

Examiners' Report/ Principal Examiner Feedback

June 2011

International GCSE
History 4HI0 01

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com.

If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our Ask The Expert email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:
<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can contact our History Advisor directly by sending an email to Mark Battye on HistorySubjectAdvisor@EdexcelExperts.co.uk.*

You can also telephone 0844 576 0034 to speak to a member of our subject advisor team.

(If you are calling from outside the UK please dial + 44 1204 770 696 and state that you would like to speak to the History subject specialist).

June 2011

Publications Code UG028115

All the material in this publication is copyright

© 2011 Pearson Education Ltd

PE Report on International GCSE 2011

It was pleasing to see a good standard of response from candidates in the first session of this new examination. The paper requires candidates to answer questions from three different sections in two hours and 30 minutes. Many candidates managed to write at considerable length in this time.

However, it was noticeable that a small number of candidates failed to complete (in some cases even start) question c in Section C. This was due to mismanagement of timing often as a result of writing over long answers to previous questions. Centres should note that the amount of space provided in the booklet for answers, is more than we would expect any answer to take, not a recommendation of the amount candidates should write.

A general summary for improvement in the approach to question types (which are common across the three options) may prove of benefit to centres and is given as an introduction to each section.

SECTION A

Question (a) This was not well answered across all the options even when fairly straightforward logic would determine the correct sequence. Candidates need to have a thorough knowledge of the chronology of the key events within each of their options, not just to ensure full marks on this question, but also to improve their answers to subsequent questions. Detailed timelines would help.

Question (b) Generally well answered. The best answers focused on consequence. One paragraph will suffice although some candidates wrote at too much length and wasted valuable time which may well have impacted on their time management for Section C. Others focused on the event itself rather than its effect.

Question (c) Some very strong answers with candidates often able to give at least two explained factors. However some gave a narrative rather than focusing on causation. Many achieved level 3 but not the top mark due to failure to make explicit links between their factors. This can be done when moving from one explained reason to the next or with a conclusion which highlights these links.

Question (d) In the main most candidates answered this question well, focusing on the issue in the question and making several explicit references to the source. However a number of candidates failed to make explicit use of the source which should provide a fertile starting point. Others waded into the question as a standard recall question. A considerable number achieved level 3 but not the top mark for the same reason as the (c) question - the failure to make explicit links between the factors. Once again this can be done as the answer moves from one factor to the next and/or in the conclusion.

1. (a) Generally well answered although some confused the order of Victor Emmanuel becoming king of Italy and the Treaty of Villafranca.
(b) Generally well answered with a sound focus on either Venetia or Rome.
(c) Some very strong answers which focused on the reasons for Garibaldi's success although few made links between these. However, a number simply told the story of Garibaldi's invasions and were consigned to Level 2.
(d) Some candidates made very effective use of the source to explain the significance of the Orsini assassination attempt, the Plombieres Agreement and the subsequent war with Austria. The best candidates integrated these with precise own knowledge. Again, some simply narrated the events of 1858-59, making implicit references to the source.

2. (a) Generally well answered although some confusion between the Convention of Gastein and the Treaty of Prague.
(b) Generally sound answers to either option although a few simply described the terms of the Treaty of Prague.
(c) Generally well focused responses although few links made between reasons. A few candidates simply narrated the events of the Franco-Prussian War.
(d) Some simply 'told the story' of the Frankfurt Assembly, with little or no reference to the source. The best answers focused on reasons for its failure with explicit reference to the source. Few made links between the factors.

3. (a) A number of candidates achieved full marks, However, many were awarded 2, 1 or even 0. A number had the Dawes and Young Plan in the wrong sequence and Kristallnacht happening before the Nuremberg Laws.
(b) Generally well answered although some candidates confused the effects of the Dawes and Young Plan and a small minority focused on the Rentenmark when examining the consequences of the Dawes Plan.
(c) Here the common mistake was to comment on the rise of Hitler in the period up to January 1933 (citing such factors as unemployment, propaganda, Hitler's skills as speaker and organiser) rather than the issue of establishing a dictatorship in the time frame dictated by the question. For those who did focus correctly there was confusion regarding the exact sequence of events following the Reichstag Fire. Again, an understanding of key dates and chronology is crucial. However, those candidates who focused on the correct period, often scored highly although they did not always make explicit links between factors.
(d) In the main most candidates answered the question well but a central weakness was an inability to make explicit use of the source. Moreover, few candidates made fairly obvious links between the early problems of the Weimar Republic.

4. (a) Versailles Peace Settlement, the March on Rome and the Lateran Treaty provided few problems. Some confusion between the Balilla and the start of the Battle of Britain.
(b) Stronger on the Lateran Treaty as some candidates described the events of the March on Rome rather than its effects.
(c) Generally sound answers to this question although some gave a narrative of the years 1919-22 and few made any links between factors.
(d) Some candidates did not go beyond the source and others made little explicit reference to the source. The best answers focused on reasons, made explicit reference to the source and made links between the factors.

