



Examiners' Report Principal Examiner Feedback

June 2022

Pearson Edexcel International GCSE
In History (4HI1) Paper 2AR

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 2022

Publications Code 4HI1_2AR

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

General Comments

Section A

General Comments

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 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 exemplifying agreement and difference (or disagreement) either by quoting 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?

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 C is correct because there is information in Extract C 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.

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

There was a small number of candidates taking Paper 2AR and on Section A their responses were largely confined to The First World War (Question 1), Russia and the Soviet Union (Question 2) and the USA (Question 3).

In Question 1 part (a), There was very impressive knowledge of Austro-Serbian rivalry, although some candidates allowed their knowledge to lead them to unnecessarily lengthy responses. Candidates who answered on anti-U-Boat measures also scored well, though some candidates wrote about the measures carried out by the U-Boats, rather than attempts to prevent their threat. Almost all candidates readily found similarity and difference in the use of poisonous gas in part (b), and generally supported their answers well from the sources. In part (c), there was some excellent analysis of the two sources and the extract to consider the effectiveness of gas in the war. Best answers provided examples of the effectiveness (or not) of gas in battles from their contextual knowledge or compared the effectiveness of gas with that of other new weapons, such as tanks.

Candidate response

This response scored in L4. It makes a judgement, which is supported throughout the response with reference to the sources and extract. Contextual knowledge is used to consider whether the impact of gas varied throughout the war and whether its impact was significant compared to other new weapons.

(c) I agree to a ^{strong} ~~weak~~ extent that gas was not very effective weapon during WWI. ~~Pro~~ I think that in the early stages of the war gas was relatively effective but later on was not. I also believe that other weapons were more effective in war.

One reason why I think gas was ~~an~~ effective method in WWI in the early stages was shown in the battle of the Ypres where the Germans used chlorine gas. From my own knowledge I know this was relatively effective as many soldiers on the allied front did not have gas masks. Source A supports this point as it states "it caused violent sickness and faintness among the French troops" which shows the effectiveness of the gas in the Ypres. Furthermore, ~~Source A's~~ I believe the German's use of gas during the battle of the Ypres was very effective and is supported by Source A "Germans, who attacked behind it, met no resistance at all." From my own knowledge I also believe that ~~the~~ the use of gas without a gas mask would cause the troops to choke being very effective at times. This is supported by Source B "A man without a mask might as well set out of the trench and risk being shot."

Though I think that in the later stages of the war

((c) continued) Many counters emerged to poison gas. From my own knowledge I know that poison gas could be fully countered by wearing a gas mask or putting wine on a towel. This supported by source C which states "masks became much better at protecting men from attacks" showing the uselessness of poison gas due to gas masks. From my own knowledge, I also know that Chlorine gas and other gases used in trench warfare required wind to travel across No man's land which meant if the gas was released on a non-windy day it could even backfire. This is supported by source C which states "required ideal weather conditions." I also know that the stalemate in the western front lasted from 1914 to the start of 1918 and that the stalemate was only broken due to the Ludendorff offensive, which meant gas did not break the stalemate. - This is supported by source C "poison gas did not break the stalemate".

I also think that there were more effective weapons in war. From my own knowledge, shelling in trench warfare was relatively effective at destroying enemy structures and struck fear into the hearts of soldiers even giving them "shell shock" and also killed many soldiers in the start of the battle of the Somme, source C shows the and could

((c) continued) be fired far. Source c stating artillery allowed a "greater range". I also think tanks were more effective at the end of the war as the 100 days offensive utilized tanks. From my own knowledge, I know that tanks was used to great effect to reclaim the land lost to the Germans due to the Spring offensive and was very effective.

Overall, I think that the interpretation that gas was not very effective was correct as gas masks countered them and other weapons were better. Though I do believe in some cases gas was very effective (Ypres I).

