



Examiners' Report **June 2023**

Int GCSE History 4HI1 02R

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_02R_2306_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

Introduction

Paper 2 Section A comprises three questions. 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 the cross-referencing and evaluation of a historical interpretation.

In **Question part (a)** most candidates signpost their answer by beginning their paragraphs with 'one feature' 'a second feature' etc. This is good exam practice and saves the examiner having to determine whether there are two features being addressed. Whilst detailed answers are encouraged, some candidates continue to write more than is necessary. Although there are two pages allocated for this answer, focused, concise responses can reach Level 3 in much less than one side and save valuable time for the higher tariff questions.

In **Question part (b)** the majority of candidates demonstrate an understanding that they should be identifying agreement and difference (or disagreement), either by quoting directly or paraphrasing the sources. An increasing number of candidates are considering the extent of support but some of them are not providing rewardable support. It is not enough to repeat the areas of agreement and difference and then make a judgement of 'partial' agreement. Instead candidates should look for evidence of the depth of support or difference. How strongly is the case made in the source? Is there a difference in tone or overall message, as opposed to just detail?

Candidates are also reminded that they are not required to consider the reliability of the individual sources. What they are asked to do is compare what the sources say, not whether what is said is trustworthy.

Question part (c) asks the candidates to consider a historical interpretation and the extent to which they agree with it, based on what the sources and extract tell them and their own contextual knowledge. The most effective way of beginning to answer this question is to establish what it is the extract says about the given interpretation and consider whether it in any way contains contradictory information. If so, this should be used as part of the counter-argument. Having said that, candidates should be careful about how they use the information in the extract. There is clearly a problem with arguing that the interpretation given in Extract X is correct because there is information in Extract X which supports it. Valid support for the interpretation must come from the two sources and the candidate's own knowledge – as must evidence disputing what the interpretation says.

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 the best responses are often those which state their position at the beginning of their answer and follow it through in each paragraph.

Paper 2 Section B focuses on Assessment Objectives 1 and 2 with an emphasis on change and causation.

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. In this year's examination, comparison between the two periods continued to get stronger, rather than leaving the examiner to work out the differences from a narrative account of the aspect in both periods. Candidates are encouraged to use comparative vocabulary, such as 'similarly' or 'whereas', in helping demonstrate similarity or difference.

Part (b) asks candidates to consider the causes of change. Most candidates are very much at ease with this type of question, though once again this year, many responses gave the reasons for change but did not explain why those reasons brought about the change specified in the question. This is very important for accessing the top level of the mark scheme.

Part (c) asks candidates to consider the extent of change or the causes of that change. Sometimes this is phrased as the extent to which an event or development might have been the key turning point. The evidence from this year's paper suggests that most candidates have a good understanding of how to address such questions. Most also appreciate that to score in the higher levels, they must bring factors into their responses which are additional to the two stimulus points given in the question.

Centres are reminded that in accessing responses, examiners consider:

- the quality of explanation in answering the question
- the use of contextual knowledge in supporting the explanation
- the candidate's overall judgement and justification of that judgement.

Question (A)1

In Question A1 part (a), both options were attempted almost equally, and many candidates score well with their knowledge. Almost all candidates found similarity and difference between Source A and B in part (b), though answers were not always supported with detail from the sources. With regard to similarity, a number of answers claimed that Source A supported the view that the Serbian government was not responsible for the assassination, though this was based on a misreading of the sentence beginning 'Even if it cannot be proved...'. In part (c), most candidates acknowledged that diplomatic tensions were already great preceding the assassination and many backed this up with precise knowledge. The best answers took this further, noting Austria's intent to take action against Serbia, using their knowledge of the context to show how this drew in Germany and Russia, and then the other European powers.

This Question (b) response scored a Level 3 mark.

One feature of the German threat to Britain in the North Sea was U-boats. Germans used U-boats to attack boats leaving British ports in the north sea. This was highly effective, but Germany only had 21 of these and therefore could only attack a small percentage. This also led to other issues like the Lusitania, and the British combatted this with anti U-boat measures like mines, and more.

Another feature of the ~~the~~ German threat in the north sea was British outrage.

Germany held raid attacks on British coastlines, and although the British decoded German signals little was done to help. This caused

((a) continued) British outrage as citizens became upset by the vulnerability they had. ~~This led~~ Other events like the Lusitania also caused outrage as innocent citizens were dying.