5. (a) This was not well answered with candidates often confusing the sequence between the first duma, the assassination of Stolypin and the Lena Goldfield Strike.

(b) Most candidates answered the question on the effects of the first duma and generally focused well on effects.

(c) This was not well answered. Candidates gave generalised comments about repression under Alexander and did not focus on the circumstances of that time.

(d) Slightly stronger answers to this question but again the two extremes - some candidates over-reliant on the source and others making little or no reference to the source. The stronger candidates developed the points about peasants, town workers and subject nationalities but few made links.

6. (a) The NEP and the German invasion of Russia were generally well known. However, there was confusion in the order of the other three events.

(b) Very few candidates were able to make meaningful development around the 2nd FYP and there was much vagueness.

(c) Generally strong answers to this question although few links between factors more especially the strengths of Stalin and the weaknesses of Trotsky.

(d) Generally well answered although some candidates were over-dependent on the source and few made links between factors.

7. (a) Generally well answered although there was some confusion between the entry of the USA to the First World War and the 'Double V' campaign.

(b) There were stronger and better focused answers on the effects of the CCC. The Second New Deal was not well answered

(c) Some very strong answers with candidates often able to explain several reasons although few made links between very obvious factors. Some consigned their answers to a narrative of the events of October 1929

(d) Usual issues with over-dependence on the source or failure to make explicit reference to the source. Some gave a narrative rather than focus on the effects. The best answers explained the effects on urban and rural areas and made explicit use of the source.

8. (a) Not as well answered as expected with a number of candidates confusing the order of the Freedom Riders, King's speech and the Voting Rights Act.

(b) Stronger answers on Watergate, where few gave narratives of the scandal, than the Voting Rights Act.

(c) This was not well answered. A minority of candidates gave developed explanations of factors related to the 1960s, especially the influence of Eleanor Roosevelt and Betty Friedan. However many were too generalised with an over-emphasis on the Second World War.

(d) Some very strong answers on a popular topic. Candidates were able to expand on the points made in the source although this was often implicit rather than explicit. Some told the story rather than focusing on causation.

9. (a) Reasonably well answered although a number of candidates confused the order of Corfu and the Kellogg-Brian Pact as well as the Munich Conference and the Nazi-Soviet Pact.

(b) Generally well answered on both options.

(c) Some very good answers with candidates able to explain at least two reasons. Again, however, few were able to make links.

(d) Most were able to make use of the source although not always explicitly. A number explained the aims of each of the 'Big Three' without explicitly focusing on the reasons or that there were differences between them.

10. (a) Some surprisingly confused answers especially with the sequence of the Potsdam Conference, the Truman Doctrine and the Berlin Blockade.

(b) Some confusion between the Berlin Blockade and the Berlin Wall. The Truman Doctrine was better answered.

(c) Some sound answers although again there was confusion between the Blockade and the Wall and between Stalin and Khushchev.

(d) Some strong answers in which candidates developed two or more reasons, linked them and related them to the source. Some, however, gave brief and generalised answers which were over-dependent on the source.

SECTION B

Question (a)

Most candidates were able to make at least two inferences and showed sound understanding of this skill. However, a significant minority simply summarised what they could see.

(b) Candidates displayed impressive cross referencing skills with many accessing Level 3 by showing similarity and difference. A weighted majority of candidates were able to quote material from the sources in support of their judgements. However, some focused only on agreement or disagreement and were consigned to Level 2. Remember they had to make supported statements on both to reach Level 3.

(c) Candidates also demonstrated the ability to construct reasoned answers making use of both source materials and own knowledge. At their best candidates demonstrated the ability to weave both own knowledge and the sources into their answers to produce a balanced response which earned full marks. A minority of candidates remained over dependent on the sources producing source led answers that did not fully meet the demands of the question.

1. (a) Candidates were generally able to make at least two inferences, although some simply described what they could see or copied the attribution about 'No God! No Religion! No King!

(b) Some strong cross referencing with candidates able to identify similarities and differences between the sources and support these with evidence from B and C.

(c) Balanced answers which were over-reliant on the sources and often failed to bring in own knowledge about other effects of the Terror.

2. (a) Generally well answered with some candidates able to make several inferences. A minority simply described what they could see in the photograph.

(b) A substantial number of candidates only identified differences between Source B and C. This consigned them to Level 2.

(c) Generally very well answered with many candidates able to integrate the sources and their own knowledge into a balanced answer. Few were wholly dependent on the sources.

3. (a) Most candidates were able to make two or three inferences from the photograph. A small minority ignored the provenance and suggested they were enthusiastic soldiers ready to go and fight for the Tsar. Another popular and generally very well answered question.

(b) Many candidates were able to identify similarities and differences between the two sources but did not always make an explicit judgement about the extent of support.

(c) Some excellent essays in which the candidates gave a balanced answer using the sources and their own knowledge. Some, however, were heavily dependent on the sources.

