



Examiners' Report June 2024

GCSE History 1HI0 P5

ResultsPlus

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

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.

June 2024

Publications Code 1HI0_P5_2406_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

Introduction

The Period Study focuses on a time span of at least 50 years and requires candidates to understand the unfolding narrative of substantial developments and issues associated with the period.

In this examination candidates answer three questions which all target AO1 (Knowledge and Understanding) and AO2 (Analysis of Second Order Concepts). Both AOs are assessed equally on all questions. Progression in AO1 is shown by a candidate's increasing ability to select information precisely and to show wide-ranging knowledge and understanding. Progression in AO2 is shown by a candidate's response moving from simple or generalised comments to analytical explanations which show a line of reasoning that is coherent, logical, and sustained.

Question 01 focuses on consequence, requiring candidates to explain two valid consequences. Candidates are expected to explain 'what happened as a result of the given event, development etc'. (2 x 4 marks)

Question 02 focuses on analytical narrative and the concepts of causation, consequence, and change. The question includes two stimulus points and focuses on a specific time period containing events, developments or ideas that can be analysed as a sequence of events. (8 marks)

Question 03 focuses on significance by asking candidates to explain the importance of an event/person/development in relation to situations and/or unfolding developments. Here candidates are expected to explain 'what difference did the event/person/development make' to the identified situation and/or unfolding development. Candidates answer two questions from a choice of three. (2 x 8 marks)

Centres are reminded that the indicative content in the mark scheme does not imply what must be included in a response nor does it give any expectation as to how candidates are expected to structure their responses.

It was noted this summer that there are still some candidates that respond to Question 02 by writing a first-person narrative account, sometimes written in the form of a letter or diary entry. Such responses should be avoided; it is extremely unlikely that any AO2 can be awarded for any such responses and only a very limited application of AO1.

In addition, centres are reminded that where candidates use extra paper, it needs to be on a separate sheet from any extra paper used for Paper B. Also, if candidates have special consideration for writing examinations, the responses for Paper P and Paper B should be separate from each other.

GCSE History specification and assessment changes

This note is a reminder that minor changes are being made to the Pearson Edexcel GCSE History specification content and assessment model. Assessment and language changes apply from the June 2025 exam series onwards, and content changes from the June 2026 exam series onwards.

We strongly recommend, if you haven't already, that you familiarise yourself with these changes in time for the start of the new academic year in September 2024. Some options are affected more than others, but all options are affected by the assessment changes.

Below is a link to the summary guidance document, which will help you to find all the specific information and guidance available to help you take on board these changes:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/GCSE/History/2016/Teaching-and-learning-materials/gcse-history-changes-for-2025-and-2026-summary-guidance.pdf>

If you have any queries, please contact Mark Battye, our History subject advisor, at TeachingHistory@pearson.com.

Question 1

In Question 01, candidates were asked to provide two valid consequences of President Sadat of Egypt's visit to Israel (1977). There are 4 marks available for each consequence. This implies a link between the stated event and the consequential events or developments that are identified by the candidate. This explanation should be supported with specific information showing good knowledge and understanding (AO1). Most candidates understood the second-order concept of consequence and were able to identify various consequences, the most common being improvement of relations between Egypt and Israel and many students managed to refer to Camp David or the Treaty of Washington to support their consequence. Another popular consequence was the breakdown of relations between Egypt and the other Arab states as their second consequence. Some candidates' consequences were repetitive and just repeated the improved relations between Egypt and Israel and lacked specific detail. Another common error was the mention of the Suez Canal being reopened as a result of the improved relationship and some candidates confused Sadat with Nasser. The question was generally well done, with not many left blank.

This is an example of a Level 1 response.

Conflict in the Middle East, 1945-95

Answer ALL questions in this booklet.

1 Explain **two** consequences of President Sadat of Egypt's visit to Israel (1977).

Consequence 1:

One consequence of President Sadat's visit to Israel is that peace was made between the Arab world and Israel.

This meant that there would be no attacks from either side, for at least a month, and that the Arab world would accept the state of Israel and its existence.