(b) - Firstly, Source A does support the information in Source B as they were both reported by Austro-Hungarian officials. ~~Both~~ In Source B, it is stated that ~~on this~~ was reported by ~~the~~ ^{an} 'Austrian official', which shows that they are against Serbia and ~~would~~ would be outraged by the Black Hand group's actions. This is supported by Source A, as this is also by the 'Emperor Franz-Joseph of Austria-Hungary'. ~~This 2 sources~~ Also, both Source A and B agree that it cannot be proved that the Serbian government was involved in this decision, as shown in the quotes 'it cannot be proved that the Serbian government was directly responsible' 'the Serbian government itself was not responsible'. This shows that the sources support each other to a partial extent, as they both come from the same side and both agree that the Serbian government cannot be proved to be involved. ~~however, this is limited as the Source B~~

↓
However, the extent of support is limited as Source B has full confidence that the Serb government was not to blame, whereas Source A believes they had influence. In Source B, it is stated

((b) continued) that the Serbian government was not directly involved when it says 'no, did it assist in the ... or supply weapons to the assassin. This ~~source~~ is conflicted by source A which questions this by saying 'its policies encourage crimes of this sort'. This shows that source B has a higher suspicion of Serbia, which proves that they do not support each other to a large extent.

In conclusion, source A supports source B to a limited extent. Although both sources are from Austro-Hungarian perspectives, source A appears to be confident that the Serb government was not involved. Source B disagrees with this, believing that the government was a huge influence on the Black Hand. Therefore, it is clear that the sources do not support each other to a large extent at all.

(c) Firstly, it is agreeable that war could have been avoided after the assassination to a huge extent. In source C, it is stated that 'many politicians worked desperately throughout July to end the crisis'. This shows that many people did not want a war, especially as Serbia had the support of Russia in situations like this and Russia was a great power. Source B supports this as it states ~~the~~ solutions, like 'demand the punishment of the Serbian border guards' and 'punishes those in the Serbian army'. This shows that war could have been prevented as it discusses ways of punishing members of the black hand who helped terrorists at the borders, instead of fighting the entire country.

~~But~~ However, ~~the~~ it is also a possibility that war could not have been avoided during this time. There were many other influences on the beginning of the war, including rising tensions between the great powers and the want for land and resources in the Balkans. It could be argued that war would have begun either way, as there was ~~a~~ already

((c) continued) a rising tension within Europe.

This is supported by source C, as it says that the assassination of F.F. 'ignited a conflict in a continent already full of international tensions'. This proves that Europe already had many issues, and that the assassination may not have been the leading cause.

In addition, war may also not have been avoidable as tensions in the Balkans were already extremely high. At this time, there had already been two Balkan wars in the years prior, and tensions were high between Serbia and A.H. The assassination of Franz Ferdinand may have caused a third Balkan war, this was something already that had endangered Austria Hungary, and due to their alliance with Germany war may have been unavoidable. This is supported by source A, as the emperor of Austria Hungary suggests that 'my government will take action'. This anger from leaders in A.H. may have led to a war either way, and alliances may be what caused this to become global.

((c) continued) In conclusion, it is evident from all of the information above that it is justifiable to disagree, and state that general war could not have been avoided to a large extent. The assassination at Sarajevo may not have been the main reason for war, and rather a spark which triggered A-H officials and other rivaling powers into joining the war. Many powers were forced into the war by their alliances, and therefore this may have resulted in war anyway due to global tensions. Therefore, it is clear that war may not have been avoidable at all.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The candidate identifies both similarity and difference from the two sources and addresses the degree to which they support each other with relation to the assassination at Sarajevo.

Question (A)2

In Question A2 part (a), the most popular option was the setting up of the Provisional Government, though there were a number of good responses on the July Days also. In part (b) most candidates found it straightforward to identify similarity and difference in the sources, particularly with regard to the seriousness of the Kronstadt Mutiny. There were some excellent responses in part (c), though candidates must take care to identify the focus in the question – this was about the level of threat posed to Lenin’s government by the Kronstadt Naval Mutiny, not what was the most serious threat posed to Lenin’s government during this period. Some candidates lost focus by arguing that the Civil War or War Communism was a more serious threat than the Mutiny.

This response scored full marks.

(a) One feature of the July Days is that there was discontent among Russian citizens against the Provisional Government. Russians felt humiliated by the defeat in the June Offensive and criticised the ~~Provis~~ Provisional Government's lack of ability to rule Russia. 2 million Russian soldiers had deserted. People were ~~not~~ furious about the ~~food~~^{bread} rationing caused by food shortage and ~~not~~ therefore protested against the government. ~~They~~ Their discontent was also triggered by the successful ~~pro~~ Bolshevik propaganda against the Provisional Government.

Another feature of the July Days is that it left Bolsheviks in ruins. Bolsheviks wanted to use this opportunity to ~~take~~ overthrow the Provisional Government, but it was not supported by the Petrograd Soviets. So, the Provisional Government worked with Petrograd Soviets to surround and arrest Bolsheviks in protest, including Trotsky, and Lenin had to flee to Finland. This left the Bolsheviks in ruins.

