

# Examiners' Report June 2019

## IGCSE 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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2019

Publications Code 4HI1\_02\_1906\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

# Introduction

This was the first examination of the new specification and there was plenty of evidence that candidates had been prepared thoroughly and generally understood the demands of the new question types. There were some examples of poor technique so it should prove beneficial to remind centres of the particular demands of the specific questions to ensure candidates do themselves justice in the examination.

Paper 2 offers an unusual challenge in as much as its two separate sections test different assessment objectives with significantly different question types.

## SECTION A

Section A focuses on Assessment Objectives (AO) 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. There is also a question on AO1 testing knowledge and understanding of the characteristics of the period they have studied.

Question (a) asks for a description of two features of an aspect of the period named in the specification. Candidates have few problems with this type of question as long as they make it clear to the examiner that they are addressing two features (i.e. 'aspects') and not just writing all they know. It is not necessary to write at great length to achieve the 6 marks, and if candidates are writing beyond the allocated space, they are probably using up valuable time which should be spent on other questions.

Question (b) asks 'how far' one source supports what is said in the other source about a given aspect of the topic. Students of history are aware that the use of 'how far' always invites a 'two-sided' answer. Therefore, no matter how much the sources may appear to be in agreement or contrast, candidates must look for both agreement and disagreement. Once both of those aspects have been addressed, then the best responses will consider the extent of the agreement and disagreement. Is one more prevalent than the other? Are there different 'moods' or tone in the sources? However, such explanation of the extent of support must go further than repeating 'they agree about x, but disagree about y', which candidates have already explained earlier in their response.

Question (c) ask 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. Centres should make sure their candidates are aware that marks are awarded according to the following criteria:

- A consideration of the interpretation; at higher levels, candidates should be able to explain and evaluate alternatives to the interpretation given.
- Analysis of the provided materials; so candidates should be using information from both the sources and the extract to support their arguments.
- Use of contextual knowledge; examiners are looking for the candidate to provide precise contextual knowledge (i.e. information that they have not been given in the question) to support their explanation.
- An overall judgement; to score in the highest level, candidates must 'adopt a position' in their response and follow that position through to the conclusion. The awarding of marks specifically for this aspect of the response is something new in this syllabus and centres should be aware

that the judgement is something which is best not left to a concluding paragraph, but is best interwoven in the answer enabling very best responses to a line of reasoning which is 'coherent, sustained and logically structured'.

Common errors which will have prevented higher reward on question (c) were failure to use both sources/extract and contextual knowledge in their response and not reaching an overall judgement until a final short paragraph concluded the response following a 'so there you are, that shows...' approach. It is to be hoped that the comments above will help centres to encourage candidates into better practice next year.

## SECTION B

Section B focuses on AO1 and AO2 with an emphasis on change and causation. Candidates should be aware that where they are deploying historical in their responses, it must be to support an explanation about change or causation. Narrative of historical events will not, in itself, be rewarded.

Question (a) asks for candidates to explain two ways in which an aspect of a country's history was different (or similar) in one period, compared to another period. Some candidates chose to describe events related to the aspect in the first period, and then describe events in the second period. Following this, they drew conclusions on similarity or difference. This approach can be successful, but a much better way of answering this type of question is to select the criteria for judgement and then use historical knowledge to support the claim being made. For example 'the role of women in medical care in the First World War was similar to their role in the Second World war because they played a vital role in nursing...'

Question (b) is a type of question with which candidates should be very familiar. Almost all candidates were able to find reasons for the events outlined. However, they must take care that they link the cause they have given to the outcome they are asked to explain. So, whilst it is undoubtedly true that a cause of the Suez crisis was Nasser's actions, to achieve the top level candidates needed to explain why those actions led to the crisis, rather than just stating that they did.

