

Examiners' Report
June 2019

GCSE History 1HI0 P5

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 2019

Publications Code 1HI0_P5_1906_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

Introduction

The Period Study focuses on an understanding of the unfolding narrative of a time period, with candidates required to answer three questions targeted at Assessment Objective 1 (Knowledge and Understanding) and Assessment Objective 2 (Analysis of Second Order Concepts).

As of the 2019 series, the Period Study forms a separate booklet to the British Depth Study sat during the same examination. Candidates should be reminded not to answer the British Depth Study questions in the Period Study booklet, or vice versa, and where extra paper is used, to ensure that separate sheets are used for the Period Study and the Depth Study, with each attached to the relevant booklet.

Q1 will always focus on consequence, requiring candidates to explain two valid consequences, giving equal attention to both. It is deliberately designed to be accessible to the entire ability range. However, some candidates provided more detail than was necessary, leaving less time to address higher tariff questions.

Q2 focuses on analytical narrative. The analytical narrative will always focus on a period containing events or ideas that can be perceived as a sequence; this could cover a number of years or a much shorter period. Candidates should be clear about the time span of the question to ensure they cover an acceptable range and what it is the narrative is designed to analyse. It is vital they understand the narrative concept, with the sense of a beginning, development and end, rather than produce three paragraphs which do not directly link. These stimulus points serve a different purpose to those on other questions; they will be useful reminders to candidates of sign posts along the narrative and not things they need to develop. Candidates do not need to use these stimulus points but there is an expectation that there will be some depth of knowledge, shown by three discrete points in the narrative being covered, although this does not mean candidates need to identify three different events.

For Q3, candidates were required to analyse the importance of an event/person/development. The question focuses on what difference the event/person/development made in relation to situations and unfolding developments. They had to answer two topics out of a selection of three. Responses ranged from impressive analysis focused on the appropriate second-order concept (AO2), which were supported with accurate, relevant and good knowledge (AO1), to those from candidates that offered simple comment with limited knowledge for support.

Progression in AO1 is shown by the 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. Centres are reminded that the indicative content in the markscheme 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 is important to recognise that in this series there was a noticeable increase in the number of responses with handwriting which was difficult to read. It is vital that candidates are made aware that examiners can only credit what they can read.

Question 1

In Q1 candidates were asked to provide two valid consequences of the Oslo Accords (1993). There are 4 marks available for each consequence. This implies a link between the stated event and the events or developments that are identified by the candidate. Candidates should make sure that they explain how these events/developments happened as a result of the Oslo Accords and not merely subsequent to it. This explanation should be supported with specific information showing good knowledge and understanding (AO1).

Most candidates understood the second-order concept of consequence. Those that did well knew specific information, such as Arafat's rejections of terrorism and the establishment of the PNA. Weaker answers were vague, frequently making generalised references to peace. There were unfortunately a number of candidates who confused Arafat and Nasser and, referred to all Arab nations when talking about recognising Israel's right to exist. Some candidates merely rephrased the same consequence and as such were only awarded for one of them.

This is a level 1 answer.

1 Explain **two** consequences of the Oslo Accords (1993).

Consequence 1

One consequence was that there was now no more violence because the PLO and stopped its violence. Therefore, no more damage harm being done to innocent lives and the country they were fighting ~~for~~ for.

Consequence 2

Another consequence was that now Israel and Palestine could talk it out and get to the root of the problem instead of causing significant damage to the country. This way their differences can be solved quicker and ~~more~~ better.



For consequence 1, this candidate has provided a valid consequence in “no more violence” but it is very general, as is the supporting knowledge, “the PLO...stopped its violence”. Thus, both AO2 and AO1 are level 1.

For consequence 2, this candidate only provides general information in terms of Israel and Palestine “talking it out” but fails to provide a valid consequence, meaning that only AO1 is credited at level 1 and AO2 is not credited at all.

Overall, this response is level 1.



