



Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

June 2022

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

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_2B

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

General Comments

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

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 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.

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.

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

Part (a) asks for a candidate 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 stronger, rather than leaving the examiner to work out the differences from a narrative account of the aspect in both periods. There seemed to be an increase in the use of 'comparative vocabulary', such as 'similarly' or 'whereas' in helping demonstrate similarity or difference. This is to be encouraged.

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. For example, in B2 the question asked why penicillin developed. Most candidates wrote on the work of Fleming or Florey and Chain and gave an account of the US government providing funding. Perhaps they considered the answer self-evident, but many of those candidates did not go on to give an explicit account of why this work or funding led to the development of penicillin.

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 candidates have a good understanding of how to address such questions and that they 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.

There were many responses which addressed all three of these criteria at a high level and received significant reward.

Common Errors

A summary of common errors is as follows:

- 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 cause 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..

Example Responses

This report provides an example of a top response for each of the three question sub-parts. Examples have been provided from the three most popular options in the expectation that centres will be able to apply the approach shown in each example to their own chosen option.

Individual Questions

Section A

There were very few responses to the questions on Topic A5, with most candidates having been prepared for The First World War (Question A1), Russia and the Soviet Union (Question A2) the USA (Question A3) and Vietnam (Question A4).

In Question A1 part (a), there was a preference for the system of alliances, which was well-known. Candidates who answered on the Allied drive to victory scored less well, with some candidates confusing it with Ludendorff's Offensive. 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. Agreement on the need to support business interests was well-covered, as was the fact that Source A did not support what Source B says about the aim to split France and Britain. In part (c), most candidates acknowledged that business interests were part of the German motivation and some developed the argument to talk about colonial acquisition to gain raw materials. Best answers took their answer further, using contextual knowledge to explain the historical context of the Moroccan Crisis and its part in the Great Power rivalry of the time.

Candidate response

This response scored at the top of L3. Two features were identified and excellent supporting material was provided

You must answer ONE question.

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 feature of the system of alliances and ententes was the Triple Alliance formed between Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy. Firstly, the Dual Alliance between Germany and Austria-Hungary was formed in 1879. Germany was concerned about a war on two fronts with France and Russia, so formed an alliance. Austria-Hungary was concerned about the growing nationalism in its empire and feared Russian intervention. Italy joined their alliance in 1882, as they were convinced by Austria-Hungary to join (they wanted to prevent Italy from joining the Allies) and encircling them from the South as well.

Another feature of the system of alliances and ententes was the Triple Entente formed between France, Russia and Britain.

Both France and Russia were concerned about the alliances made against them, so formed the Franco-Russian alliance in 1892.

Britain and France then formed the Entente Cordiale in 1904 after they amended their dispute over Egypt. In 1907, Russia and Britain formed the Anglo-Russian Entente. ~~is~~ The combination of the Franco-Russian Alliance, Entente Cordiale and Anglo-Russian Entente formed the Triple Entente between the Allied powers.

In **Question A2** part (a), the reluctance of Nicholas to work with the Dumas and his antipathy towards them was covered by most candidates. There was also good knowledge of the reasons why NEP was so unpopular with many Bolsheviks. In part (b) candidates found it easier to explain similarity than difference and there was some misunderstanding of Source A, where a number of candidates read the source as saying the Provisional Government must be obeyed. There were some excellent responses in part (c), though candidates must take care that where they have extensive contextual knowledge, they do not allow this to cause them to overlook what is said in the two sources and the extract.

Candidate response

This answer comfortably reached the top of L4. It began with a judgement which is supported throughout the response. A variety of reasons for the overthrow of the Provisional Government was explained and there was an excellent conclusion.

(c) its opposition. Source 1A declares that
"The military orders of the Provisional Government will be carried out any where they do not conflict with the orders of the Soviet.
Despite this attempt at control, poor decisions were made. The Minister of War, Kerensky, was also a member of the Petrograd Soviet, and with this authority he launched the June Offensive. 60,000 troops were killed by the Germans, sparking outrage. These poor decisions only boosted the rate of desertion, which had been increasing rapidly now that the death penalty had been removed, and 2m deserted.
The lack of land reforms ~~with~~ ^{EX C} continued the "economic crisis", as peasants, having expected land reforms, continued to only produce food for themselves and seize land from the nobles. These poor decisions were not only due to the fact that the Government felt it didn't have the authority to impose change, but also due to the fact that it was run by "upper-class dictators" EX C. Most of the Government was of the land-owning class, meaning they did not want to redistribute it to

((c) continued) peasants, but as Sergei Bostates,
"the war continues to be fought for greedy
"purposes" as continuing WW1 ^{was the} ~~greater~~
only way to keep receiving reparations from
the allies. There were ~~poor~~ poor decisions, and
the "Food and fuel shortages" (Exc), ^{when} ~~the~~
bread rationing in Oct 1917 fell to 1/4 lb,
~~the~~ led to great anger among the people,
making this their biggest problem.