(b) Source A supports ~~so~~ Source B about the Kronstadt Naval Mutiny ~~to~~ in the sense that they both portray the ~~Kronstadt~~ mutineers as brave people. In Source A, it is stated the mutiny 'do not fear' ~~as~~ the 'government forces' in 'starving them into submission'. This shows the bravery and determination of the mutineers in wanting the revolution and stopping the suffering of those in Russia. Similarly, Source B presents how the mutineers "died shouting, 'Long live the Revolution!'. This portrays the mutiny as brave heroes who sacrificed themselves for the betterment of Russia. They ~~did~~ did this for 'voicing the suffering of the Russian people'. This again shows how both sources portray the mutiny as ~~to~~ brave heroes and revolutionaries.

However, Source A does not support source B to a small extent as well due to the difference in the ways Bolsheviks have acted in reaction to the mutiny. While in source A, ~~to~~ it is stated that the 'government' killed 'women and children' which seems brutal and violent, and Lenin also was portrayed to deem this mutiny as a 'very minor incident'. This depicts the Bolsheviks thinking as if the mutiny is merely some simple unrest that could be easily oppressed and resolved using violence. However, Source B

((b) continued) portrays the government reactions quite lightly and moderately, only stating that there were 'government forces' and that mutineers 'were shot'. It was quickly covered without the brutal details that Source A had. Therefore, Source A ~~does~~'s description of the Bolsheviks reaction does not support Source B.

(c) I disagree with the statement in source C that suggests how the Kronstadt Naval Mutiny was a serious threat to Lenin's government. ~~Although~~

Firstly, although the mutiny did cause unrest and revolutionary ideas to appear to the Russian public against the Bolsheviks, it was easily suppressed and was not a serious threat to Lenin. As source B stated, the mutineers were inexperienced and 'did not know how to use their artillery'. This shows how they were not in a strong military position compared to the Bolsheviks who had ^{their} well-trained ~~armies~~ Red Army. Therefore, the Bolsheviks simply had to ~~use~~ send 'over 60,000 men to crush the mutineers' using their strategy of violent repression, as stated in source C. Source A ~~is~~ states the 'government planes killed' ~~the~~ women and children, and 'shot' mutineers, as stated in source B. This shows the Bolsheviks taking violent measures to dominate, so ~~the~~ Lenin's government was not ~~so~~ seriously threatened. As source C states, the ~~the~~ Kronstadt naval ~~sailors~~ sailors had 'strongly supported the Bolshevik Revolution', so it could be argued that it was more of a shock to Lenin, ~~that~~ that they became mutineers, as even Trotsky claimed the mutiny to be the 'reddest of the reds.' As stated in source A, Lenin

((c) continued) thought of it as a 'very minor incident'.

Nevertheless, ~~the~~ war communism was more of a threat to Lenin's government compared to the mutiny, as it was a long term policy that had massively harmed Russia's economy. To get the best resources in the civil war, Lenin came up with the war communism strategy to requisition peasant food to soldiers, leaving peasants very little to eat for themselves. This caused peasants to lose motivation and grow ~~the~~ less crops. Workers in factories with more than 10 workers were set production targets, ~~and~~ for the war. If targets were not met, they would be severely punished. As source B states, the mutineers "died for voicing ~~of~~ the suffering of the Russian people" during war communism. Rather than a ~~po~~ mutinous unrest, suffering and discontent among the Russians during war communism could not be simply put down by ~~the~~ Bolsheviks. Hence, so it was a ~~rather~~ more difficult situation to solve and comparatively a bigger threat to Lenin's government. As stated in source C, Lenin was 'forced to abandon war communism' ~~after~~ to improve his position as a leader. Therefore, ~~the~~ war communism was a more serious threat, not the mutiny, as ~~it~~ it could not be

((c) continued) solved by violence.

Lastly, the mutiny in a way actually improved Lenin's governance as it made Lenin realise the need to 'introduce the New Economic Policy', ^{stated in source C} so it was not a serious threat to Lenin's government indeed. ~~As~~ As stated in source C, "Lenin realised change was necessary" ~~due~~ so he improved Russia's economy by introducing NEP which allowed peasants to sell their own crops and ~~the~~ private businesses to make own profits. This increased crops sold and factories profits by 2 times. Therefore, opposition and discontent decreased. ~~Therefore~~ So, in a way, the mutiny actually bettered Lenin's government.

In conclusion, ~~the~~ I disagree with source C about the mutiny being a serious threat to Lenin's government because it was easily suppressed using violence, unlike war communists discontent triggered. Lenin himself also considered it as a small problem. In a way, it also bettered Lenin's government as it ~~made~~ made Lenin abandon War Communism and introduce the NEP.



This Question (a) answer scored full marks for identifying two features of the July Days, and supporting these fully with sufficient accurate knowledge.

