protection. Source A disagrees with this ~~maintaining~~ maintaining the ^{view} ~~opinion~~ that it was unarmed and passenger vessel.

To conclude, Source C justifies the sinking of Lusitania, to a significant extent, and I do not agree with this ~~open~~ account. They maintain the view that it was a ~~passenger~~ not a passenger vessel, despite transporting 'many women and ~~but~~ kids'. Moreover

((c) continued) ~~the~~ USA entry to war in 1917, a country that had not been involved from the start of war in ~~1918~~ 1914, the attack ~~on~~ Germany killing 128 people ~~they~~ ~~the~~ who were innocent, was surely an indicator that what ~~the~~ Germany did was not justified.



The response considers evidence from the sources and extract and uses contextual knowledge to construct a balanced argument with a convincing conclusion.

A high-scoring top-level response.

Question (A)2

Candidates demonstrated a good knowledge of opposition to the NEP but there was some confusion about the Bolshevik takeover. Some candidates wrote about the February revolution and the overthrow of the Tsar, whilst others described events during the civil war. What was required was details of the October Revolution, establishing the Bolsheviks in power.

In Part B, candidates readily found similarity and difference between sources A and B, particularly by analysing the Tsar's attitude to the Duma. Most candidates noted the strong agreement between the sources with regard to the expectations of the Tsar, and similarly strong difference in terms of how successful the Dumas were. Part C was well answered, with some candidates showing an impressive understanding of the context leading to the formation of the Dumas and the attempts by the Tsar and his ministers to undermine the Dumas' work.

Part B: A balanced answer.

(b) The evidence in source A mainly disagrees with the evidence in source B. This is apparent in many parts, as source A shows the Tsar "welcome"ing the duma, but source B presents him dismissing it, in disappointment. The Tsar's hopefulness in source A about the Duma, is not seen anywhere in source B, as his belief in "a brilliant future for Russia" in source A makes no appearance in source B. Additionally, the Duma disappointing the Tsar by "intending to make trouble and arouse mistrust among the people" in source B, is replaced by the "difficult tasks" the DUMA must deal with to honor the "faith" the Tsar has put in it.

Although mostly disagreeing, the two sources do agree on some aspects of the Tsar's relationship with the DUMAs, as both sources mention them having the same goal. In source A the Tsar is "convinced" that the duma will "devote all its strength into saving Russia and the nation's well-being", which co-relates with his point in source B, of the DUMA being "called to establish peace and a good government in Russia."

In conclusion, ~~at~~ the evidence of

((b) continued) the 2 sources mainly disagree on the Tsar's relationship with the DUMA, with source A depicting him very supportive and hopeful of the DUMA's potential and honor, but source B presenting him as disappointed and angry with the DUMA's troublesome actions resulting in their dismissal. Although they do agree on the initial purpose of the DUMA's, being improving the nation's political government and overall well being with honor, they clearly disagree on the potential of the DUMA very much opposing its actual actions in source B, which is why they mostly disagree.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Note the use of language to show that the degree of support is being considered e.g. 'mainly disagrees', 'do agree on some aspects'.

Rewarded at top level for demonstrating the degree of support.

Part A: The candidate has answered on the Bolshevik takeover.

One feature of the Bolshevik takeover of power was the storming of the Winter Palace. This was led by Trotsky, who used to be the Commissar of War during the February Revolution. The Winter Palace was the home of the Provisional Government, the government that was set up to rule Russia before democratic elections could be held. The storming and taking over of the Winter Palace was therefore the decisive move in the takeover of power to defeat the Provisional Government and take power for themselves.

Another feature was Lenin's leadership. The takeover of power wouldn't have been possible without the leadership of Lenin. His speeches led to the massive growth of the Bolsheviks, allowing them to gain the support needed to take over power. Alongside Trotsky he was able to coordinate the takeover at the right time to gain power. His ideas were influential to the Bolsheviks, many of them outlined in the April Thesis, allowing the Bolshevik takeover to take place.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Two features covered. Each has good supporting material and would be marked at the top level.

Part C: A rather formulaic approach to the question but high scoring.

(c) I agree to a partial extent with the idea that the creation of the Duma helped to improve the way Russia was governed. The most important factor in assessing this is ~~the~~ the fundamental laws, the factor of medium importance is that it was democratically elected, and the least important factor is that it was not trusted by the Tsar.