It can also be argued that their dealing
with opposition was the main issue, as this
allowed the Bolsheviks to gain support,
leading to their overthrow in the October
Revolution. The June offensive spilled
to the July Days, where on 3-4 July,
thousands were protesting in Petrograd
including many Bolsheviks, despite Lenin's
objections. After the protesters were shot at on
3rd July and arrested, Kerensky began
to have contact with General Kornilov,
who wanted to establish a military dictatorship
to control the railways. He was fired and
marched on Petrograd on 25th August,
the Bolsheviks were released from prison
and the red guard given weapons. This

((c) continued) Kamilov ~~was~~ and his Kossacks never reached Petrograd and the Bolsheviks were seen as heroes. Lenin then continued to gain support through his April Theses, where on 16th of April he not only called for peace and an end to the "unbearable" living conditions, but also for "all power to be transferred to the Soviets." Through this, they managed to gain 800k supporters, leading to Lenin deciding to revolt at the party congress on 10th Oct, against the views of Kamenev and Zinoviev, ~~within~~ the Provs Gov's poor handling of opposition led to their downfall.

In conclusion, the lack of authority was the main problem of the Provs Gov, as it led to the actions which caused the most anger. While ~~the~~ its poor decisions did harbour content, it was mainly due to their lack of authority that they felt they could not make better decisions. Similarly, while they did not handle opposition well, and were ultimately overthrown by the Bolsheviks in the October Revolution,

((c) continued) the Bolsheviks would not have gained the support they needed, were it not for Lenin's lack of authority.

In **Question A3** candidates seemed to very-much enjoy writing about the more 'modern' lifestyle and dress of the flappers. Where they remembered that they were asked to give two features of the flappers (one of which could validly have been that they were very much in the minority) high marks were awarded. The opposition of the Supreme Court was rarely attempted, but when it was, candidates seemed to have good knowledge. Part (b) presented few problems with answers generally focusing on the fairness of the trial. In part (c) some candidates wandered a little from discussion of whether the conviction of the two men was a result of them being foreigners into whether it was a result of them being 'Reds'. Fortunately, such answers, provided similar arguments to those about foreigners and no real damage was done.

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 Source B supported Source C, only to a 'slight' extent.

(b) Source A ~~agree~~ supports source B to a slight extent because they both agree that the Sacco and Vanzetti trial was fair. Source A states that 'Sacco and Vanzetti had a thoroughly fair trial.' This supports source B as source B says 'It is not true that the authorities fixed the trial to find them guilty of a crime carrying the death ~~penalty~~ penalty.' Therefore source A supports source B as both say that the trial was fair and they were convicted properly without bias.

~~How~~ However source A only supports B slightly because source A states that the 'Reds didn't have anything to do with the trial ~~where~~ whereas source B says that the fact that they were foreign helped their verdict. Source A says 'The trial was about murder and robbery and had nothing to do with 'Redness'' whereas source B says 'they were low class foreigners, labour agitators, and ~~ad~~ admitted to being the 'reddest of Reds' therefore source A doesn't support B as B states that their trial was influenced by the 'Reds'

((b) continued) whereas source A says it wasn't.

In conclusion, source A supports source B to a slight extent because although source A and B state that the trial was fair and the part of the courtroom wasn't biased, source A states that the trial wasn't influenced by the 'Reds' whereas source B says that it was.

There was a significant increase in the number of candidates attempting **Question A4** in this year's exam. Life in South Vietnam under Diem was particularly well-known. Hearts and Minds was less popular and some candidates confused it with a desire to win support from the public in the USA. Similarity and difference in what Sources A and B said about the results of the Tet Offensive was covered well and most candidates appreciated the subtlety behind suggesting in part (c) that the American victory might not really have been a success.

Section B

There were very few responses to the questions on Topics B1, B3, B5 and B6, with most candidates answering on Medicine (B2), China (B4) and The Middle East (B7).

