

Examiners' Report

Summer 2016

Pearson Edexcel GCE
in History (4HI0) Paper 01

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 2016

Publications Code UA041796

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2016

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>

PE REPORT | GCSE PAPER 1

It was pleasing to see a good standard of responses from candidates in the third session of this examination. The paper requires candidates to answer two questions in one hour 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 their second question. 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.

Question (a) This was slightly better answered across in certain of the options, less so in others 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. Others focused on the event itself rather than its effect. A minority of students attempted a narrative based response which either failed to address the question altogether or required the response to be combed for relevance.

Question (c) Some very strong answers with candidates often able to give at least two explain and analyse two causes. However some gave a narrative rather than focusing on causation. Others focus on in what ways or how rather than causation, more especially in options 5 and 9. Many achieved level 3 but not the top mark due to failure to show how the cause led to the outcome. This can be done when moving from one explained reason to the next or with a conclusion which highlights how the causes combined to produce the outcome.

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 explicitly show how the factors combined to produce the outcome. Once again this can be done as the answer moves from one factor to the next and/or in the conclusion. Moreover, some approached the questions in options 6 and 8 as how or in what ways rather than as causation.

1 (a) Generally well answered.

(b) Generally well answered with a sound focus on either the Ems Telegram or the Battle of Sedan.

(c) Some very strong answers which focused on the reasons why Prussia was able to defeat Austria in 1966 although few were able to show how these reasons combined. Some simply gave a narrative of the war.

(d) Some candidates made very effective use of the source to explain how economic factors encouraged unification. The best candidates integrated these with precise own knowledge.

2. (a) Very well answered

(b) Generally very good answers on either option with the Orsini Bomb being by far the most popular option.

(c) Very well answered with candidates able to analyse and combine a number of reasons including Garibaldi's strengths as a leader and popular support in Naples and Sicily.

(d) A number of very strong answers with most candidates making explicit reference to the source. Some were able to show how the factors combined to produce the outcome.

3. (a) Generally well answered although a number of candidates had Witte's appointment after the formation of the Social Democratic Party.

(b) A number of very strong answers especially on the Russo-Japanese War.

(c) For the most part well answered with a significant number of candidates able to focus on reasons for Alexander III's policy of repression.

(d) Generally very well answered with candidates able to explain and analyse a range of reasons for the growth of opposition to Nicholas II. Many, however, failed to show how these reasons combined to produce this opposition.

4 (a) For the most part well answered.

(b) Very strong answers on either option.

(c) Some strong answers with candidates able to explain, analyse and combine at least two reasons for the frequent changes of government.

(d) Some excellent answers which explained, analysed and combined a number of factors. However, some candidates did not go beyond the source and others made little explicit reference to the source.

5. (a) Generally sound answers.

(b) Generally well answered on The Munich Putsch. However a number of candidates confused the Weimar Constitution with the Weimar Republic and wrote and wrote about the early unpopularity of the Republic.

(c) Some very strong answers from candidates who focused on reasons such as the Rentenmark, the Dawes Plan and Stresemann's policies abroad. A small minority wrote at length about the problems of 1923 especially the effects of hyperinflation and failed to focus on the years 1924-29.

(d) Generally very well answered with candidates making effective use of the source and focusing on the Enabling Act, the police state and propaganda.

6. (a) Sound answers to this question.

(b) Generally very well answered on either option.

(c) Generally sound answers which focused mainly on the reasons for German opposition to the Treaty of Versailles. Some saw this as a question about the reasons for the differences between the Big Three at Versailles.

(d) This was very well answered with a significant number of candidates making effective use of the source to explain, analyse and effectively combine a number of reasons.

7. (a) Mainly sound answers to this question.

(b) Generally strong answers on collectivisation although less confident on the Second Five Year Plan with some writing more about the First Five Year Plan.

(c) Generally sound answers with candidates able to explain, analyse and combine at least two reasons for the Show Trials.

(d) Very well answered with candidates able to make effective use of the source to explain, analyse and combine a number of reasons why Stalin won the leadership contest.

8. (a) Generally well answered although some did confuse the order between Comecon and NATO.

(b) Some impressive answers on the effects of either event. However, a number of candidates did confuse Yalta with Postdam.

(c) Some very good answers with candidates able to explain and analyse at least two reasons and show how these combined to

produce the outcome. However, a number of candidates wrote t considerable length about the period 1945-47, more especially the Long Telegram .

(d) Well answered. Most were able to make use of the source although not always explicitly. A small number included the actual Cuban Missiles Crisis even though the question ended in 1961.

9. (a) A mixed bag with a number of candidates believing that the Ed Murrow programme preceded the Rosenberg trial. .

(b) Very well answered on either option with an impressive focus on effects of either the 'I have dream speech' or NOW.

(c) Some impressive answers which focused well on causation and were able to explain, analyse and combine at least two reasons. Some, however, described the events of the Watergate case rather than focusing on causation.

(d) Some very strong answers in which candidates developed two or more changes, combined them and related them to the source. A small number of candidates wrote at length about the changes in the 1960s.

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