Question (A)3

In Question A3 part (a), Prohibition was the choice of the vast majority of candidates and they often scored very well. Only a small number were able to score similarly by answering about the Second New Deal. In part (b) most candidates had little difficulty pointing out similarity in the sources with regard to Hoover's attachment to laissez-faire at the start of the Great Depression and/or his opposition to government spending but fewer were able to identify from Source A his seeming willingness to take stronger action if it became necessary, which was not mentioned in Source B. In part (c) some candidates struggled to address the focus of the question, whether or not Hoover's reaction to the Depression was misjudged, though there were many very good answers that used the evidence in the Sources and the Extract, together with precisely-chosen knowledge, to argue that Hoover was responsible for not appreciating the suffering caused to the American people sooner.

Question (A)4

In Question A4 part (a), most candidates chose the aims of the Vietminh in the First Indochina War though some confused aims with tactics and some went well beyond the First Indochina War to write about the aims of North Vietnam during the 1960s. Relatively few attempted the Paris peace talks, though there were some good answers. In part (b), most candidates were able to identify a number of differences between the Sources though with regard to difference, fewer noted that the evidence in both suggested that the USA was at least attempting to improve life for the South Vietnamese. Part (c) was generally answered well with many debating the difficulties of the decision faced by Johnson when committing men and resources to the war both with regard to the evidence of the Sources and the Extract, and with their own, often extensive, contextual knowledge.

This Question (c) answer scored full marks.

(a) One feature of the Vietminh's aims were their objective of establishing a communist country. The leader of the Vietminh was: Ho Chi Minh, an avid communist who established the Indochinese Communist Party to aid the Vietminh in a political environment. Therefore, the Vietminh ~~was~~ used various resources to highlight their communist agenda of uniting Indochina under a communist leader by fighting the capitalist French occupation. They did this by using resources provided by the communist countries of China and the Soviet Union.

Another feature of the Vietminh's aims were their want for independence from ~~the~~ colonists. ~~Using the~~ After the horrific famine that killed 2 million citizens during the Japanese ~~invest~~ occupation during WW2, the Vietminh wanted Indochina to have complete independence from all colonisers, including the Japanese and the French. This was established by declaring their independence after WW2. Also, the Vietminh provided social and financial aid

(a) continued) in rural areas of Vietnam to attract more supporters to the ~~map~~ Vietminh. Overall, the Vietminh strived for their people to have freedom and independence from all external powers.

(b) Source A supports Source B to a small extent regarding the ~~effect~~ of cause of US involvement. This is demonstrated by Source A stating that the US wants South Vietnam to "choose their own system of government and to live and work in peace", which directly ~~is~~ supports Source B saying that: "the USA promises the South Vietnamese people peace, democracy and better lives". Therefore, by including the reasons behind US involvement, both sources support each other to a large extent. Additionally, Source A explains that the USA believes they "have a duty to help the South Vietnamese people" which ~~is~~ supports Source B to a minimal degree when it says that "we they haventm been "increasing our involvement". Finally, Source A supports Source B's insistence that the South Vietnamese lack certain rights: "rights are being threatened" and Source B explaining that the government is "corrupt and undemocratic".

However, to a larger extent, the two sources differ in their depictions of the effect of US involvement.

While Source A highlights US involvement as highly positive: "North Vietnam is trying to deny them the right" and therefore the US is providing a choice. On the other hand, Source B explains that the US have "drive[n] them from their villages and destroy [ed] their crops". This means that the two sources

((b) continued) directly oppose the effects of US involvement.
Also, Source A ~~says that~~ mentions the "communist pressure"
as the true enemy whereas Source B says that
the South Vietnamese "now consider the USA... as their
real enemy".

Overall, Source A only supports Source B to a
small extent, as Source A highlights US involvement
as helpful and positive for the people while
Source B depicts it as harmful and inherently
corrupt.

(c) I believe that ultimately, Source B and Extract C highly support the interpretations. However, Source A provides some contrary evidence.

To a large extent, the interpretation that Johnson made a huge error in increasing US's involvement has paramount evidence. This is supported by Extract C stating that: "it was an enormous risk" and that even Johnson agreed "this is a terrible thing we're getting ready to do". This is directly supported by the media reaction to the Vietnam conflict, with even Walter Cronkite stating that the war was "unwinnable" for the USA. Additionally, Source B provides supporting statements as the people now "suffer under US bombs" and consider the USA "as their real enemy". The US bombing campaign was horrific, with over 7 million tonnes of bombs dropped, ~~the~~ ~~then~~ 5 million South Vietnamese alone lost their homes. This demonstrates how grave an error US involvement became. Additionally, ~~the~~ increased US involvement led to the use of defoliants like napalm and Agent Orange: killing 400,000 and leaving 500,000 people with birth defects. ~~Extract C~~ Extract C even highlights how "Vice-president Humphrey opposed it"; ~~is supported by~~ Also, Source B highlights that the increased US involvement meant that they were supporting a "corrupt and undemocratic government" which directly supports the

((c) continued) interpretations as the USA prides themselves on the fairness and of their justice system.