The most important factor is the fundamental laws. In April 1906, a few months after the October manifesto, Tsar Nicholas II published the fundamental laws, which reversed many of his promises. The tsar had the power to dissolve the Duma at any time, and all decisions made by the Duma could be vetoed by the Tsar. This meant that its powers were limited. Source B supports this, writing, 'a new Duma will be called in November this year,' which reflects the fact that Dumas were often dissolved quickly with long breaks in between. In addition, Extract C writes, 'did not always succeed in... pushing through reforms.' This refers to the Tsar's power to veto the Duma's decisions. The Dumas lost influence due to the fundamental laws.

((c) continued) However, the Third Duma lasted for its full 5 year term, which ~~soo~~ demonstrates a growth in support for the Duma, and meant that it had more influence. On balance, the Fundamental Laws is the most important factor as they greatly limited the power of the Duma and ~~therefore~~ its ability to improve the way Russia was governed.

The factor of medium importance is the fact that the Duma representatives were democratically elected. This took Russia a step closer to being a constitutional democracy, and away from autocracy. The Romanov family had been in power for ~~ready~~ over 300 years, with the dynasty having begun in 1613. Many other countries were becoming democratic, so ~~these~~ the Duma gave the Russian people hope that there was going to be political change.

Source A writes, 'the elected representatives of the Russian people,' which demonstrates the fact that the Duma reflected the views of the Russian people. However, the representation of different groups decreased vastly between the second and third Dumas, as ~~so~~ Extract C writes, 'only the richest could vote in elections.'

((c) continued) This meant that the effect on Russia's governance was limited. On balance, the Duma being democratically elected is the factor of medium importance as that was only the case with the first two dumas.

~~The fact that the Dumas were~~
the least important factor is the fact that the Dumas were not trusted by the Tsar. Tsar Nicholas II was a firm believer in autocracy, and was unwilling to share his power with the Duma, but the 1905 revolution had forced him to make concessions. Source B writes, 'they intended to ~~to~~ make trouble and arouse mistrust among the people,' which highlights the Tsar's lack of trust. In addition, extract C writes, 'criticism of the Tsar in the first two Dumas.' The opposition to the Tsar by the Dumas made him even more reluctant to cooperate with them, and the Dumas' power was therefore very limited. However, extract C writes that, 'the Duma offered a major platform for political debate,' and that 'the debates were reported in the newspapers' which shows that the Dumas did have some influence on Russia. On balance, the Tsar's lack

((c) continued) of trust in the Dumas is the least important factor as the Dumas had limited influence to begin with, and this exacerbated that problem.

In conclusion, I agree to a small extent with the idea that the creation of the Duma helped to improve the way Russia was governed. The most important factor in assessing this is the fundamental laws, the factor of medium importance is the fact that it was elected, and the least important factor is ~~that~~ the Tsar's lack of trust in the Dumas.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The response uses contextual knowledge and the information to build a convincing response. There is an attempt to prioritise factors but this is not really needed on this question.

There is sufficient here to be rewarded in Level 4.

Question (A)3

In Part A candidates answered well on Hooverilles, though some mistakenly thought they had actually been set up by Hoover himself. Responses on the Palmer raids were less common, but when chosen, candidates seem to have a good understanding of the topic.

In Part B the difference between the standards of living described in sources A and B was well noted with candidates also aware that the two sources demonstrated a generally higher standard of living in the USA then elsewhere. This was an important factor in reaching a conclusion on the degree of support or difference as the two sources both described wealth and prosperity but differed in how widespread the prosperity was. This was a key factor in Part C, where candidates often carried out a very detailed audit of the sources and extract in answering the question. However, in this option there was less support from contextual knowledge then that demonstrated in other options. Sometimes the contextual knowledge provided related to the Wall Street Crash and its consequences, which was not relevant to a question on the roaring twenties.

Part A: The candidate has answered on Hoovervilles.

Hoovervilles, were unattractive lodgings built/purchased by people after the Wall Street Crash and during the Great Depression. They were shanty towns, in Washington DC and New York, for example. As the unemployed and middle class citizens had lost their savings they had no financial security resulting in lack of money. This prevented them from renting/buying housing resulting in temporary housing such as Hoovervilles.

Another feature of Hoovervilles is their name. They were named after President Hoover, who promoted Laissez-faire policies and voluntarism where the government promoted individualism and an 'every man for himself motto'. This resulted in a worsening of the economic state of the USA and the citizens used

((a) continued) The name as a small rebellion against Hoover who had ironically not guaranteed 'villa's' for them but the opposite.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Some use of incorrect information but plenty in the response to demonstrate a clear understanding of the role of Hoovervilles, with two features covered.

Part B: A balanced response but not well-developed.