In **Question B2** part (a), where candidates had a sound grasp of chronology, high reward was achieved by explaining developments in x-rays and blood storage, or those brought about by war, such as plastic surgery and improvements in brain surgery. Where candidates lacked precise knowledge, they tended to fall back on general comments about the work of Simpson, Lister, Koch and Pasteur. The reasons for the development of penicillin (part (b)) were well-known with detailed accounts of the work of Fleming, Florey and Chain and of US funding. Some candidates wrote about the need for penicillin, though this was not, in itself a reason for its development. Answers to the part (c) questions showed an excellent understanding of developments in medical treatment and public health in the years 1845-75, though sometimes candidates showed some confusion about the difference between the two terms.

Candidate response

This response scored at the top of L3. Two reasons for the development of penicillin are discussed and how those reasons contributed to the given outcome is explained.

(b) One cause for the development of penicillin was the role of teamwork. Key individuals were involved - Fleming, Florey, Chain and Heatley. Fleming discovered penicillin in 1928[?] ^{by chance}. However due to lack of funding, he couldn't develop it further. Chain, Heatley and Florey developed it at Oxford University. They created a pure sample with the help of petri dishes and penicillin discs. As a result, they tested it on children, rats and Albert Alexander. Which caused them to realise how important was its use. Without them building on each other's work, penicillin wouldn't have been discovered. Therefore, one cause was the role of teamwork. ~~Another cause for the development of penicillin was~~

Another cause for the development of penicillin was the role of the US government and funding. After finding out its use, they couldn't get funding from Great Britain in order to mass produce it. If they had no funding, then they couldn't produce it and it would be even harder to make and distribute.

((b) continued) However, the US government and pharmaceutical companies agreed to fund the development. With this money, they were able to develop pure samples and test it out on people. Making penicillin safe and trusted. The funding allowed people to recognize its importance in the D-day campaign, where penicillin saved 15% of the survivors. Pre to funding, at least 200 million people have used penicillin today. Without ^{funding} it wouldn't be developed and not used. Therefore, one cause of the development was funding.

Question B4 saw some excellent responses. Part (a) was particularly well argued with students showing a good understanding of the impact of 1950 Marriage Law and able to explain the greater role of women in politics as a result of policies introduced by the CCP. Good knowledge was also shown of the cause of student unrest (part (b)). Disillusionment with the policies of the CCP, overseas education, poor living conditions and the treatment of Wei Jingsheng and Hu Yaobang were all used to explain the outbreak of student protest, though the events in Tiananmen Square might be more accurately be seen as a consequence of student unrest than the cause of it. C(ii) was the more popular of the part (c) questions, though there were good responses on the changing nature of Sino-Soviet relations. Part c(ii) was particularly well-answered with some excellent analysis of the impact of the First Five-year Plan, the Great Leap Forward, the Cultural Revolution and Deng's modernisation policies. Most impressive was the ability of many candidates to justify their judgements with precise details of the comparative impact of the various policies.

Candidate response

This response scored at the top of L4. It is not expected that candidates will necessarily write as extensively as this candidate, but it may be informative to see how the very best answers to Part (c) questions set up an argument, use contextual knowledge to address that argument throughout the response and then reach a reasoned conclusion.

(c)(i) OR (c)(ii) Although I would contend the first five year plan was not bring about significant change in the Chinese economy between 1949 to 1959, I would argue other factors such as the great leap forward (1958) and Deng's economic policies (from 1978) had a greater effect with the key and most successful turning point being Deng's economic reforms.

The first five year plan was introduced in 1952 and lasted until 1957. Mao believed ^{agricultural} ~~economic~~ policies necessary introduced such as mutual aid teams and agricultural producers cooperatives would increase output and allow for industrialisation to be fit it was the right time to modernise China's industry. The plan focused on the rapid expansion of heavy industry such as iron, steel, coal and petroleum and represented a significant change as China looked to move from traditional and old-fashioned methods to a modern and more efficient economy. It also included construction projects such as a road and rail bridge at the Yangtze river at Nanjing. Around 10000 Soviet ~~Soviet~~ experts came to China to provide Mao with the knowledge required to launch his industrialisation programme. The results of the first five year plan were phenomenal; electrical power production tripled, coal production doubled and steel production quadrupled, and as well it prompted a positive change in China's economy.

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued) Mao claimed the results of the first five year plan demonstrated that socialism was more successful than capitalism.