Consequence 2:

Tensions in Palestine increased as they did not want peace with Israel unless their land, especially the fertile land was given back to them. If there is peace between Israel and Egypt, then there would be conflict and no peace between Egypt and Palestine.



For consequence 1 the answer was not rewarded as it is based on the Arab world rather than Egypt, making it incorrect. No rewardable material. For consequence 2, a basic comment is given, 'tensions in Palestine increased', making the AO2 Level 1. There is limited knowledge shown ('land') which shows a little understanding of the topic making the AO1 Level 1. Overall, it is the top of Level 1.



Candidates should ensure they provide specific detail to support the consequence they have identified.

This is an example of a Level 2 response.

Conflict in the Middle East, 1945-95

Answer ALL questions in this booklet.

1 Explain two consequences of President Sadat of Egypt's visit to Israel (1977).

Consequence 1:

One consequence was that the Israeli Prime Minister, Menachem Begin, was prompted to visit Egypt in December 1977. This showed that the tensions between Egypt and Israel were being reduced over time, as Sadat was the first Arab leader to enter direct negotiations with Israel. These ~~visit~~ visits showing a reduction in hostility, which allowed the Camp David Accords to occur, which strengthened the peace between Israel and Egypt.

Consequence 2:

Another consequence of Sadat's visit to the Knesset in ~~Israel~~ Israel in 1977 was Arab outrage. The other Arab leaders saw Sadat as a traitor, as he had entered peace talks with Israel. As a ~~consequence~~ ^{consequence}, Egypt was kicked out of the Arab League, isolating it from the rest of the Arab world. In addition, many many Arabs in Egypt were angry, and in 1981, Sadat was

assassinated by an Egyptian extremist



For consequence 1, features are analysed to explain a consequence, 'prompted visit to Egypt' and tensions reduced, making the AO2 Level 2. It is supported with specific knowledge such as 'Begin' and 'Camp David Accords', making the AO1 Level 2. Overall, it is the top of Level 2. For consequence 2, a clear consequence is explained 'Saw Sadat as traitor', making the AO2 Level 2. There is supporting knowledge 'Arab League' making the AO1 Level 2. Overall, it is the top of Level 2.



Candidates should provide two different consequences and avoid repeating themselves.

Question 2

In Question 02, candidates were asked to provide an analytical narrative of relations between Israel and Egypt in the years 1949-56. The overall structure of a sequence including a beginning, development and end was clearly demonstrated by candidates who attained Level 3. It was clear that candidates had been taught to use language which indicated analysis of links, for example 'consequently', 'which resulted in', and this was apparent even in answers which had more limited knowledge. Most candidates attempted this question and those who performed well demonstrated good coverage of the period. The best candidates showed an awareness of how the end of the Arab Israeli war impacted on Israeli-Egyptian relations, and then linked that to the rest of the period with a deterioration of relations. Some candidates were also able to link it to wider tension in the region. There were many candidates with good knowledge of King Farouk's abdication, who were able to link this to new leadership in Egypt under Nasser. However, a significant minority of candidates struggled with this bullet point and were either unaware or misunderstood this development. Nearly all candidates could mention what the Suez Canal was, most could in some way discuss its importance in regards to Egyptian-Israeli relations. A large proportion of candidates attempted to turn the question into a narrative account on just the Suez Canal and the specific Suez Crisis. This meant that a proportion of the period in the question was not analysed. Some candidates were able to achieve high levels despite this, as their knowledge was specific and demonstrated how this crisis had an impact over the period. The best answers used specific knowledge linked together, emphasised by good analytical language, which brought the account of the period to life.

This is an example of a Level 3 response.

2 Write a narrative account analysing relations between Israel and Egypt in the years 1949-56.

(8)

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- the abdication of King Farouk of Egypt (1952)
- the Suez Canal

You **must** also use information of your own.

