



Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback
Summer 2024

Pearson Edexcel International GCSE
In History (4WHI1) Paper 02R

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by 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.

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

Summer 2024

Publications Code 4WHI1_02R_2406_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

General Comments

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 cross-reference 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 wrote more than is necessary. 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 demonstrated an understanding that they should be identifying agreement and difference (or disagreement) either by quoting directly or paraphrasing the sources. A large number of candidates considered the extent of support but some of them did not provide 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? What is not required, however, is a consideration of the reliability of the individual sources. What candidates 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 best responses are often those which state their position at the beginning of their response 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 was strong, 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 critical in reaching the marks in Level 3.

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 had 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.

Paper Summary

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

- In Part (a) candidates sometimes provide over-lengthy responses or fail to make it clear that they are providing information on two separate features. Judgements are often left to a short summary at the end.

* 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 (though this is not possible where the suggestion is that one source says something which the other does not). Best 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.

Individual Questions

In Section A, there were responses to the questions only on the USA (Question A3) and Vietnam (Question A4).

In **Question A3** part (a), problems in farming in the 1920s and attitudes towards immigration in the 1920s were both answered by a good number of candidates with little problem. In part (b) most candidates had little difficulty pointing out similarity in the sources with regard to the scale of the problems facing the New Deal or the introduction of the NIRA but fewer were able to identify difference. There were however, plenty of good answers that did both and which addressed extent in getting into Level 3. In part (c) some candidates tended to drift beyond the dates specified in the question, 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 the New Deal, in its initial stages, had a number of successes and failures.

In **Question A4** part (a), the tactics of General Giap and the bombing of Cambodia were both attempted by candidates and there were some well informed answers. In part (b), most candidates were able to identify a number of similarities between the sources though with regard to difference, especially concerning Diem's failures, but differences were less commonly identified and there was some misreading of Source A with regard to the reasons for an opponent deciding to join the NLF. Part (c) was generally answered well with many candidates having ample understanding of Diem's government enough to discuss a range of reasons for growing opposition.

In Section B, there were responses only to Changes in Medicine (B2) and China: conflict, crisis and change (B4).

In **Question B2** part (a), many candidates had a sound grasp of the ways in which medical care before the foundation of the NHS was different medical care following the introduction. The causes of the development of penicillin were generally well known. However, fewer were able to link the causes directly to the outcome.

Answers to the part (ci) question were often impressive in their knowledge of the improvements to health in the years 1848-75, though a number of candidates were less sure about linking their answers to developments in science and technology. Likewise, in part (cii) there was some very good understanding public health provision in the years 1860-1911, such as the importance of government legislation. In both (c) questions however, some candidates were a little imprecise with regard to the dates of key developments, e.g. with reference to the introduction of the 1848 Public Health Act and Snow's study of the causes of cholera in Soho.

Question B4 saw some excellent responses. Part (a) - China's changing relationship with the USSR - was generally well known, however, some candidates struggled in part (b) with regard to their knowledge of the causes of the introduction of Deng's one-child policy. In part (ci) some candidates found it difficult to address themselves to how threats to the government of China changed between 1900 and 1937. A significant number simply described the different threats to the Qing and the rule of the GMD with the barest attempt to consider how the nature of these threats changed or remained the same. Part (cii) was more popular and better answered with some excellent analysis of the changes to the Chinese economy, with reference to the stagnation of the era of the Cultural Revolution and the effects of various of Deng's modernisation policies.