4. (a) This painting stimulated a great number of inferences about Prohibition. A number of candidates achieved full marks.

(b) Most candidates were able to, at least, identify similarities between the two sources and a number were able to identify similarities and differences.

However, not all these candidates made explicit judgements on the extent of support between the two sources.

(c) Most candidates were able to make effective use of the sources to give a balanced argument. However, many did not go beyond the source content using their own knowledge possibly of gangsters and the attitude of the general public.

5. (a) The photograph stimulated a range of inferences with most candidates able to achieve 2 or 3 marks. A small number, however, simply summarised what they could see.

(b) A number of candidates identified similarities and differences between Sources B and C. However, only a few made explicit judgements about the extent of support between the sources.

(c) Some strong answers which made use of most, if not all the sources, and used their own knowledge to challenge the view, more especially the role of Gandhi in the 1920s.

6. (a) The photograph elicited a number of acceptable inferences, although a minority of candidates simply described what they could see.

(b) Generally sound answers identifying differences between Sources B and C although some candidates missed obvious similarities and failed to make judgements about the extent of support between them.

(c) In many cases answers were too heavily dependent on the sources with little or no own knowledge. Those that gave balanced answers using the sources were able to reach mid Level 3 but no higher.

SECTION C

(a) This was, in general, very well answered with many candidates achieving full marks. However, candidates should bear in mind that this is a comprehension question. They are not being asked to make inferences but to select three points from the source.

(b) The “key features” question was answered impressively with candidates making good use of both selected and contextual knowledge to produce developed points on the War in the Pacific, Florence Nightingale and the Battle of the Atlantic.

(c) Answers on change over time were of more variable quality. Some candidates were content to simply develop the stimuli in the question earning a maximum of L3(9). Others were able to make links between the stimuli and make judgements on the nature of change enabling them to access Level 4. In this regard there were many impressive answers on both the Changing Nature of Modern Warfare and the History of Medicine. To reach higher levels candidates needed to be aware of the ‘change’ element in the question but this was lost as some ploughed through the stimulus and wrote down everything that they knew.

1. Very few answers.

(a) There were very few answers to this question. Candidates generally identified at least three points from the source.

(b) Often generalised key features for both options.

(c) Only a handful of candidates focused directly on foreign intervention and its impact on events in Greece and Belgium.

2. Answered by only a handful of candidates.

(a) Those that did answer this question, generally identified at least three points in the source.

(b) Some sound key features for both options.

(c) Answers tended to tell the story using the scaffolding rather than focusing on the idea of change.

3. (a) Candidates generally found at least three points of comprehension from the source although some made inferences rather than using their comprehension skills.

(b) Virtually all candidates chose the key features of the work of Florence Nightingale and produced sound answers although few made links between the features.

(c) Some very good answers which used the scaffolding to focus on the idea of change. A few simply gave a narrative based on the four points.

4. (a) Generally candidates achieved full marks on this question by identifying at least three points of comprehension from the source.

(b) Most candidates chose WHO and were able to give detailed key features although few made links.

(c) Answers were of variable quality. A minority used the scaffolding to focus on the idea of change in the peacekeeping role of the League and the UN. Many, however, confined their answer to a narrative based on the few points and showed few links.

5. (a) A minority of candidates made inferences. The majority, however, were able to extract at least three points of comprehension from the source.
(b) Most candidates opted for the UN Partition Plan and were able to describe at least two key features although few made links.
(c) Only a minority of candidates were able to focus their answers on the actual question - to what extent the involvement of the superpowers changed events in the Middle East. Many did not go beyond the supply of arms and/or simply described the scaffolding points. There were missed opportunities especially over the Suez Crisis and the Yom Kippur War.

6. (a) This was generally well answered with candidates able to make at least three points of comprehension from the source.
(b) Most candidates chose Deng. However there were strong answers to both options although few made links between these features.
(c) This was well answered by a number of candidates who made effective use of the scaffolding to show the changes in support for Mao and the Communist Party in the years 1934-70. A minority simply described the events shown in the scaffolding.

7. Few candidates answered this question.

(a) Few answered this question. Those that did, were generally able to extract at least three points of information from the source.
(b) Candidates answered questions on both options. Key features were identified but links were not made between them.
(c) The handful of answers gave a narrative focused on the scaffolding rather than focusing on change.

8. A very popular question.

(a) Generally strong answers with the majority of candidates able to achieve full marks. Some candidates made inferences and were still rewarded but this is a source comprehension rather than inference question.
(b) Some very good answers on both the Battle of the Atlantic and the War in the Pacific although few made links.
(c) Although some candidates wrote a narrative based on the four scaffolding points, a significant number focused well on the idea of change and continuity especially in the use of Blitzkrieg tactics.

Further copies of this publication are available from
International Regional Offices at www.edexcel.com/international

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit
www.edexcel.com

Alternatively, you can contact Customer Services at
www.edexcel.com/ask or on + 44 1204 770 696

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