(b) One similarity is that both sources is that they both agree that the life of ordinary Americans was, on the whole, improved. We can see this in source A as it states: "Life in our own ordinary house was greatly improved during the Roaring Twenties". We can also see this in source B where it says: "An ordinary American has a life similar to the privileged classes". This shows that ~~both~~ both sources ^{strongly} agree that generally, the life of Americans was improved in the Roaring Twenties. This was caused by the economic boom and the growth of new consumer goods along with advertising and credit, which allowed and encouraged average Americans to purchase these new goods, boosting industry and business.

One difference is that where source A notes that not every American prospered in the 1920s, source B shows ~~that~~ only the positive impacts on their lives. We can see this as source A says: "Not everybody did so well," whereas source B says: "ordinary Americans similar to privileged classes". These contradict as source A allows us to see how many people suffered due to the growth of companies and new industries and how it caused them to lose their jobs, but source B only mentions how the US was leading in manufacturing automobiles and much more and the positive effects those had on the people. This clearly shows that the sources strongly contradict.

One other similarity ~~was~~ between the sources is that both mention how the automobile industry was thriving. We can see this as source A says: "company that built my father's car ~~was~~... was put out of business by Ford and mass production" and in source B as it says: "US citizens owned 81 per cent of all the automobiles in the world". Both of these show

((b) continued) how the assembly line and mass production helped to boost the sales of Ford automobiles, even going as far as to mention how it crushed other companies.

Overall, I think these sources mostly agree, as they both admit that life in the 1920s was generally more prosperous, but whereas source A mentions the downturns, source B completely ignores them.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The response identifies similarity and difference and considers the extent of support. The answer reaches Level 3, though needs a little more development for full marks.

((c) continued) goods during this era. Although agreement towards this view is seen by Source B which suggests that statistics such as '10 percent of Americans owned a car' and further makes us compare how the ^{high} consumption of 'gasoline and milk' in the USA with the rest of the 'world'; Source A does not agree that ~~consumer~~ consumerism would have been ~~argued~~ the greatest cause for prosperity in the Roaring Twenties as 'Mass production' did account for ~~the~~ numerous companies being 'put out of business', as opposed to the view of Mass production in ~~the~~ Source A extract C. We know that Mass production had brought great development to many industries, especially the automobile industry as it has ~~for~~ ~~the~~ increased the speed of the manufacturing process. This is known ~~especially~~ in particular from the Ford company who which was able to produce one ~~no~~ Model-T car every 10 seconds on one day in October 1921.

((c) continued) Furthermore, source A and extract C suggest that the prosperity of the 1920s was not distributed among everyone in the American. ~~Source~~ Source A hints this through the line 'Not everybody did well' and ~~the~~ further ~~present~~ presents how the writer's own family ~~was~~ was brought into poverty, while extract C presents us to how 'farmers, immigrants and black Americans' were all unimpacted by the economic gain of the United States in the 1920s. Contrarily, ~~source~~ source C, ~~suggests~~ ^{mentions} that 'ordinary Americans' lived 'a life similar to the privileged ~~the~~ classes everywhere else' demonstrating the single view that every American's life had improved.

In conclusion, it ~~cannot be said~~ ^{must be agreed} upon the view that not many Americans shared the prosperity of the Roaring Twenties. Although ~~the~~ all sources mutually agree of the ~~the~~ immense social and financial development went through, ^{per fact} it must be considered that ~~many~~ many industries such as the steel industry and cotton industry ~~did go through~~ suffer the effects ~~of~~ of over production that resulted from the consumerism of

((c) continued) the 1920s, as did ~~certains~~ many farmers and minorities of the USA, who were either victims to Mass production or changing demands.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This is a good response with the source and extract interrogated well.

It needs a little more contextual knowledge in support but reaches top level.

Question (A)4

Only a small minority of candidates chose to answer on this option. Almost all candidates answered on Strategic Hamlets and knew the topic well. Candidates readily found differences between sources A and B but were less confident on similarities between them. Perhaps the most obvious similarity was that both sources showed the Paris peace talks led to an agreement accepted by the US government. The majority of candidates argued strongly that the Paris agreement did lead directly to the final defeat of South Vietnam with some good contextual knowledge used to show how difficult it was for South Vietnam to resist renewed communist offences – even though the USA continued to supply money and material after the agreement.

Question (A)5

There were too few candidates answering this question to report on general performance.

Question (B)1

There were too few candidates answering this question to report on general performance.