Plan:
Nationalise the Suez
Suez

Black Arrow
Straits of Tiran

Immediately after the 1948-49 Arab-Israeli War, Plan D left around 700,000 Arab-Palestinians without a country as they dispersed into surrounding Arab countries, including Egypt. Tensions were already high with Egypt after the war as they claimed the Gaza strip in the war. This was not helped in 1952 when King Farouk abdicated and General Nasser took over as the leader of Egypt as ~~his~~ one of his first goals was to nationalise the Suez canal, which was then owned by England and France. Nasser nationalising the Suez canal meant he could toll any ships coming through and block a trade route for Israel. Nasser went through with this and all ships to or from Israel were ~~stopped~~ ^{denied} entry.

Israel, England and France didn't like this as Israel had no trade and France and England lost the Suez canal. Israel hit first in 1955 with Operation Black Arrow which saw Israel take back the Gaza strip. Nasser didn't like the attack and so responded by closing the Straits of Tiran, which was an alternate trade route for Israel.

This sparked England and France to sign the Suez
Sevres agreement which meant that they would intervene
on a tight close to the Suez canal on accounts of a 'police
action' to help Israel in the Suez Crisis. This meant that
in 1956 Israel launched an attack on the Sinai desert to
get to the Suez canal which is when English and French
troops 'intervened' to try and take back the Suez
canal. However, the UN intervened before they could do so,
leaving peacekeepers in the Sinai to prevent further conflict.



The candidate has given a narrative with clear sequence leading to an outcome, and has analysis of linkage, such as 'dispersed', 'didn't like this', 'sparked', making the AO2 Level 3. It is supported with good knowledge, such as 'Nasser', 'Black Arrow', 'Sevres Treaty', making the AO1 Level 3. Overall, it is the top of Level 3.



Candidates need to provide specific details to support their narrative.

This is an example of a Level 2 response.

2 Write a narrative account analysing relations between Israel and Egypt in the years 1949–56.

(8)

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- the abdication of King Farouk of Egypt (1952)
- the Suez Canal

You **must** also use information of your own.

Relations between Israel and Egypt
and Israel in the years 1949-56 were
negative for many reasons, one of those
reasons being the Suez Canal crisis.
This was when Nasser nationalised the
Suez Canal and made it Egyptian. This
threatened Britain and France as they
were big trading partners there. At the
start they met up with Israel to
take control of the Suez Canal again.
As a result this left Egyptian
feelings of Israel to become
increasingly negative due to the fact
that they felt like they could
no longer be trusted.



The candidate has provided a narrative with some organisation, leading to an outcome, but the answer lacks coherence. It has some analysis, such as 'this threatened Britain' and 'became increasingly negative', making the AO2 Level 2. There is some knowledge and understanding with 'Nasser nationalised the Suez Canal' but not a great deal so the AO1 is a weak Level 2. Therefore, overall it is a mid Level 2.



Candidates need to ensure they establish a beginning, middle and end for the narrative, and utilise language which helps analyse the links between the events and not merely list the events one after the other.

Question 3

This question is comprised of two 8 mark questions based on the second order concepts of significance and consequence. Candidates had to explain the importance of two of the following three topics: the end of the British Mandate (1948) for the creation of Israel; UN Resolution 242 (1967) for relations between Israel and the Arab world after the Six Day War; Arafat renouncing terrorism (1988) for attempts to find a solution in the Middle East. The most popular option was the end of the British Mandate, with the other two options equally shared for the remainder. Candidates who addressed the importance of the factor raised in relation to the development produced Level 3 responses when supported by good knowledge and understanding. This was in contrast to candidates who explained the importance of the factor in general terms, which normally stayed in Level 2. The majority of answers were able to focus on the question asked although a large number of candidates are still failing to link their answer to the second part of the question, eg relations.

In terms of the question on the British Mandate it was answered quite well by many candidates. The best answers were able to explain several reasons of importance including, quite commonly, how the end of the mandate allowed for increased Jewish immigration with the Law of Return in comparison to the restrictions the British had previously put in place. Others considered how British withdrawal led into the Arab-Israeli war and how Israel's victory in this allowed the newly created Israel to gain more land and establish itself against its Arab neighbours. Most candidates could explain that the end of the British mandate led to UN Resolution 181, which then led onto the official declaration of the state of Israel upon British withdrawal. Weaker responses showed quite detailed knowledge of the issues the British had faced during their Mandate, but quite often a candidate would provide quite a descriptive narrative of the British mandate and its difficulties and not return successfully to how this was important for the creation of Israel.