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

This is a level 2 answer.

one consequence of the oslo awards was that it was the first time that proper negotiations of peace between Israel and ^{palestine} ~~palestine~~, due to the oslo awards, ~~both~~ ~~palestine~~ palestine acknowledged the state of Israel and Israel acknowledged that pLO was the representatives of palestine. This was a step towards peace and showed israelis and palestinians that peace can be soled. It helped both the countries rebuild themselves and their economy as there now was a ^a threat of war.

Consequence 2

Another consequence of the oslo awards was ~~that~~ that it led to the creation of the PNA. This handed all the matters of the palestinians and helped them get a voice. They improved the relations between neighbouring countries and helped to rebuild the country, town and economy. It also gave the palestinians a better life.



This candidate has provided two clear consequences: the proper negotiation of peace and the creation of the PNA, both of which have been explained with reference to specific details such as the mutual recognition of Israel and Palestine.

This candidate gains full marks for both consequences.



Candidates should provide two different consequences and avoid repeating themselves.

Question 2

In Q2 candidates were asked to provide an analytical narrative of the Suez crisis in 1956. There was an improvement in the approach to the narrative question, however, there needs to be more work on the linking of events. 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 demonstrated analysis of links, for example 'consequently' and 'which resulted in.' This was apparent even if they had more limited knowledge.

Most candidates could give information beyond the stimulus points, although the weakest relied heavily on these and often simply repeated them in a sentence. It was pleasing to see that the majority of answers wrote a narrative that ended with a definite outcome. Weaker answers showed knowledge of the basic events (nationalisation, British/French/Israeli attack, USA intervention, Britain humiliated) but failed to explain how one event linked to the other. There were a number of candidates who were confused about the role of the British and French and the sinking of the ships.

This is a level 2 response.

2 Write a narrative account analysing the key events of the Suez crisis in 1956.

Significance

Nasser's rise to power increased
Israel's ability to trade increased
Formation of UAR with Syria and Egypt

kept Suez in Egypt control (8)

You may use the following in your answer:

- Nasser
 - British and French troops
- You must also use information of your own.

Brit, France and Israel

secret talks

IDF invade

Gaza and Sinai

Brit and France withdrawal

DSSR caters report to Africa

Israel attacking Egypt

- Nasser closes Strait of Suez

- Israel attacks

IDF destroy Egypt

air force, take

Gaza strip bank

Sinai and Gaza

~~The Suez crisis~~ was occurred due to the
~~USS~~ The Suez crisis occurred in 1956 and
was due to Britain, France and
Israel's secret talks. Israel's reason to
invade Egypt was due to their negative
relations with Egypt after they allowed
Fedayeen to invade Israel. ~~The~~
~~Suez~~ crisis Events were that the IDF
invaded Gaza and Sinai which was
a demonstration of IDF superiority
and dominance over Egypt. ~~An~~ An unexpected
result of this was that Britain and
France withdrew and left Israel
troops to technically deal with the repercussions.
Nasser's ability to maintain control
of the Suez canal for Egypt led to his
increase in respect by ~~the~~ Egypt and Arabs.
This was significant ~~as it led to~~
for Israel as it led to their ability
to trade, increasing. ~~Another~~ A huge
important factor of the Suez crisis is

it resulted in the formation of the UAR, due to causing Syria and Egypt to unite. This was a depiction of how beneficial the Suez crisis was for Palestinians.



This candidate has attempted to write a narrative but the answer is more about the significance of events. However, there is some organisation leading to an outcome making the AO2 an insecure level 2. The knowledge is mainly relevant and accurate but it is also mainly focused on cause and significance. So AO1 is also not strong in level 2.

Overall, this response is placed at mid level 2.



Candidates need to ensure they utilise language which helps analyse the links between the events and not simply list the events one after the other.

This is a level 3 response.

During the period of the Suez crisis, it was ultimately sparked by Nasser nationalising the Suez Canal, in an attempt to raise money by tolling ships. ~~The~~ Money was needed to be raised in order ~~to~~ for Nasser to construct the Aswan dam.

However, Britain and France were outraged, as it meant they couldn't receive money by taking ships to pass through. In a desperate attempt to regain control, Britain and France held secret meetings with Israel, in order to develop a plan to retake control of the Suez Canal.