Question (B)2

Medicine is a popular topic and there was good knowledge demonstrated in response to the three questions set. In Part A, candidates tended to focus on improvements in anaesthetics and a reduction in infection as a result of the work of Lister and Snow. It was unfortunate that some candidates thought there were no anaesthetics before 1848. Candidates knew a great deal about the problems of medical treatment during World War One, though some responses tended to give details of poor conditions and the wide variety of injuries rather than considering how treatment was difficult. Best responses focused on the problems of X-rays and blood transfusions, the lack of effective antibiotics and the newness of some of the medical issues, such as the need for plastic surgery. Most candidates chose the Part C question on Florence Nightingale and had a good knowledge of women in medicine. In Part C(ii) there was a strong emphasis on the development of penicillin and the importance of war, both of which were important factors in bringing about change in medicine.

Part A: An excellent response, based on comparison between the two time periods.

(a) One way in which surgery in 1848 was different in 1875 was surgery's had become aseptic. This was because, in 1967, after the work of Pasteur's Germ Theory had been released in 1861, Lister realised that the carbolic acid which was used to treat sewage, could be used to treat infections. In 1967, he began using it to sterilise equipment and in wounds. This differed from surgery in 1848 because as they had not realised the link between germs and disease, the conditions which surgeries were done in were very unclean. For example, doctors did not wash their hands and

(a) continued) used unclean tourniquets and bandages leading to infection.

Another way in which surgery was different was ^{the} pain relief of Chloroform was more widely used.

In ~~1847~~, c. 1846, William Morton began using Ether in ~~medic~~ surgery however it caused vomiting and irritated the lungs so in 1847, Simpson developed chloroform which was an effective anaesthetic. However in 1848 it was not widely used because it was believed that childbirth should be painful and doctors feared unconscious people would die more easily. ~~But in~~ As a result, in 1845 surgeons were rushed to avoid pain. But in 1853 during the birth of her 8th child, Queen Victoria claimed that chloroform was "blessed" so by 1875, painkillers were used widely in many operations.



Very thorough coverage of the move to aseptic surgery, followed by precise knowledge of how the use of anaesthetics changed in the period.

Clearly Level Three.

Part B: A moderate response lacking specific detail.

(b) One cause of the problems of the medical treatment in the First World War was the lack of equipment that they were able to use to treat soldiers on the front line. The distance from ~~to~~ the front line compared to the dressing station were around 18km away in the first world war. The efficiency of treating the soldiers was very slow, due to the slow acceptance of technology such as x-rays in the war. As a result of this, the inaccessibility of medical treatment was one of the main causes of the build up of casualties in the first world war.

A second cause of the problems of the medical treatment was the lack of knowledge. As the war progressed, injuries such as trench foot became more common, yet full understanding of why this occurred was not yet known. As a result, incorrect remedies such as salt-soaking was the most available treatment, yet did not completely eliminate the problems completely. Diseases like this spread quickly, as the acceptance of the understanding of the Germ

((b) continued) theory and all its applications to medicine was not yet met



The candidate validly claims that there was a lack of suitable equipment, but the example given is not valid. Whilst it is true that there was, as yet, no effective antibiotic, it is untrue to suggest that the germ theory was not widely accepted in 1914.

A low Level 2 response.

Part C: A well-answered and balanced response.

(c)(ii) OR (c)(iii) In the years 1920-48, there were huge developments in science and technology that lead to ^{significant} improvements in medicine including: penicillin to fight infection, ~~the NHS~~ and ^{the} use of blood plasma in transfusions.

Penicillin was first discovered by Fleming in 1928 after he returned from holiday and discovered that ^a mould growing on some of his petri dishes had killed the bacteria surrounding it. He carried out further research and published his findings in 1929. Florey and Chain were interested by Fleming's work and managed to secure 5 years of funding for research ~~to~~ from the USA. In 1941, they tested penicillin on a policeman with sepsis and found that it did work to fight infection (although they didn't have enough to cure the policeman completely). The US government saw penicillin's potential for fighting infection during WW2 and commissioned its mass production (the British government followed suit in 1943). Due to its mass production, Penicillin was able to save the lives of thousands of

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued) ~~4~~ soldiers and therefore was a huge breakthrough in medical treatment. By 1946, ~~a doctor~~ doctors in Britain could prescribe penicillin to the public and it saved many lives by 1948. It was also extremely significant because penicillin ~~could~~ seemed to cure most bacterial infections (unlike ^{other cures such as} Salvarsan 606 which was discovered in 1909 and only cured syphilis).