In terms of the question on UN Resolution 242 responses that achieved a higher level showed knowledge of both what was included in the Resolution and that it was ultimately refused by both sides – mentioning that the Arab States responded with the ‘three nos’, whilst Israel said that it would only negotiate over territory separately. This was often supported by a demonstration of understanding that the Resolution’s significance was related to it being the first iteration of ‘land for peace’, but that directly after the Six Day War it actually did little to positively impact relations in the Middle East. Some very strong responses commented on Palestinians rejecting the premise of the Resolution, due to its reference to them as a problem, which they found insulting, whilst both the USA and the USSR supported it. Many basic responses showed contextual knowledge of Israel’s victory in the Six Day War, particularly that this included the occupation of a large amount of new territory, and that the Resolution therefore had something to do with giving this land back to the Arab States. Some showed knowledge of what the Resolution contained but misunderstood its significance – arguing that it was a great success as it returned the territory won in the war and brought peace to the region. Some candidates confused Resolution 242 with Resolution 181, or thought it was the same as the ceasefire which ended the Six Day War, rather than knowing it came six months later.

In terms of the question on Arafat’s renunciation there was a range of answers. The stronger candidates were able to place the speech in its historical context of past terrorist activities by the PLO and were able to link it to increased US involvement in the peace process and the Oslo accords. Some good responses linked to increased Islamist radicalisation as being a threat to Arafat. Weaker candidates tended to expand on the ‘new beginning’ aspects of the speech for relations, or spoke about how bad terrorism was. However, a large number confused this speech with the earlier olive branch one.

This is an example of a Level 2 response.

- ☒ The importance of the end of the British Mandate (1948) for the creation of Israel.
- ☒ The importance of UN Resolution 242 (1967) for relations between Israel and the Arab world after the Six Day War.
- ☒ The importance of Arafat renouncing terrorism (1988) for attempts to find a solution in the Middle East.

The end of British Mandate have a great importance in the creation of Israel. In 1940s when the British Mandate could not solve the problem between Israel and Palestine they handed it to the UN and USSR. In 1947 USSR proposed a partition plan. According to this plan both Arab and Jews/Israelis got 50% of the land. And in 1948 British Mandate ended there and Israel got ~~all the power~~ was formed. They had all the power now ^(as the British Mandate power ended) because now even the last troops of Britain were removed and slowly slowly different countries started recognising accepting Israel as a nation.

- ✗ The importance of the end of the British Mandate (1948) for the creation of Israel.
- ✗ The importance of UN Resolution 242 (1967) for relations between Israel and the Arab world after the Six Day War.
- ✗ The importance of Arafat renouncing terrorism (1988) for attempts to find a solution in the Middle East.

UN Resolution 242 was set between Israel and Arab world after the Six Day War. Because ~~many~~ almost all of the countries suffered after that war. But UN Resolution 242 did not have that much effect because after some time War of attrition was started where Egypt fought with Israel to get Sinai and Suez canal back. Hence this proves that UN Resolution it was not that effective because the Israeli - Arab relation remained the same.



First response: Mandate. This candidate has presented the answer more as a narrative, but it does have some explanation, with an attempt to analyse, 'They had all the power', making the AO2 Level 2. There is some knowledge for support, 'partition plan', making the AO1 Level 2. Overall it was awarded top of Level 2

Second response: UN Resolution 242. The candidate has given some explanation on the failure of the resolution as it 'was not effective', making the AO2 Level 2. There is some knowledge for support, such as 'Sinai', but it is weak for Level 2. Therefore, it was awarded mid level 2.



It is important that points are explained, not simply described, to demonstrate analysis of the topic. Two well-developed explanations that also have good knowledge and understanding will enable candidates to attain Level 3.

This is an example of a Level 3 response.

- The importance of Arafat renouncing terrorism (1988) for attempts to find a solution in the Middle East.