However, to a lesser degree, so there is evidence that US involvement was not an error. While protests such as Kent State where 4 were killed highlighted how the young generations believed the Johnson made an error, 58% of the public believed that the National Guard were justified. Therefore, a 'Silent Majority' agreed with Johnson's earlier decisions. This ~~is~~ support for Johnson's decision was supported by Source A, that highlights how if South Vietnam falls, it's a "threat to peace across ~~+~~ throughout the world". This highlights how Johnson's decision was in fact justified. This is also supported by Extract C that states "that if the USA didn't become involved it "would destroy the USA's attempt to contain the spread of communism". This fear of communism is even ~~shown~~ evidenced by Source A: "communist pressure... ~~the~~ is a threat to peace". At the time, the Red Scare was incredibly influential throughout the USA, with the Marshall Plan, Truman Doctrine and Domino Theory all established to prevent global spread of communism. Therefore, ~~the~~ evidence ~~is~~ suggests to a lesser degree that Johnson was justified by his decision. Finally, this is supported by Source A highlighting that "North Vietnam is

((c) continued) trying to deny them the right "to freedom, which is supported by Extract C saying that "if he did not act, South Vietnam would soon fall" to "North Vietnamese troops". This is supported by the ARVN being a weak fighting force, because as soon as Nixon deployed Vietnamisation, North Vietnam employed the Spring Offensive. This was also shown during the Laos invasion, where 50% of the 21000 ARVN troops were wounded or killed. Therefore, perhaps Johnson anticipated this weakness and tried to prevent it.

In conclusion, I believe that Johnson's increased involvement in the Vietnam conflict was a "huge error" (Extract C). While Source A strongly disagrees with this interpretation, the combined evidence provided by Source B, Extract C and the ~~knowledge~~ external knowledge, it is clear that Johnson made a grave error. The Vietnam conflict killed 1-3 million citizens and cost the US \$167 million, which was a grave damage to the economy. Therefore, the USA should have never increased involvement in the conflict.



The candidate uses the evidence of the Sources and Extract fully to debate both sides of Johnson's decision to escalate US involvement in Vietnam, and supports this with precisely-chosen contextual knowledge. The answer reaches a fully-justified conclusion.

Question (A)5

There were only a very small number of responses to this question and too few to make general comments.

Question (B)1

There were only a very small number of responses to this question and too few to make general comments.

Question (B)2

In Question B2 part (a), many candidates had a sound grasp of the ways in which the role of women changed across the time period specified, particularly with regard to the growth in the number of female doctors and the growth in number and increased professionalism of nurses, especially at the Front. The causes of the improvements in surgery, part (b), were generally well known with detailed accounts of developments in anaesthesia and aseptic surgery. However, fewer were able to link the causes they identified directly to the outcome.

Answers to the part (ci) question were often impressive in their knowledge of the government's role in improving public health provision, with reference to various acts passed in the late nineteenth century, though sometimes less so with regard to linking the work of Pasteur and Koch directly to this factor. Not all candidates were as precise in their understanding of 'public health' as they needed to be in attempting this question. Likewise, in part (cii) there was some very good understanding of how warfare prompted changes in surgery, such as the development of x-rays, plastic surgery and antibiotics. Not all candidates, however, were so confident in developing a counter-case to the question.

This response was awarded a secure Level 3 mark.

(a) One way in which the role of women had ~~changed~~ ~~was~~ changed was that women were given more fulfilling roles. ~~By~~ In 1875, women were widely used as midwives or low level nurses in hospital. By the first world war, women were allowed to become doctors as they could be accepted into one of three societies. This would allow ~~them~~ women to gain a medical licence and become more present in hospitals.

Another way the role of women changed was from a role of support to leadership. As men were ~~be~~ at war, it opened opportunities for women to fill. They went from support roles such as nurses in the 1875 to leading wards during the first world war.

^{b)}
(b) ~~continued~~ One cause of development in surgery was the work of Louis Pasteur. After developing the germ theory in 1861, he tried to spread the new information. It was slowly accepted but he didn't publish his findings until 1878. However, disproving the theory of spontaneous generation allowed hospitals to understand that microorganisms ~~can~~ infected the wound from the air. This helped with ~~the~~ infection from surgical incisions and reduced the death rate. Hospitals started to cover wounds and re-do dressings everyday, this reduced the chance of infection.

b) Another main problem in surgery was pain. Although developed before this time (1846-47) ether and chloroform helped the problem of pain. Stopping pain was a huge issue as before this time, surgeons needed a team to hold the surgeon down. This meant that the surgeon could not make precise cuts as the patient would move. This led to more death. The introduction of ether and chloroform not only made surgery a nicer experience but also reduced the mortality rate of surgery.