In **Question 2** part (a), candidates found a wide range of different features to describe, ranging from the causes of the war to its main events and the reasons for the Bolshevik success. Whilst many candidates described opposition to the Tsar in the years leading up to the First World War, a small minority wrote on opposition to the Tsar during the war years and, in particular, in 1917. Such answers received little credit. In part (b) candidates readily found agreement and difference in the sources' analysis of Trotsky and Lenin. Part (c) caused challenges for some candidates who struggled to come to a decision on whether Lenin or Trotsky made the greater contribution. There were many answers suggesting they were both very important in bringing about the Bolshevik Revolution. This was a perfectly acceptable judgement to make and where it was supported by references to the extract, two sources and contextual knowledge, high marks were awarded.

Candidate response

This response scored in the top level. Similarity and difference were both identified, explained and supported from the sources. The candidate also considered the extent of the support, concluding that the sources agree more than they disagree and that there was only a 'hint of disagreement'.

(b) Source A and B both acknowledge that Trotsky and Lenin were both crucial for the 1917 October Bolshevik revolution. ~~See~~ This is evident as Source mentions Lenin as the 'brains' and the 'planner' and Trotsky as 'could say the right thing to inspire the crowds'. This is supported by Source B in the quotations 'both extraordinary men' and 'two strong leaders'. Furthermore ~~both~~ both display a tone of admiration ~~and~~ further emphasising Trotsky and Lenin very important for Bolshevik revolution to occur ~~and~~ and public bias of immense gratitude for them.

But the sources A and B differ on their extent of influence of public ^{and Lenin's of time of influence} as Source B mentions ^{no body} ~~they~~ expected that they would last in power for long' but there is no mention of this in Source A as both are portrayed as powerful, influential figures who had support and capacity stay in power for long. But source B displays a sense of shock and disbelief as they are surprised that Trotsky and Lenin would be in the favour of public for so long.

((b) continued)

Overall, sources agree more than they disagree as they support each other and that Trotsky and Lenin for great men essential for Bolshevik success. There is only a hint of disagreement as Source B unsure they would be a success for long, source B differs to source A in the sense that it is unable to see future of the Trotsky and Lenin's leadership.

In **Question 3** part (a) the majority of candidates answered on the Ku Klux Klan and demonstrated an excellent understanding of its organisation and work. Surprisingly, hire purchase was less well-known and a substantial number of candidates included buying 'on the margin' and its role in bringing about the Wall St. Crash in their responses. This was not really what examiners were looking for. Responses to part (b) revolved around similarity and difference in terms of Long's power and popularity, with best answers noting a distinct difference in tone between the sources. It was surprising that some candidates believed Source B was agreeing with Source A in calling Long a dictator. In part (c) most candidates saw Long as a viable threat to Roosevelt because of the influence he held in Louisiana. Others argued that his approach was too dictatorial and his support too localised to be a serious threat. Examiners were most impressed with the candidate who argued that Roosevelt won the 1936 election with twenty-seven million votes, so a potential six million did not pose a genuine threat.

Candidate response

This response scored in L3. Two features were identified and supporting material was provided to demonstrate a good understanding of the period covered.

SECTION A

Historical Investigation

You must answer ONE question from this section.

You should spend about 45 minutes on this question.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box . If you change your mind, put a line through the box and then indicate your new question with a cross .

- Chosen question number: Question A1 Question A2 Question A3
Question A4 Question A5

(a) one key feature of the Ku Klux Klan is that it had ~~many~~ a ~~the~~ radically discriminatory ideology. This was a key feature because it summarized why the Klan contributed to social tensions. This means that because the Klan was very open about their violent practices and ideas towards minority groups like black people, who were slowly gaining their place in society during the 'Jazz era', there were rising ~~tensions~~ social tensions as the Klan grew.

Another key feature of the Ku Klux Klan was that it appealed to many Americans. This was a key feature because it resulted in the Klan's numbers rapidly growing across the USA. This was because many white Americans began to feel threatened by social change that

(a) continued possibly degraded their superiority
and threatened the purity of the USA
and the white race in general. ~~which~~
~~express~~