Another factor which prompted great change in China's economy was the introduction of the great leap forward in 1958, although this ultimately resulted in detrimental ramifications for China's economy. Mao Zedong announced the great leap forward to the 8th party congress in May 1958 and Mao declared that following the China would overtake Britain as a leading industrial power in less than 15 years. The plan included the involvement of the ~~the~~ whole population in modernising both the economy and the agriculture simultaneously. 60,000 furnaces were set up in ~~the~~ backyard and collectivisation of agriculture forced ~~to~~ 700 million peasants into one of 26,000 communes across China. Moreover, all businesses were taken over by the state and private ~~ownership~~ ownership was abolished, it represented a rapid advancing into a fully socialist state. However, the great leap forward marked a very negative change to the Chinese economy, backyard furnace steel was poor quality and had to be thrown away (although 11 million tonnes were produced in 1958); collectivisation of agriculture resulted in a famine which caused the death of 50 million and industrial production declined due to a lack of profit motive. In early 1959 Mao admitted the failure

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued) of the great leap forward and continued on his limitations as an economic planner, following this he stepped down as head of state. The great leap forward marked a negative turning point in China's economy and required years of recovery to get it back on track.

Finally, what I would argue was the most significant change and key turning point in the economy was Deng's economic policies. Deng was appointed paramount leader of China in October 1978 and unlike Mao he refused to be held down by constricting communist belief, he famously said "it does not matter whether the cat is black or white so long as it catches the mice, it is a good cat" indicating his support for capitalist policies. When he assumed power he aimed to modernise China's industry, encourage foreign investment in China and develop international trade. He replaced communes with Xiangs (original town / villages) and rented land to peasants for 15 years, each Xiang had a quota to give for the government but could sell any extra for profit, Deng hoped this would increase agricultural output to allow the population to improve its lives for individualists. He also introduced privatisation of industry, SEZs (special economic zones) were established in coastal areas where the Hong Kong and Taiwan market was easily accessible.

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued) since at first foreign investment was only encouraged in export industries but by 1984, due to it being so successful it was allowed in home industries too. China's export growth grew 500% in the 1980s and this was aided by giving exports tax concessions and freedom of some financial flows. Although for the most part the Chinese population welcomed Deng's policies, some JOE workers opposed them as they used to have an 'iron rice bowl' - wage regardless of output but now income was based on productivity, these protests meant that a new working contract based on output could not be introduced until 1986 and JOE remained inefficient. Despite this, overall Deng's policies stimulated a vast improvement in China's agriculture and industrial production and represented the key turning point in the economy from 1949 to 89.

To conclude, whilst the first five year plan did cause a change in China's economy I would argue the improvements it stimulated were mostly undone by the disaster of the Great Leap Forward which prompted an immensely negative impact on the economy. Consequently, I would contend Deng's introduction of capitalist economic policies marked the most significant turning point in the Chinese economy as they prompted permanent improvement.

In **Question B7** part (a), most candidates focused on the intentions behind the two proposals, with the Balfour Declaration seen as a political statement designed to elicit support from the Jewish community, whereas the Peel Commission was a more genuine attempt to provide a solution. Other responses noted that, unlike in the Balfour Declaration, the Peel Commission had come to accept that the two communities could not live together. Candidates readily found two reasons for the Second Intifada, most commonly in the failure of the Oslo Accords and Sharon's provocative speech at Temple Mount. A minority of candidates attempted c(ii) and some were obviously challenged by the requirement to assess the significance of Kissinger's work. Most were uncritically in favour of his efforts. C (i) was more popular and better answered, with the majority of candidates arguing that the Suez Crisis led to the replacement of the influence of Britain and France in Egypt with that of the USA and the Soviet Union.

Candidate response

This response scored in L3. It provided a succinct, yet precise, explanation of differences between the terms of the Balfour Declaration and the terms of the Peel Commission Report.

(b) One cause of the second Intifada was that many Palestinians were unhappy and above all deprived of a stable living condition. Therefore feminist groups and paramilitary groups such as Hamas started using much more violent practices and devices such as heavy artillery guns, bombs and rocket launchers. The lack of stability combined with poverty caused rage in Palestinians. Furthermore as they were living in occupied territories, they were put under harsh conditions by the Israeli state.

Another cause of the second Intifada was that the Palestinian government, along with Yasser Arafat was quite passive. Agreements such as the Oslo Peace Accords, 1993, were long-term passive agreements without much drastic change. Palestinians wanted quick and effective change which would see them have a stable government and land. As a result of this, riots turned into a bloody and violent Second Intifada.