Question (c) focuses on change. Candidates are asked how far something changed or how significant an event or person was at bringing about change. The comments made in discussing section A are relevant to this question as well, though the criteria are different. Responses are judged against:

- The quality of explanation in answering the question.
- The use of contextual knowledge in supporting the explanation.
- An overall judgement which is justified with sustained support.

Unlike in section A, candidates are given two stimulus points to assist them in their response. They do not have to use these stimulus points, but it is obviously to their advantage to do so. They must be careful, however, not to treat these stimulus points as an invitation to write everything they know about the topics. They are a suggestion that, in some way, information about them could be used to support an answer and candidates are not required to provide a narrative about them. Centres should also be aware that a consideration of three aspects is required to reach a high level 3 mark, or access level 4.

## Question 2 A1

This was a popular option and candidates demonstrated good knowledge of the period. The sources presented few problems, although some candidates struggled to use contextual knowledge to support their analysis of the sources and extract in part (c).

The candidate has chosen to answer on the Triple Alliance, rather than the Bosnian Crisis.

(a) ~~The~~ ~~Two~~ ~~features~~ of the triple alliance are that it was <sup>made</sup> up of the ~~main~~ European countries Germany, ~~Russia~~ Austria-Hungary and Italy, and that it was formed due to ~~increased~~ ~~tensions~~ increased tensions and nationalism in Europe ~~during~~ during the early 1900s.

The Triple Alliance was formed due to tensions including small outbreaks such as Bosnian crisis and Moroccan crisis of 1905-1906.



This answer does address two features of the Triple Alliance (who was in it and why it was formed), but the support is not sufficient to enable access to level 3. The response is, therefore, marked at level 2 for providing two features and some information about them.



Make sure that the examiner can clearly see that two features are being addressed by having two clear paragraphs - one on each feature.

## **Question 2 A2**

The most popular option on the paper; Rasputin is always popular and proved so once more this year. Candidates had few problems with the sources and were well-acquainted with alternative interpretations of why the Provisional Government fell.

This candidate has shown good examination technique.

(b) One way that source A is similar to source B is that they both agree that Kornilov attempted to remove the Provisional Government <sup>in an uprising</sup> ~~by force~~. In source A, it says: 'I am being forced to remove the government.' In source B it says: 'Kornilov had decided to overthrow the Provisional Government.' Both sources have similar tones as they are both from the perspective of the two key figures: they are both passionate about their beliefs and are not passive towards the <sup>incident.</sup> ~~government~~.

The two sources differ because they describe different reasons for the revolt. Kornilov says in source A: 'I desire nothing for myself other than the salvation of Russia.' He says he did it for the benefit of the people. However, Kerensky says Kornilov's intention was to 'establish a personal dictatorship'. These are two very contrasting ideas. The two sources also differ because of the way they view the revolt would impact the world war. In source A, Kornilov says he would 'lead the country to victory over the Germans' and ~~to this~~ <sup>contrary</sup> to this, Kerensky says: 'any attempt to reverse the ... revolution would only help the Germans'. Kornilov felt <sup>the revolt</sup> it would make Russia whereas Kerensky thought Russia would be weakened.

Overall, I think the two sources contradict each other more than agree. This is due to the ~~two~~ <sup>two</sup> extracts being from Kornilov and Kerensky who <sup>both</sup> ~~had~~ <sup>equally</sup> had very different personal accounts of why the revolt began.



Both agreement and difference are identified and exemplified, which takes this answer to the top of level 2. There is also a suggestion that one side is presented more strongly than the other, which moves this response into level 3.



Remember that this question asks 'How far', so best responses will consider the extent of support, rather than just identify support and difference.



## **Question 2 A3**

Another very popular option. Most candidates answered well on mass production, though some were diverted into agricultural production instead of its use in manufacturing. Prohibition was very well-known and there were some very impressive discussions on whether it damaged or benefitted American society.

This is a very good response, showing the approach needed to be rewarded a level 4.