Another breakthrough in science and technology between 1920-48 was the use of blood plasma in blood transfusions. In 1934, it was found that blood plasma could be used ~~to~~ (as an alternative to all components of the blood together) for patients with blood loss. This was an especially important discovery during World War two since if dried, blood plasma did not need refrigeration and could be transported easily. As a bonus - it could be used for any blood group. Before administering, doctors, surgeons or nurses would simply add water to rehydrate it. This meant that many more soldiers' lives were saved ~~through~~ ^{due to} blood

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued) plasma transfusions) than in previous wars such as the first World War.

It wasn't just developments in science and technology that improved medicine in 1920-48. One of the arguably most significant changes in medicine was the introduction of the NHS. In 1942, William Beveridge published the Beveridge Report which recommended that a national health service be set up because ill health was causing British people to become poor or be kept in poverty. Therefore, on the 5th July 1948, the NHS was set up to provide free medical care at point of access to all people from the cradle to the grave. ~~that~~ ~~argue~~ ~~that~~ The NHS was extremely important since it meant that many poorer members in society could see a doctor for the first time and many sought medical help much sooner before their illness developed further, meaning their chances of survival were greatly increased. Also, everyone had more equal access to treatment as medical professionals were paid based

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued) on skills and qualifications rather than where in the country they worked. This saw many huge improvements to public health including infant mortality dropping dramatically.

In conclusion, I would argue that science and technology were important, but not most significant in changing medicine in the years 1920-48. ~~This I would~~ ~~instead~~ believe that public health measures like the introduction of the NHS were actually more significant and important. This is because while penicillin and blood plasma did save many lives, they were most important during the Second World War (especially in this time period), whereas the NHS allowed everyone to have free medical care at point of access for the first time in Britain and without the NHS, many ordinary people would not even have been able to afford to benefit from breakthroughs like penicillin.



The candidate has addressed three aspects (infection, blood and the NHS) and explained the importance of each in bringing about changes in medicine.

There is a well-argued conclusion and the response was marked in the top level.

Question (B)3

There were too few candidates answering this question to report on general performance.

Question (B)4

As always, China proved a popular option, though there were some significant errors demonstrated in responses to Parts A and B. In Part A, some candidates confused the date 1963 with the introduction of Deng's agricultural reforms. Consequently they saw the differences as between a state-run agricultural system and the introduction of an element of private enterprise. This was unfortunate, as the real difference was between an independent agricultural sector in 1949 and a collectivised system in 1963 together with a dramatic decline in production as a result of famine. On Part B some candidates were unfamiliar with the Three and Five-anti Campaigns and as a result wrote on measures carried out by Mao during the Cultural Revolution. This was unfortunate, as the Three – and Five-anti Campaigns are listed in the specification. Performance on the Part C questions was much stronger and there were some thoughtful and perceptive analyses of the impact of the one child policy.

Part A: A response where one factor is debatable.

(a) One way agriculture differed ~~before~~ and after the war was in 1949, agriculture had not been yet collectivised. In 1963, peasants did not own their land yet, ~~but~~ but they would be allowed to continue work on smaller, landlord owned farms.

By 1963, full scale collectivisation had taken place, and peasants would work in communes, of 50000 peasant households, and consisting of so, organisation of agriculture was different.

Agricultural output had also increased massively from 1949 to 1963. In 1949, landlord owned farms were not commercially oriented, as the largely capitalist policies meant that the peasants profits of grain would go to landlords. However, by 1963, after the (failed) Great

Leap forward and collectivisation,
~~farms had been communes had been~~
mechanised, ~~to~~ allowing for an
easier grain procurement and
higher output, designed to fund industrialisation
and the China's rapidly expanding
population (10 million per year in the
1950s)



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The response covers the move from private landlord to collectivisation well at a Level 3 standard.

The second point is less clear. Is the candidate saying that production was higher in 1963 because of the Great Leap Forward (which would be incorrect) or that following 1963 there was an improvement?

The quality of the first difference, together with the possibility of allowing the second meant the response was marked at low Level 3.

Part C: A knowledge-based response, lacking in direct focus.

Deng was a more economically progressive politician who was willing to introduce new ideas and policies to China, such as freeing it economically, as well as politically. Another major policy that he introduced was the one child policy, however, I will agree it was not the most important.