(c)(i) OR (c)(ii) ~~Warfare~~ ^{X-rays were} significant as to changes in surgery as ^{they} ~~it~~ brought about ~~the necessity for new techniques.~~ ^{precision} For example X-rays ~~are~~ were mass produced and were on medicals carts during the wars. They helped locate shrapnel and bullets for surgery that was a lot more precise. ~~It~~ ^{they} also helped define broken bones which decided if there was a need for surgery. ~~X-rays~~ X-rays helped with the problem of blood loss. ~~It~~ ^{they} also helped with ~~deciding~~ whether a patient needed surgery or not. X-rays massively changed surgery but also go hand in hand with warfare as they were used vastly with warfare related injuries.

Penicillin also brought a change in surgery. Even though it did not directly improve surgery, it still changed the practise. Flemming, Florey and chain led to the eventual production of the first antibiotic ⁱⁿ by 1939. The way it changed surgery was by reducing the necessity for it. ~~Red~~ ~~It~~ For example, a boy came into ~~the~~ hospital with a broken leg with the bone

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued) poking through the skin. Usually, the surgeon would amputate the leg but - this time they decided to dress the wound with penicillin and the wound healed. Although penicillin reduced the necessity for surgery, it did not directly change it.

Warfare played a significant part in changing surgery. Not by changing conventional surgery, but by adding new departments. The second world war left many soldiers wanting to return to their normal lives but couldn't due to having severely injured faces. This brought the necessity to improve facial reconstruction surgery. Warfare also brought many injuries that surgeons could practise and perfect their techniques on. This shows that warfare created a significant change.

To conclude, warfare was the main reason surgery changed. Warfare brought new and better techniques. Although X-rays caused a huge change in surgery, they wouldn't have been as popular without

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued) warfare. And penicillin did not directly change surgery. Showing that warfare was the most significant factor in bringing change.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Here the candidate identifies two causes of improvements made to surgery, supports them with accurate knowledge and attempts to show how these causes led directly to the outcome.

Question (B)3

There was only a limited number of responses to this question.

In part (a), some candidates were unable to identify social change in the period specified, preferring instead to describe political or economic change. There were some impressive responses that referenced the restrictions placed on the lives of women, young women especially, by 1937, also how Japanese society had turned its back on 'western' liberal-democratic norms. In part (b), candidates knew well the causes for Japan's worsening relations with the League of Nations during the 1930s, though some answers identified causes outside the time frame of the question, with regard to Pearl Harbor for example. Question (ci) was by far the most popular choice of candidates and was, again, answered well. There were some very impressive responses that referenced not just the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-95 and the Treaty of Versailles in some detail, but also considered the importance of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty and the outcome of the Russo-Japanese War.

Question (B)4

Question B4 saw some excellent responses. Part (a) was well known with students showing good understanding of how the Cultural Revolution transformed Mao's position in the wake of the setbacks of the Great Leap Forward. Good knowledge was also shown of the causes of Mao's introduction of the Hundred Flowers Campaign, though even well-informed answers must take care to link their identification of causes directly to the outcome specified. In part (ci) some candidates found it difficult to address themselves to how the government of China changed between 1911 and 1949. A significant number simply described the transition between the Qing, the Warlord Era, the rule of the GMD and the victory of the CCP with the barest attempt to consider how the nature of China's government changed or didn't change. Part (cii) was more popular and better answered, with some excellent analysis of the impact of the First Five-year Plan, the Great Leap Forward and Deng's modernisation policies. Some candidates, however, did not address themselves specifically to 'industry', drifting off into the various agricultural policies of the period. These might have been linked to industrial change, but usually weren't.

This response received a top Level 4 mark.

(a) One way Mao's position was different was that before the Cultural Revolution, Mao was not as adored or respected. Mao was seen as someone who prevented freedom of speech and caused the Great Famine in China. However, after the cultural revolution, Mao had his own cult and fanatic supporters who carried around the Little Red Book of Mao, which was considered religious and granted miracles, such as blind people being able to see again and disabled people walking.

Another way was that before the Cultural Revolution, Mao felt he was not the undisputed leader of China. Many people questioned him during the Hundred Flowers campaign, and he stepped down from head of state after the failure of the Great Leap Forward. However, in 1969, nobody dared to question Mao, as his 'Red Guards' commenced the attack on the 'Four olds'. After Mao had stepped down, Liu Shaoqi and Deng Xiaoping took control of China, and Mao was disappointed by their capitalist practices, and had Shaoqi killed and Deng

((a) continued) dismissed.