(c) Elva Extract C suggests that prohibition was one of the causes of enormous damage to American society. It says that "ordinary Americans [...] smuggled illegal alcohol" into the country". This statement that prohibition turned lawful citizens into criminals is supported by Source A which states that prohibition "harms the morals" of people and "spreads contempt" for legality. ~~It is also supported by~~ This increase in crime is supported by the fact that there were 32,000 speakeasies in New York City, and 34 people died from wood poisoning over 4 days, due to the production of their own alcohol. This is <sup>also</sup> stated in Extract C; they made "moonshine", and the "smuggled illegal alcohol"; such as Mexican tequila and Canadian Whiskey, could not always be considered as safe. The fact that "even those close to the president drank alcohol" as stated in Extract C shows that prohibition caused great corruption in America; many policemen were paid off with \$50 bills or cigars and other gifts. ~~This is supported by~~ by organised crime groups, such as the gang led by Al Capone. The effect of prohibition on organised crime is supported by Source B which states that people who were "already criminals" ~~were~~ had "just shifted from other crimes to bootlegging".

However, prohibition did not always cause damage ~~as the~~ such as "alcohol abuse" as Source Extract C states. In fact, the levels of live damage decreased from 23.9 per 10,000 to 17.6 in the 1920s. Also,

((c) continued) one survey carried out by an American magazine stated that 40% of people were in favour of the Volstead Act of 1919. This shows disagreement with Extract C's statement that prohibition "clearly failed" to lower alcohol consumption. Source B agrees with ~~the~~ the survey, saying that people have "greater respect for morality and religion" - this contrasts with the "social problems" claimed by Extract C. In addition, Extract C states that "consumption increased in all social groups", but the levels of drinking in 1929 were only 70% of the levels in 1920; although this is high, it indicates that Extract C's interpretation is less convincing.

Prohibition was not the only reason for damage in American society. Extract C states that drinking "caused a fall in production", ~~but this disagrees~~ however prohibition was not the only cause of this. Following Europe's recovery from the First World War, the price of a bushel of wheat dropped from \$2.50 to \$1 and the proportion of farmers dropped from  $\frac{1}{3}$  of the population to  $\frac{1}{5}$ . This was because of a decrease in demand as Europe was able to produce its own food again by 1920. This caused extensive problems such as unemployment and low wages in rural areas, which shows that prohibition was not the only cause of extensive damage to human society. This "misunderstanding" as stated in Source B shows that Extract C is far more negative about prohibition causing agricultural problems as was in the

((c) continued) "newspapers" (Source B).

Nevertheless, the negative tone of Extract C ("failed", "smuggled" and "~~extensive~~ enormous damage") is supported by the negative tone of source A ("criminal", "corrupt", "demoralises") showing there is some support for the negative interpretation of ~~Extract C~~ prohibition in Extract C. Furthermore, prohibition cost the government \$11 billion in taxes, and the rise in organised crime led to 200 gang-related murders in Chicago alone.

In conclusion, the interpretation provided by Extract C is convincing to a great extent. Although it omits the benefits of prohibition (decrease in liver disease) and fails to mention other reasons for the decrease in production (such as lack of demand for goods ~~and crops~~ such as US ~~cigarettes~~ cigars that were popular in the First World War), it rightly emphasises the ~~mostly~~ negative effects, which vastly outweighed the positives. It led to ordinary people being forced to become criminals, an increase in ~~protection~~ corruption and it did cause extensive damage as stated by Extract C, and supported by Source A to a greater extent, although Source B does agree on the rise of organised crime.



Thorough use of the sources and the extract, impressive contextual knowledge and a thoughtful conclusion.



The question calls for an assessment of the interpretation using the sources, extract and your own knowledge. So make sure all of those are included in your response.