The pre-Deng China was an economically isolated one. It was focused mainly on being self-sufficient and was hostile to the outside world, with trade making up only 10% of its GDP. However, Deng realised that he needed to modernise China. He established SEZs, in which foreign investment was encouraged, and trade flourished, making up 60% of the GDP by 1989. Industrial output also skyrocketed, with it increasing by $\frac{1}{3}$. His introduction of the 14 Modernisations made other fields of the Chinese economy grow such as agriculture. He introduced the Household Responsibility System, which, whilst retaining some quotas, allowed farmers to sell their own food, as well as to make their own choices in terms of

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued) what to grow, so there was a move away from rice and wheat to cash crops. Prior to the modernisation, crop yields were growing by only 2%, however, after they were growing by 8%, so more labour was freed up for industry, as shown in the increase of urban population. Foreign businesses also came in, with Coca-Cola building a factory in Shanghai, and Boeing selling its 747 planes to China, making it a more economically open country. State enterprises were also privatised.

Moreover, the Beijing Spring during the rule of Deng introduced greater political and intellectual freedoms. Certain books were unbanned, religious persecution stopped, and certain ideological points, such as the reading of ~~Marx's~~ Marx's notes on Mathematics in university were cancelled. However, overall, Deng was still a communist conservative, and believed in the "socialist road" and one party system. He refused to introduce democracy, and did not tolerate the student protests, such as in Tiananmen square, in which troops were ordered to open fire on democratic protesters. 2700 were killed. He also reno-

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued) led by party officials who sympathised with the protesters. China did open up to politically in terms of foreign policy. For instance, Deng met the American president Jimmy Carter and held a summit with USSR in 1985, the first time since the Sino-Soviet split. China became a more politically liberal, but still politically stringent country, as it continued to imprison people for their political views such as Wei Jianxing, but allowed freedom and openness elsewhere.

The one-child policy was introduced by Deng as a response to the worrying trend of overpopulation in China, and was put into effect by aborting many children, as well as putting in financial incentives for parents not to have children. It mainly produced negative effects, such as the '4:2:1' effect, in which a child would have to care for both their parents AND their grandparents, as well as the issue of unregistered children not being able to access social security or public services as they were illegal.

Overall, I believe that the biggest change was economic, as this was the field that changed China most dramatically, and made it open to the world.



The candidate has an impressive knowledge of the work of Deng but chooses to explain the importance of his measures, rather than consider which was the most significant event in bringing about change in this period. The candidate has chosen not to write on the Cultural Revolution, which is surprising in view of its importance. However, three other aspects are covered.

The lack of direct focus on the question means that the response, although detailed, could not be marked above Level 3.

(b) One cause of anti-campaigns was to eliminate opposition to ~~the~~ communism. The campaigns were directed towards former nationalists and capitalists, and Mao found it essential to eliminate them to expel any opposition to his rule. The ~~ear~~ Three anti campaigns were against waste, corruption and bureaucracy while the Five anti campaign was against bribery, fraud, theft of state property, tax evasion and sabotage. Those guilty would often be persecuted of these crimes, allowing Mao to ensure all Chinese society would be obedient to his communist policies.

Another cause of the campaigns were to create a climate of fear so that Mao could have greater control over Chinese society. 99% of Shanghai businessmen were found guilty of one of the crimes of the ~~5~~ Five anti-campaigns, and over 200,000 letters were received, many being self-confessions. Many would have to pay fines and ~~it~~ could be

(b) continued) humiliated publicly, causing some to even commit suicide due to the mental pressure. This allowed Mao to create a cruel climate of fear that gave him vast control over Chinese society, and spread the message that disobedience will be fatal.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Note that the candidate not only provides the reason, but also shows how that reason brought about Mao's required outcome.

Question (B)5

Responses to the questions in this option tended to divide between those who knew the history and those who did not. Candidates who were aware that in the Congo the UN used force to keep peace and aimed to keep the country together, whereas in Namibia the aim was to set up an independent country working with the government to build a democratic state, did well. Equally, in Part B a knowledge of the work of the Refugee Commission and the use of Nansen Passports was essential in scoring well. Part C answers were restricted almost exclusively to C (ii) where there was a high level of understanding of the role of the UN in the Middle East, though the candidates did not always consider the importance of a key turning point.

Question (B)6

This was not a popular option, though there were some good responses. In Part A similarity was seen between the movements in France and Vietnam in their aim to undermine the military planning and activities of a more powerful enemy and their use of sabotage. In Part B most candidates stressed the importance of aircraft carriers enabling air supremacy in a context where distances were of an extreme nature. In Part C, candidates seemed more secure in discussing changes in aerial warfare between 1939 and 2000; whilst they showed knowledge of guerrilla warfare in the late 20th century they were not always able to demonstrate how far there was change.