~~Subsequently~~ Subsequently, Israel launched an attack on Egypt, whereby they ~~was~~ managed to lift the blockades, allowing British and French troops to move in on the Canal.

However, Egypt sunk ships into the Canal, making it inaccessible.

This therefore resulted in UN intervention and Britain and France withdrawing, lowering international respect.

As a result, Egypt decided to partner with the USSR, from whom they received weapons and troops, which angered Britain and France, as well as the US, resulting in the ~~loan~~ 300 million loan for the Aswan dam being constructed.



This response demonstrates a clear narrative about the Suez crisis showing linkage of events, as demonstrated with phrases such as 'desperate attempt' and 'subsequently'. AO2 is placed in level 3.

The content goes beyond the stimulus points with details regarding secret meetings with Israel and the sinking of ships providing clear knowledge and understanding. Therefore, AO1 is also in level 3.

Overall, this response is awarded a high level 3.



Candidates need to provide specific information to support their narrative.

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 establishment of the Israeli Defence Forces for the protection of the new state of Israel; the actions of the USSR and the USA for the outbreak of the Six Day War (1967); PLO activities in Lebanon (1970-82) for Israeli security. The questions on the IDF and the Six Day War were the topics most often selected.

Candidates who addressed the importance of the factor raised in relation to 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.

For the IDF question, level 2 responses often provided general knowledge about the role of the IDF in war or the support of the IDF by the USA, rather than demonstrating specific knowledge on the IDF itself. Candidates who attained level 3 recognised multiple implications and were more likely to focus on the IDF's conscription regime and their use of reservists and how this aided the effectiveness of the IDF. Some of the very best answers also referenced the unifying aspect of the IDF and its role in helping to forge a sense of nationhood in the new state.

The question on the Six Day War produced some very good responses at level 3 with many candidates addressing the USSR misinforming Egypt regarding Israeli troops and the USA's funding of Israel. The responses which remained in level 2 often demonstrated knowledge such as both sides supplying weapons yet failed to explain how this caused the war. There were some answers which focused on the events of the Six Day War rather than the role of the USSR and the USA in causing the conflict.

The topic of the PLO led to some weaker responses outlining the general terror activities of the PLO rather than the importance of the PLO in Lebanon for Israeli security. Better responses showed a tremendous depth of knowledge referencing the proximity of Lebanon to Israel, the creation of a civil war in Lebanon, the Coastal Road Massacre, Operation Litani, the camp massacres and the PLOs move to Tunisia, clearly explaining how each of these events impacted on Israel's security.

This is a level 2 response for both answers.

- The importance of the establishment of the Israeli Defence Forces for the protection of the new state of Israel.
- The importance of the actions of the USSR and the USA for the outbreak of the Six Day War (1967).
- The importance of PLO activities in Lebanon (1970–82) for Israeli security.

The establishment of the IDF meant Israel was heavily protected, yet also equipped and prepared to attack. A key example is the Arab-Israeli war, in 1948. This saw the IDF utilised to attack any ~~partition~~ threats after the UN ^{Resolution 181} ~~partition~~ plan, which was the declaration of Israel as a state.

- ☒ The importance of the actions of the USSR and the USA for the outbreak of the Six Day War (1967).
- ☒ The importance of PLO activities in Lebanon (1970–82) for Israeli security.

The USSR and the USA were key factors to the outbreak of the Six Day war. With both the USSR and the USA being classed as 'Superpowers' in the middle east, both countries helped supply weapons to Arab countries. However, them themselves had ongoing problems as they were in the middle of the Cold war.

Nevertheless, ~~both~~ the USSR supported Egypt and the USA supported Israel, whereby their conflict over the countries resulted in the six day war.

This is evident as the USSR gave an inaccurate tip about Israeli troops preparing to attack. This resulted in an Arab attack against Israel. ~~however~~ ~~the~~ USA and Egypt using weapons

curticy of the USSR to attack. However the USA encourage Israel to respond.



First response – IDF – provides an attempt at analysing that Israel was heavily protected. Unfortunately, the analysis is weak and means the AO2 is just into level 2. Only general knowledge is demonstrated with passing comments on the Arab-Israeli War but it lacks depth, making the AO1 a level 1.