Arafat renouncing terrorism was very important for attempts to find a solution in the Middle East. In 1988 Arafat realised that Israel were not going to be beaten in war and instead decided he needed a change in tactics. Arafat changed the PLO's policies and adopted a two state solution, recognising Israel's right to exist and renouncing terrorism against them. This was extremely significant as it was the first time that Arafat and the PLO had recognised Israel's right to exist and was important as this was the end of PLO raids and attacks. Arafat decided that the West Bank could be the new proposed state for the Palestinians. Overall this was very important as this meant that there was an opportunity for an agreement or peace treaty in the Middle East as the PLO had agreed to a two-state solution for the first time.

Secondly, Arafat renouncing terrorism was important as it meant the USA started to pressure Israel into making a peace treaty. After Arafat renounced terrorism the USA invited him to speak at the UN in December 1988 to reaffirm his position and reveal internationally his hopes for a solution. The USA desperately wanted peace between Israel and the PLO and as Israel heavily relied on US aid they could pressure Israel into starting talks with the PLO or else threaten to withdraw funds. Furthermore the international sympathy for the Palestinian cause was at an all time high after the 'Iron Fist Policy' so this meant Israel now saw the PLO and Arafat as an intermediate, especially due to the rise of Hamas. Overall it was very important as this put a lot of international and importantly US pressure on Israel to find a solution in the middle east Middle East.

- ☒ The importance of UN Resolution 242 (1967) for relations between Israel and the Arab world after the Six Day War.
- ☒ The importance of Arafat renouncing terrorism (1988) for attempts to find a solution in the Middle East.

UN Resolution 242 was significant for relations between Israel and the Arab world after the Six Day War in June 1967.

UN Resolution 242 was a policy that stated Israel would withdraw from all the land they gained in return for the Arab nations accepting and recognising Israel's right to exist. Originally both Egypt and Jordan agreed but later ~~did~~ we refused to accept it after the 1967 Khartoum Conference. This conference decided on the 3 Nos - no negotiation, no peace and no recognition. This was important as UN Resolution 242 did not succeed in creating peace in the Middle East and meant Arab relations with Israel after the Six Day War were still very hostile and tense. Overall the plan was significant as its rejection revealed how the Arab states still were not willing to negotiate with Israel.

Secondly, the UN ~~Resalt~~ Resolution 242 in 1967 was important for relations after the Six Day War as it was the basis for future peace treaties in the ~~for~~ future.

For example in 1988 the Camp David Accords agreed that Egypt would recognise Israel's right to exist and in return Israel would withdraw from the Sinai within 3 years. Another example of this can be seen in the Oslo Accords where Israel withdrew from areas in the West Bank in return for the PLO to stop raids against Israel. This meant that UN Resolution was very important for relations between Israel and the Arab world as despite it being rejected at the time it became the main basis for peace in the ^{future} revealing its importance over two decades ~~was~~ later.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

First response: Arafat. The candidate has given an explanation, with analysis of importance and a line of reasoning, such as recognising Israel and the role of the USA, making the AO2 Level 3. This is supported with good knowledge of the period with 'West Bank' and 'Hamas', making the AO1 Level 3. Therefore, it is awarded the top of Level 3.

Second response: UN Resolution 242. The candidate has provided an explanation with analysis and line of reasoning, 'not willing to negotiate' and 'Feature of peace treaties in the future' making the AO2 Level 3. There is good supporting knowledge with '3 Nos', conditions of the resolution, meaning the AO1 is Level 3. Overall, it is the top of Level 3.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Candidates need to provide specific knowledge to support their explanation.

Paper Summary

Based on the performance seen on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

- Make sure that you attempt all three questions, including both parts of Q1 and Q3.
- For all questions use accurate and relevant information to show your knowledge and understanding of events.
- Q1: Explain a link between the event and the consequence and do not merely describe or state something that happened. Focus on what happened as a result of the event.
- Q2: Have a clear beginning, middle and end, ensuring the events or developments in your narrative are linked together to show a clear sequence of events.
- Q3: Explain the impact the development/event/person had on the second development/event/person named in the question. Focus on what difference the development/event/ person made.
- In this examination series there was still a number of responses with illegible handwriting. Candidates should be aware that examiners can only credit what they can read.

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

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