Question (B)7

The Middle East was a popular topic with some excellent knowledge demonstrated in Part A on the similarities between the war in Lebanon and the Gaza War. Some candidates failed to score well on Part B as they read the question to be on the causes of shuttle diplomacy, whereas it actually called for an explanation of the **success** of shuttle diplomacy. Most candidates answered C(ii) and demonstrated a good understanding of the significance of the various wars in the second-half of the 20th century and their importance in relations between the Arab nations and their Jewish neighbours.

Question (B)8

This was the first year this new topic has been examined. There was a small number of candidates but there was a very wide range in the quality of responses.

As is often the case, those responses receiving the highest marks were those which appreciated that each question required detailed knowledge of an area of content within the specification and an application of that knowledge to the specific question.

So in Part A, it was essential that candidates understood that the Sexual Offences Act (1967) decriminalised homosexual activity carried out between men in private and the consequences of that legislation. Candidates who did not have that knowledge tended to give very vague answers suggesting that '*things got better for sexual minorities.*', without explaining how or why.

In Part B, candidates were invited to consider the impact of economic depression on ethnic tensions in the 1930s. As such answers were expected to focus on the formation of groups such as the BUF and anti-Semitic demonstrations. Unfortunately some candidates mistakenly saw this period as being when the Windrush generation began settling in the UK.

In Part C, answers were almost exclusively on changing opportunities for women. There was some very good knowledge of improvements in opportunities but some candidates failed to consider whether it was the First World War which played the major role in change, or indeed whether that change was permanent.

Part C: A well-argued and informed response.

(c)(i) OR (c)(ii) The First World War was significant in changing opportunities for women in the period 1914-44. In 1914, before the outbreak of war, women lived their lives completely inferior to men and ~~women~~ their jobs were considered to be running the home and being a mother. However, the WWI changed this as women took on the ~~jobs~~ ^{jobs} previously undertaken by men. This involved the dangerous job of working in munitions factories. During WWI, women proved to the world that they were able to carry out the same jobs as men. This changed opportunities for women as while they did have to give up their jobs when the men returned home, their efforts in the war paved the way for crucial progress in the feminist movement, leading to them having an even larger role in WW2 as they could join the armed services. However, there were limitations to this.

Winning the vote was also significant in changing opportunities for women. Before 1919, no women in Britain had the right to vote. However, following the Representation of the People Act (1919), some women gained the vote. The Act allowed men over 21 and women over 30 who owned a home or were married to a home owner to vote. ~~While the difference in voting ages was~~ The limitation of the Act was that there were strict conditions women had to meet in order to have the right to vote. Few women owned their own home as there were not many ways for a woman to make her own income. ~~Therefore~~ This meant that a woman's right to vote was tied to her husband. However, this was rectified in the 1928 Equal Franchise Act, which ~~lowered the voting age~~ gave all men and women over 21 the right to vote. This was significant in changing opportunities for women as by 1928, all women had a say in politics and had achieved a level of equality with men. I believe this was more significant in changing opportunities for women than the WWI, as while WWI may have

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued) been a catalyst for women winning the vote, the Representation of the People Act and the Equal Franchise Act showed a ^{positive} legal change in women's opportunities, unlike WWI which did not directly improve women's opportunities.

Another important reason for the changing opportunities of women was the Sex Disqualification Removal Act, 1919. This allowed women into legal professions such as solicitors, barristers, magistrates and jurors. This Act showed that women were finally ~~receiving~~ receiving more equal opportunities to men in the workplace. A limitation of the Act was that judges could still ask for a same-sex (male) jury in cases which were deemed 'too sensitive' for women. Among many of these cases were crimes like rape where a woman's point of view could have been extremely valuable. However, ~~more~~ ^{the more} equal opportunities in the workplace were also supported by the new first Birth Control Clinic being opened in 1921 by Marie Stopes. While it was only accessible to married women, it allowed them to benefit more from the 1919 Act as they would control their fertility and therefore focus on their careers. ~~Thus~~ These improvements for working class women showed a large improvement in opportunities for women. Especially as they could now enter legal professions, the 1919 Act marked the start of women gaining a level of control over their ~~own~~ country. I ~~think that~~ ^{believe} the Sex Disqualification Removal Act improved opportunities for women more than WWI as similarly to ~~the~~ ~~act~~ winning the vote, this Act showed that the change WWI had paved the way for was finally starting to happen and women were ~~not sent back to work~~ ~~at~~ able to work proper jobs, unlike after WWI where they were forced back into domestic work when the soldiers returned.