(b)

One cause of Mao's introduction to the Hundred Flowers Campaign was to test the CCP's loyalty. He used the campaign to identify those who opposed him in the ^{party} campaign, and followed by the anti-rightist campaign to target his enemies by placing them in thought reform reform camps. Mao wanted to shake up the CCP and target his enemies so that he could achieve complete control over the CCP. Therefore, one cause of Mao's introduction of the Hundred Flowers campaign was to identify enemies of the state and attack them.

Another cause was to provide intellectuals with more freedom. Mao thought having more artistic freedom meant there would be more advances in technology and scientific research, as the intellectuals were the ~~best~~ leading people in technology, which could also be used for nuclear warfare. Mao assumed intellectuals would be happy for freedom of speech, allowing them to progress the Chinese industry. Therefore, intellectuals such as Hua Fong were able to make advances in science for Mao.

(c)(i) OR (c)(ii)

~~I believe~~

I partially believe Deng's reforms in China's industry were the most important changes, as Mao implemented many new reforms during the first Five Year plan. On the other hand, the Great Leap forward had a huge negative impact on the Chinese industry.

In 1979, Deng introduced special economic zones, (SEZ's) which was vastly superior to Mao's communist approach, as the Chinese industry expanded its growth by 500%. Private ownership was re-introduced, providing people with an incentive to work harder. However, Deng kept some state-owned enterprises (SOE's), but they were unsuccessful. Deng adopted an open-door policy, encouraging trade with foreigners and allowed managers to chase their own targets and strategies in businesses. Therefore steel production, electricity production etc. rose to record levels, while advances were made in technology and science, proving Deng's changes to be important.

Another successful change to China's industry was the first five-year plan. Mao Zedong began his policy of rapid industrialisation, which was also very successful, as the urban workforce was motivated and willing to work.

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued)

Coal production doubled, electric power tripled and steel production quadrupled. Major infrastructure advances were made, including dams, roads and famous Yangtze river bridge. Thus an equally significant change was Mao's first five year plan, as it allowed China's industry to rapidly catch up to the West.

However, one less important change was Mao's second five-year plan, the Great Leap Forward. People were unhappy with the lack of incentives for their work, causing them to be less motivated. Meanwhile famine was raging, causing food to be rationed and 50 million deaths. Production rates fell, and people were encouraged to make steel in their backyards but it was of poor quality and had to be thrown away. Soviet experts left in 1960, but Chinese people were unprepared and 200 projects were cancelled. Therefore, another less important change was the Great Leap Forward, which failed so terribly Mao stepped down as Head of State.

In conclusion, I partially agree Peng's reforms in China's industry were the most important. While the somewhat capitalist, modern reforms greatly helped China, Mao's first Five year plan was similarly important and resulted in

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued) ...rapid industrialisation, catching them up with superpowers. However, one less important change was the Great Leap Forward, a huge failure that resulted in the Great Famine and poor production rates.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response focuses clearly on the issue of Chinese industry in the period framed in the question. It displays an excellent grasp of the material, referring to at least three issues, and comes to a fully-justified conclusion.

Question (B)5

Candidates from across the ability range attempted Question B5. With regard to part (a), a number struggled to identify valid differences between the health promotion policies of League of Nations and the United Nations though there were some strong responses. Candidates were generally happier answering part (b), referencing UN intervention in the Middle East following the Six Day and Yom Kippur Wars. This was known in good detail by many, though it must be stressed that candidates should link their knowledge of causes directly to the outcome specified in the question to access the top level in the mark scheme. Of the two questions in part (c), (ci) was the overwhelming choice of candidates and there were some very impressive answers. Many candidates knew the failings of the League in the interwar years very well, and were able to consider the role played by members of the League, and powers that weren't members of the League, in weakening its ability to keep the peace. A lack of precise knowledge of the period, and the inability to introduce a third factor, were often the main problems demonstrated by those candidates that attempted question (cii).

Question (B)6

The number of candidates that attempted question B6 was relatively small. Part (a) posed few problems for most with answers referencing the differences in the technology used and the targets of air warfare in the two conflicts most commonly. Similarly, there were some very good responses to part (b) with many identifying causes of the effectiveness of German U-boats as the wolfpack system and the problems posed to the Allies by the 'Atlantic Gap'. In responses to both part (c) questions, some candidates found it challenging to address the concept of change and tended to describe two or three factors relevant to sea warfare or technology in the periods specified with little reference to this essential element. This was particularly noticeable in answers to (ci). There were more higher-scoring responses to part (cii) and some very impressive answers that knew the impact that changes in technological warfare had and were able to evidence this in various conflicts. They were also able to identify elements of continuity during the period, with reference to the essentials of ground warfare, during the two Gulf Wars, for example.

This response received a Level 2 mark.

