

Examiners' Report/
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2014

Pearson Edexcel International GCSE
in History (4HI0/01) Paper 1

Edexcel Certificate in History
(KHI0/01) Paper 1

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 2014

Publications Code UG039051

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2014

General Introduction

It was pleasing to see a good standard of responses from candidates in the first session of this new 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. 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.

1.

- (a) Generally well answered.
- (b) Generally well answered with a sound focus on either the War with Denmark or the Battle of Sadowa.
- (c) Some very strong answers which focused on the reasons for the failure of the Frankfurt Assembly to achieve unification although few were able to show how these reasons combined.
- (d) Some candidates made very effective use of the source to explain how Bismarck was able to bring about unification. The best candidates integrated these with precise own knowledge.

2.

- (a) Generally well answered
- (b) Generally sound answers to either option on Garibaldi's invasions.
- (c) Generally well focused responses although some candidates wrote at length about Cavour's foreign policies.
- (d) Generally sound 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.
- (b) Some very strong answers especially on Bloody Sunday although a number of candidates gave lengthy descriptions of Bloody Sunday with little focus on effects.
- (c) Generally well answered with a significant number of candidates able to focus on reasons for failure. Some, however, gave very descriptive accounts of each of the dumas with only explicit references to reasons for failure.
- (d) Generally very well answered with candidates able to explain and analyse a range of reasons for the growth of opposition to Nicholas II and make effective use of and reference to the source. Many, however, failed to show how these reasons combined to produce this opposition.

4.

- (a) Generally well answered.
- (b) Good focus on effects of both.
- (c) Some strong answers with candidates able to explain, analyse and combine at least two reasons. .
- (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) Some sound answers on the Kapp Putsch, by far the most popular option, which focused on effects. However, a considerable number of candidates described the causes and events of the Putsch with little explicit focus on effects. Those that attempted von Schleicher knew little about his period as Chancellor.

(c) Some very strong answers from candidates who focused on reasons for changes in the position of women in Nazi Germany and were able to combine these factors. However a significant number simply described what happened to women in Nazi Germany and failed to focus on causation.

(d) Again some excellent answers which made effective use of the source to explain and analyse how the Nazi Party changed in the years 1920-28 and were able to combine these factors. However, a number simply described the events of the 1920s, more especially the Munich Putsch and did not focus on change. Others moved beyond 1928, to the widening appeal of the Nazis as a result of the Depression of 1929.

6.

(a) Sound answers to this question.

(b) Too many descriptions of either the Anschluss or the Nazi-Soviet Pact and not enough focus on the effects on international relations of either event.

(c) Some candidates focused extremely well on causation and were able to explain, analyse and even combine at least two reasons for Hitler's success in challenging the Treaty of Versailles. A number of candidates, however, simply described what Hitler did. Others brought in the Anschluss and/or the Sudetenland crisis which were both outside the remit of this question.

(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) Not always well answered with a number of candidates placing the assassination of Trotsky at the end of the period.

(b) Generally sound answers to both options although some candidates gave very generalised effects on the purges themselves rather than the purges of the armed forces.

(c) Very well answered with candidates able to explain, analyse and combine at least two reasons for the survival of the Soviet Union.

(d) Generally very well answered with candidates able to develop and, in some cases, combine, factors mentioned in the source.

8.

(a) Generally well answered although some did confuse the order between the beginning of the Korean War and the Soviet invasion of Hungary.

(b) Some impressive answers on the effects of either event. However, many candidates gave unnecessary details about the actual Soviet invasion of Hungary of the Cuban missile crisis.

(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.

(d) Well answered. Most were able to make use of the source although not always explicitly. A minority, however, saw this as a broad question about worsening relations and brought in NATO, the Warsaw Pact and the U2 incident.

9.

(a) A mixed bag. Many believed that the Black Panthers were set up before the assassination of Malcolm X.

(b) Generally well answered although too many candidates described the causes and events of the Brown v Topeka case with only passing references to the effects of the case.

(c) Generally very well answered with at least two explained, analysed and combined reasons. A minority went beyond 1965 and explain the impact of Black Power and the Black Panthers.

(d) Some very strong answers in which candidates developed two or more reasons, combine them and relate them to the source. A minority described the changes rather than focusing on why they took place.

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>