## **Question 2 A4**

Most candidates chose to answer part (a) on the Gulf of Tonkin and had a very good understanding of its significance, which they used as one of its features. Similarity and difference was readily identified in part (b) and there was some excellent contextual knowledge demonstrated in part (c)

## **Question 2 A5**

Very few candidates chose this option and many of the responses suggested that some of them were hoping to find questions on Nazi Germany. Those candidates who had been prepared for the option had a good understanding of the importance of sport in part (a) and identified similarity and difference in part (b). Alternatives to Gorbachev being the reason for the end of the GDR were less well known.

## **Question 2 B1**

An option chosen by only a small number of candidates. The precision needed to score well on parts (a) and (b) was generally lacking, but there was some good knowledge of the changing position of black Americans and the impact of the Civil War in part (c)

## Question 2 B2

One of the more popular options and one in which candidates demonstrated good contextual knowledge and an understanding of change and development across the period. The question on the significance of Koch was very well answered.

This response shows good exam technique, with two paragraphs clearly demonstrating two similarities.

(a) One way in which the role of women in medical care was similar the ~~the~~ two world wars was that nurses played an important role in supporting doctors. In both World War One and World War Two nurses played an active role in providing care to sick patient and were even allowed to work near the front line and overseas. ~~In both wars the ~~the~~ ~~the~~~~ In both wars it was accepted that nurses would work with doctors to provide care to the sick.

Another way in which the role of women in medical care was similar in the wars was that in both wars female doctors were discouraged from enrolling. In the first world war, in 1914 the war office refused to allow women to work ~~on the front~~ <sup>in hospitals</sup>, and once they were allowed to only a few were allowed in. In the second world war female doctors only made up a small number of doctors, with only 10% of doctors being female. Moreover, after both wars women were expected to go back to being GPs.



This response addresses two similarities - the role of women as nurses and, the reluctance to accept women as doctors on equal terms with men. Both points are well supported so a level 3 mark is awarded.



Rather than writing about women in the First World War and then the Second World War, pick an aspect of their work (e.g. nursing) and then consider similarities in that aspect in the two wars.

## **Question 2 B3**

Very few candidates chose to answer on this option. However, those that did seemed to know the topic well. There were some good responses on how Japanese society had become more open (part a) and thoughtful answers on how far the Japanese government changed after the Meiji restoration.

## **Question 2 B4**

This was the most popular option on the paper and candidates demonstrated both an excellent understanding of the events in China during this period and a thorough understanding of how to answer questions related to change. Part (a) saw very good comparisons and in part (b) there was very good linkage between the reasons given and the outcome. In both questions in part (c), candidates used alternatives well to assess the significance of the given event.

A persuasive answer, showing a clear link between the various factors.



<sup>C</sup>  
(continued) The Chinese civil war was the most significant event in the changing of position to the communist party in the years 1921-49 as they were placed as China's official government. However this was only possible with the propaganda bred from the Long March in 1934 and the loss in support of the Guomindang brought from the war with Japan.

The Long March began on the 16th of October 1934 as the small communist party were trapped to the Jiangxi Soviet by the GMD after the collapse of the first united front. Covering 14 mountains and 7 rivers the Long March was dangerous ~~but~~ with thousands <sup>dead</sup> ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~party~~, however it was successful. The communist party escaped the GMD with the support of peasants and gained in status. Their kind treatment of the peasants had the party a good name and more members, it also would act importantly as communist propaganda in the years to come as dictator Mao Zedong completed it. By the end of the Long March though the party remained vulnerable and although with more support in the same position as before, it would be the Sino-Japanese war with Japan that would influence the party's position further.

The war with Japan forced the creation of the second united front, that alone improving further the party's reputation as after the GMD's extermination campaigns of the early 30s they agreed to fight

(c)(i) OR (c)(ii) along side them, showing the party's commitment to the Chinese people. The GMD's poor effort in the war made up of much ~~old~~ earth tactics, where hundreds of peasants lost their homes, and <sup>Chiang Kai Shek's</sup> continuous attempts against the CCP painted the party as pathetic and ~~even~~ uncommitted in comparison to the CCP, their <sup>successful</sup> guerilla tactics and continuous kindness to the peasants. The war ended as ~~As~~ Japan bombed pearl harbour and support of the GMD plummeted, leaving the CCP stronger than ever before with peasant support and a greater name. This change in position is limited ~~the~~ though as the party remain still not the official government of China, this being brought about through the Chinese civil war from 1945 - 49.