(a) Air warfare during Italian invasion of Abyssinia ~~was~~ ~~different~~ had different purpose than air warfare in the Arab-Israeli Six-Day War. ~~During~~ The Italian troops during invasion of Abyssinia were encountering resistance when pushing the indigenous people as they were also equipped with modern weaponry and had better tactics. To avoid heavy casualties aircraft were deployed to while eliminating remaining resistance.

release gas, the indigenous people had no protection against chemical weapons nor anti-aircraft weapons.

Aircraft used by the Israeli army during Six-Day War were to destroy Egyptian aircraft bases to gain complete air superiority over the Arab army. ~~Israeli~~ During the Six-Day War Arab infantry and heavy armaments were completely exposed to Israeli

((a) continued) aircraft as most of their fighter jets were either destroyed during bombardment of aircraft bases or shot down in dogfight.

(b) The invention and usage of U-boat prepared a significant threat to Allied supply ships in the Atlantic during WW2. The U-boat was the ~~most~~ most advanced and leading boat during its time. It's able to dive deeper than most submarine making it ~~hard~~ easier to evade Allied's radar, it's able to ambush Allied supply ship without been spotted.

(c)(i) OR (c)(ii) The invention of new ~~tech~~ technology had brought a dramatic change to modern warfare. New concepts and tactics were made ~~as~~ as a consequence.

Before ~~the~~ drones had a war purpose, tasks such as recon, scouting enemy bases for intelligence were mostly done by aircraft. However using pilot for recon had proven to be fairly dangerous as if the aircraft were shot down or the pilot is captured either way it's a massive loss ~~for~~ as training a elite pilot proven to cost more than building a fighter jet. Furthermore if ~~information~~ ~~the~~ pilot is intercepted for intelligence the result can be catastrophic. ~~The~~ Drone on the other hand can get the task done and because the technology involved in a military purpose drone could remain stationary high up in the sky without been spotted.

Missiles poses a much greater threat in modern warfare. Majority of the missiles contains a nuclear warhead for extreme destruction. Even those ~~that~~ that are not equiped with one will still have enough power to cause tremendous damage. What makes missile so effective is their enormous range, most missile ~~could~~ ~~to~~ could fly overseas if needed.

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued) For example Cuban crisis: Loads of nuclear missile were shipped to Cuban and ~~the~~ nuclear war was on the edge of breaking. ~~At~~ Most ~~of~~ countries use missiles as ~~a~~ last resort ~~to~~ if peace talking is not an option.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This response attempts to focus on difference, in this case between the use of air power in the Abyssinia War and the Six-Day War, but is only able to identify one that is valid.

Question (B)7

There were relatively few answers to Question B7 but the question was often done very well. Some candidates struggled to identify ways in which the position of the PLO changed between 1983 and 1993 though part (b) was answered more confidently by more, often with reference to the increase in the scale of Jewish immigration during the 1930s and the recommendations of the Peel Commission. The two part (c) questions were about equally popular. In both, some candidates struggled with the concept of 'turning point' and barely addressed themselves to it, despite having a good knowledge and understanding of relevant material. However, there were some very impressive answers to (ci), especially, that referenced the Suez Crisis or Yom Kippur War as turning points in international involvement in the Middle East, alongside those given in the question. Similarly, for (cii), good answers were able to show how the Oslo Accords could be considered as a turning point in the search for peace next to other potential turning points in the period.

Question (B)8

There were only a very small number of responses to this question and too few to make general comments.

Paper Summary

Centres often ask about common errors in candidates' responses. Reference has been made above to some of those errors, but the comments below may provide a useful summary.

With regard to Section A:

- In Part (a) candidates sometimes provide over-lengthy responses or fail to make it clear that they are providing information on two separate features.
- In Part (b) candidates may show that there are similarities and differences in the sources, but fail to support their statements with information from the sources. Better answers sometimes explain similarity and difference but do not go on to consider the extent of the agreement/disagreement.
- In Part (c) candidates sometimes fail to address both sides of the argument, or interrogate the sources/extract in sufficient detail to find support and opposition to the hypothesis. Contextual knowledge is not always used to support arguments, leaving responses as little more than a source/extract audit. Judgements are often left to a short summary at the end.

With regard to Section B:

- In Part (a) candidates sometimes respond in a way which fails to make comparisons, thus leaving the response as two separate, unrelated paragraphs.
- In Part (b) candidates sometimes provide unnecessary detail instead of restricting their answer to explaining causes. Answers often don't explicitly state why the causes that are identified led to the stated outcome.
- In Part (c) candidates may answer well on the given topics, but fail to bring a third topic into their answer. Candidates sometimes fail to provide an explanation of how the hypothesis may be supported and opposed. Judgements are often left to a short summary at the end and do not always include a consideration of the extent to which the candidate agrees or disagrees with the hypothesis.

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>