In conclusion, I believe that while ~~the~~ ~~the~~ the First World War was significant

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued) in changing opportunities for women to a great extent, its significance is undermined by other groundbreaking improvements in women's rights and opportunities. I believe that the Sex Discrimination Removal Act was the most significant reason for changing opportunities for women as it allowed them more equality to men in job opportunities and it meant that the women had an influence, while still a limited one, over the legal system. It even allowed while they were still heavily controlled in these new professions, the Act marked the start of women being able to advocate legally for other women, and it put them in a place where they would soon be able to make change.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The candidate has chosen a number of key points in the period, successfully arguing that important though the war was, other factors were more important.

The level of explanation and supporting contextual knowledge, together with the judgement made puts this response firmly in Level Four.

Part B: Knowledge shown but lacking specific focus.

(b) One reason for an increase in ethnic tension in the 1930s was due to the increased ~~number of immigrant arriving in the UK during WW2~~ increased support in radical and white supremacist groups such as the Eugenics Society and the BUF^{in 1932} led by Oswald Mosley. The increase in anti-ethnic feeling was growing across ~~eng~~ England, especially after the large influx of new ethnic groups after WW1. Many white people felt under threat in employment and with women, who many claimed ethnic minorities were 'stealing'. The use of ~~fundamentalist~~ ^{farist} harmful rhetoric elevated tension as the BUF's black shirts were violent and aggressive while the Eugenics Society tried to pass sterilisation and anti-intermarriage bills. Ethnic minorities felt increasingly more under attack by the ~~the~~ white British public as well as vulnerable due to lack of legal defence.

This was ~~extended~~ increased by the 1936 Battle of Cable Street which included a conflict between the BUF and anti-fascist. While the BUF

((b) continued) were massively outnumbered, the police escort supported that the police in fact were institutionally racist and did not hold the interests of ethnic immigrants to high importance allow unjust violence and conflict. The Battle of Cable Street ended due to working class support, the poor feeling more united with ^{immigrants than} the racist and fascist BUF. However, the majority on the UK as well as the institutions in place to defend ethnic British people did not support or aid ethnic minorities, heightening feelings of injustice and threat.



The response demonstrates a good understanding of the causes of increased ethnic tension, but the second point (violent demonstrations) is very similar to the first point. However, it is possible to see a distinction between them, so this response was marked at Level Three.

Part A: An impressive explanation of the changes resulting from the Act.

(a) One way in which treatment for sexual minorities was different before and after the Sexual Offences Act was the extent of government prosecution of homosexuals. Before it was passed, even private homosexuality was illegal, which meant that gay men could be arrested and charged for a relationship conducted in their own home. This was seen with Alan Turing in 1952. However, as the act legalized ~~that~~ private homosexuality over 21, the treatment from the government changed. They allowed sexual minorities to conduct their own private relationships, so long as nobody else was in the building, and did not charge them for gross indecency. Therefore, treatment of the sexual minorities improved after the Sexual Offences Act.

((a) continued) through the government.

Another way treatment changed was peoples acceptance. Before the act was passed, homosexuality was seen as a taboo, and accepted by very few. This was seen through John Cooney's attack on Charles Kenneth Crowe - who he killed for being dressed as a woman in 1950. Sexual minorities were treated as unnatural. This changed after the passing of the act as it established homosexuals as a group of people with rights. It increased public conversation, which led to a greater public understanding and thus acceptance of sexual minorities. This was seen as they began to be more visible in the media and government (Chris Smith). Therefore, the public's treatment of sexual minorities became more accepting after the sexual offences act 1967.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The candidate provides two clear differences. The first addresses the legal position of homosexuals, whilst the second explains how the Act marked the beginning of a change in public perception of homosexuality.

A very strong Level Three.

4HI1_02_SecA

Candidates who failed to label their answer to the Section A questions correctly were marked in this section.

4HI1_02_SecB

Candidates who failed to label their answer to the Section B questions correctly were marked in this section.

Paper Summary

Centres are reminded that the most successful responses demonstrate the following qualities:

- In Section A, Part A, full detail is given of two distinct features.
- In Section A, Part B, consideration is given to the extent of the support or difference.
- In Section A, Part C, both sides of the argument are considered and a supported judgement made.
- In Section B, Part A, direct comparisons are made and supported with detailed contextual knowledge.
- In Section B, Part B, an explanation of how the given cause led to the stated outcome is provided.
- In Section B, Part C evidence is provided from at least three aspects of content and a judgement is made which makes comparisons or considers relative importance.

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>

