



Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2025

Pearson Edexcel
In GCE History (9HI0/04)
Advanced

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 2025

Publications Code 9HI0_04_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Introduction

It continues to be evident that many centres had completed and attended the online training course (modules 1-4), provided by Pearson, regarding task setting and applying the mark scheme. This stood them in good stead when it came to supporting and guiding their students and in the assessment their work. Team Leaders reported that they observed many of the suggested approaches in the samples that they moderated, and how this helped with the moderation process. While it is not a requirement of the specification to complete this on-line course it is evident, over the last few years, that it has helped establish 'best-practice'.

It also continues to be evident that many centres use Edexcel's coursework advisory service regarding the choice for their students of appropriate topics, interpretations and reading, and while this is not obligatory, it meant the candidates in those centres were completing coursework tasks that fitted the requirements stated in the specification. It should be noted that this does not mean that centres who did not use the service submitted tasks that were not appropriate, though in some cases questions were too broad.

Team leaders continued to report some concerns with the application of the generic mark scheme and the standard this summer, and where there were concerns the centre work was out of tolerance, the sample was further reviewed by a Team Leader, and, if necessary, the Principal Moderator, to ensure a process of fair moderation for all centres.

The purpose of external moderation is two-fold. Firstly, it ensures that all centres have applied the requirements of the specification, completed the required paperwork, supported and guided candidates appropriately and applied the generic mark scheme. Secondly, it ensures that centres are brought into line with the agreed standard of how the mark scheme should be applied, so there is consistency across all centres.

Centre administration

- Most coursework samples were uploaded on time for their moderator to access, and there were very few that failed to include work from the highest and lowest scoring candidates (from the complete centre entry) if they were not part of the pre-selected sample. However, some centres still fail to do this and a request for a further upload was required. It is essential that the centre has double checked that the highest scoring candidate (or one of them if there are numerous on that mark point) is part of the sample, particularly if the original identified random sample does not capture this candidate. This is also the same with the lowest scoring candidate.
- The Specification requires candidates to include a word count. Best practice was seen by moderators when the word count was included at the end of the piece of work, or as an accumulative word count on each page. Either method is

acceptable. It was noted by moderators that some candidates did not include a word count at all. It is important that centres check this and ensure a word count is on candidates work.

- Most Centres adhered to the word recommendations, and the further guidance provided by Edexcel, where a candidate was either over or under, and this was usually commented on by the Centre. Centres are advised that in all levels of the mark scheme the statement 'it is not concise' is a reference to those candidates who do not operate within word recommendations, and, therefore, that is the mark range that should be applied when the 'best fit' level has been determined.
- It was also noted by moderators that some centres noted the use of AI by candidates, and in accordance with guidelines considered this in the application of the mark scheme. It was also noted by some moderators that suspected use of AI by some candidates was observed and had not been noted by the centre. These pieces of work were moderated but also reported to Pearson for further consideration. It has to be emphasised that in the production of this piece of examined work vigilance over the use of AI by candidates is, in the first instance, the responsibility of the centre, as is the initial reporting of it.

The resource records sheet still appears to be problematic for some centres:

- Some were 'signed off' by the teacher concerned on the same day. Such centres had failed to appreciate that regular monitoring of the resource records is a necessary part of the validation process. Furthermore, they had clearly missed the opportunity of utilising the resource records for mentoring their students as their research progressed.
- Some students (and therefore their teachers) clearly failed to appreciate how the resource records should be used. There were instances where only the three selected works appeared on the resource records, but the submission was accompanied by an extensive bibliography.
- Moderators reported that many centres had indicated on the front cover sheet the levels awarded for each of the bullet points and then arrived at a 'best fit' overall level and mark. However, some centres merely put a total mark and a general summative comment about the piece of work. Sometimes the comment is simply 'this is a very good candidate who has produced an excellent piece of work' and this may be accurate it is not helpful to the moderator.
- Some explanation for each bullet point assists in the moderation process, while little explanation makes it difficult for the moderator to see how the overall mark has been arrived at. Centres are advised that candidates do not always operate completely within one level (particularly candidates at Level 3 and Level 4) and more often display qualities across two levels (and sometimes even three), so a

breakdown of bullet points and levels is very helpful in understanding the mark awarded.

Standard of work

The standard of work was generally good, and the majority of candidates were able to engage, with varying degrees of success, with their selected interpretations. Weaker candidates were those who had selected textbooks as one or more of their chosen works, had selected factors relating to an event rather than significantly different interpretations or who simply reiterated the interpretations in their own words. The higher scoring candidates demonstrated sound evidence of wider reading and were confident in challenging historians' different interpretations with their own research.

A significant number of candidates followed a set formula: analysis (or attempted analysis) of the views of the three chosen historians, followed by comparison/cross reference with other historians. Some candidates tended to use the chosen works as sources to illustrate rather than interrogate lines of argument and their argument. Some points, however, still need to be made:

- There are still some candidates who focus on schools of thought and describe that particular standpoint rather than the specific interpretations of the three historians, and this can weaken their response. This is not an exercise in simply identifying that a historian is an 'intentionalist', functionalist, or 'revisionist'. That, in itself, is not sufficient, and often sent candidates down a path of description rather than an analysis and evaluation of interpretations and how they differ.
- Some candidates struggled with bullet 4 in finding and applying 'appropriate criteria'. Some used the criteria on the Edexcel web-site – and used it not very successfully; others invented their own check list and still more assessed the validity of the interpretations by testing them against their own reading / research. These latter methods were generally the more successful. Centres need to work with their students in relation to thinking about the criteria by which interpretations can be judged. This is not something that can be simply taught, as each coursework task can be different, and it is up to the student to determine valid criteria. For centres where candidates all do the same questions, this raises a challenging teaching issue.
- It is important that centres ensure independent research by the candidate.

Annotation and marking

Marking by most centres was generally accurate and there were relatively few centres where moderation resulted in an adjustment of marks to the whole cohort. Many centres annotated their students' work thoroughly, using the wording of the mark scheme and showing where they had identified specific levels of the different bullets. Their summaries on each candidate's authentication sheet gave a brief outline of performance on each of the five bullet points. This practice is to be commended and encouraged. There were some centres, too, where internal moderation was not

required, but it had been undertaken, presumably as a precaution. Again, a practice to be commended.

There are, however, still some problems:

- Where marking was inaccurate, it was usually in the assessment of bullets 3 and 4. There was a tendency to reward work at level 5 where there was no real understanding demonstrated of basis of the difference in the arguments presented, and the nature of the historical debate. The problems with bullet 4 have already been touched upon. These impacted on marking in that teachers had difficulty in identifying where, and in what ways, criteria were established and applied.
- A small number of centres failed to annotate the work of their candidates. It was thus tricky – and hard work – for moderators to establish just why specific levels and marks had been awarded on each of the five bullets. It would be politic to remind centres that moderation is not re-marking, but an assessment of the accuracy of the centre's marking.
- There were several instances where the students' work had clearly been marked by two different people, and where there was no indication that any internal moderation had taken place.

Overall, performance by candidates and their teachers represents continued development of the assessment requirements of this particular component.