Overall, this response is a low level 2.

Second response – the Six Day War – provides some explanation regarding the USSR giving inaccurate information and USA encouraging Israel. However, there is no proper analysis, making AO2 a level 2. There is some knowledge but it is not all accurate and rather basic at times, meaning the AO1 is a weak level 2.

Overall, this is a mid level 2 response.



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 a level 3 response for both answers.

- ☒ The importance of the actions of the USSR and the USA for the outbreak of the Six Day War (1967).
- ☒ The importance of PLO activities in Lebanon (1970–82) for Israeli security.

The actions of the USSR were one of the main factors why the Six Day War broke out. The USSR falsely informed Nasser that Israeli troops were gathering on the Syrian border, therefore forcing Egypt to act due to the Egyptian-Syrian pact made where both countries promised to defend each other from attack. This was important for the outbreak of the 6 day war as Nasser was preparing troops to fight which would not have happened if he did not believe attack to be imminent. Because of this, the Israelis were now also preparing for war.

The actions of the USA were also important for the outbreak of the war as they supplied Israel with lots of weapons. This was important because without the support from the USA, Israel wouldn't

have gone to war first and only won it due to their support as they would not have been strong enough

The USSR was also important for the outbreak of the war as they supplied Egypt with new weapons which meant they ~~were~~ felt they were in a better position for war, however the most important was their false warning of Israel's preparing for war - this forced Nasser to act.

☒ The importance of PLO activities in Lebanon (1970-82) for Israeli security.

There were many Palestinian refugees living in Lebanon due to being expelled from Jordan and the PLO often made raids into Israel from Lebanon. In Lebanon, the PLO set up schools and hospitals and their headquarters were in Beirut. This threatened Israeli security as they often made raids in Israel which were retaliated with many Israeli troops marching into Lebanon.

~~The PLO~~ The PLO threatened Israeli security by hijacking a bus ~~in~~ in Tel Aviv and killing Israeli teachers. However, the importance of PLO ~~at~~ activities in Lebanon were not that much of a concern for Israel as they always retaliated by sending in many more troops to attack, killing ~~and~~ many and destroying villages. Israel responded to the bus hijacking by invading Lebanon in 1982 and killing Lebanese civilians whilst the PLO fled North. The IDF surrounded Beirut and cut off supplies.

PLO activities in Lebanon were ~~quite not very~~ important for Israeli security as when the civil war broke out in Lebanon, between the Lebanese Christians and PLO, the IDF surrounded the refugee camp of Sabra-Sha and allowed the massacre of many Muslim and Palestinian refugees.

PLO activities were important to Israeli security as many terrorist attacks were planned and carried out by PLO fighters living in Lebanon as it was



First response – Six Day War – provides a clear analysis of the roles of the USSR and the USA in relation to the outbreak of the war with a line of reasoning. The candidate has identified the issues of the USSR providing false information and USA providing weapons to Israel. This makes the AO2 level 3. Knowledge is specific so AO1 is also level 3.

Overall, this response is a high level 3.

Second response – PLO – does have some analysis but is not consistent for secure level 3 for AO2. There is accurate and relevant information, such as the invasion in 1982, which places the AO1 as a secure level 3.

Overall, the response is mid level 3.



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:

- Share the knowledge that you have learned: if you are not sure how to answer the question, pick out the topic specified and write down what you can remember about it. Aim to write something for every question.
- When tackling Q1, ensure the explanation shows the link between the event and the consequence and don't simply describe something that happened after the event.
- On Q2, make sure that you focus on the date range specified in the question and don't waste time writing about things that happened before or after.
- On Q2, make sure your narrative response has a beginning, middle and end. Don't write it in the first person or as a story – a historical narrative is like a television documentary, as opposed to a drama, and it needs to be clear that the events you're writing about actually happened.
- On Q3, read the question really carefully to make sure you are selecting the correct content for your answer.
- Good answers on Q3 will explain why the development/event/person specified was important, but better answers explain the impact they had on the second development/event/person named in the question. So try to ensure that you can explain the impact **for** the second development/event/person, rather than keeping it general.

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>