The Chinese civil war brought a conclusive change to the CCP's position as they finally became ~~off~~ China's official government although not gaining any further support. The civil war lasted 4 years and ended in January 1949 with the battle of Huahwei. It secured the party's position on top as Mao Zedong head of the communist party became the head of state. It changed their official position although the support ~~off~~ for the party had been carried from the war with Japan 8 years earlier.

The civil war brought a final and the most significant change to the communist party's position in China throughout the years 1921-45, with the war with Japan bringing a positive ~~shift~~ change and finally the Long March a long lasting change, catalysing and allowing the other events and those changes to take place, although, not the most significant.



The response sets out a judgement at the beginning of the essay and follows that judgement through the essay to a final conclusion.



Try to decide what you think the overall answer is to the question before you start writing and then make sure your paragraphs support that answer.

## Question 2 B5

It was surprising to see a number of nil responses to the question in part (b). The work of the UN in Mozambique is listed in the specification and candidates should have been aware of its success in that country. Part (a) was better answered, but there was a tendency in part (c) to provide narrative about the stimulus points, rather than use them to address the question.

## Question 2 B6

Although part (a) proved a little challenging for some candidates, the reasons for the Allied success against German u-boats in the Atlantic was very well-known (part b). There were some extremely detailed descriptions of guerilla warfare in part (c), but candidates did not always consider how far it changed. Similarly, in part (c) (ii) candidates sometimes answered as if the question were about nuclear weapons and drones, rather than developments in technology and communication.

## **Question 2 B7**

Another popular option with some excellent responses. Candidates demonstrated a thorough knowledge of the two intifadas and had a good understanding of the significance of terrorism and the Yom Kippur War.

The answer shows good technique by dividing the response into two paragraphs with the first stating 'one cause' and the second 'a further cause'.

(b) One cause of the Suez Crisis was that ~~Britain~~ the USA withdrew their offer for a loan, to help Nasser build the Aswan Dam. The Aswan Dam had been a project proposed by Nasser when first becoming ruler of Egypt, and it was something that was potentially going to provide employment, and help Egypt financially. Therefore, the USA removing this loan caused Nasser to nationalise the Suez Canal, as an attempt to raise the money needed to fund the Aswan Dam.

The nationalisation of the canal led to a further cause, <sup>of the crisis</sup> which was Britain's and France's worry about losing ownership, and therefore losing money. This caused them to secretly agree with the leader of Israel to attack, in the hope they would gain ownership once again. ~~They~~ Consequently, this was a very major cause as it was what started the attack from Britain and France in the first place.



The candidate has clearly identified and explained two reasons for the crisis. However, the first reason (withdrawing the loan) is not clearly linked to the outcome. Why was Nasser's nationalisation the cause of a crisis? This is explained in the next paragraph, but overall there is one cause linked to the outcome, which means a low level 3 mark is awarded.



Ensure that when you provide a cause of an event, you point out why the cause led to the event. Don't leave it to the examiner to work it out.

## Paper Summary

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

- Ensure they provide support to the features identified in section A, part (a), but do not write at excessive length.
- Provide evidence of agreement and difference in section A, part (b) and consider the extent of support/difference.
- Make sure they use sources, extract and contextual knowledge in answering section A, part (c).
- Ensure a judgement is provided in section A and section B, part (c) and that the judgement provided is supported.
- Compare aspects of a period in section B, part (a), rather than just writing about each period and then drawing conclusions.
- When providing causes in section B, part (b), make sure an explanation is given as to how those causes brought about the outcome.





## Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London WC2R 0RL.

<https://xtremepape.rs/>