



Pearson

Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2018

Pearson Edexcel GCE History
(8HI0 2A)

ResultsPlus

 **edexcel**

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 2018

Publications Code 9HI0_38_1806_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

Paper 9HI0 38

Paper Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range with A Level paper 38 which deals with The Making of Modern Russia, 1855-1991 (38.1) and The Making of Modern China, 1860-1997 (38.2).

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A contains a compulsory question which is based on two enquiries linked to one source. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts - cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Section C comprises a choice of essays that relate to aspects of the process of change over a period of at least 100 years (AO1). Most candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and there was little evidence of candidates being unable to attempt all three sections of the paper within the time allocated. Examiners continue to note that there are a number of scripts that pose problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

In Section A, the strongest answers demonstrated an ability to draw out and develop reasoned inferences from the source for both enquiries and to evaluate the source thoroughly in relation to the demands of the two enquiries on the basis of both contextual knowledge and the nature, origin and purpose of the source. It should be reiterated that weight is not necessarily established by a discussion of what is missing from a source. If the author of the source has omitted something intentionally in order to modify its meaning or to distort the message of the source, then it will be relevant to discuss that omission in reaching a conclusion regarding the use that a historian might make of the source. However, comments on all the things that the source might have contained but failed to do so is unlikely to contribute to establishing weight.

In Section B, examiners were impressed by the number of responses that clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. However, as was noted in last summer's report, weaker candidates often wanted to turn questions into a main factor/other factors approach, even where this was not appropriate to the focus of the question. The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-pointed strands which are the focus for awarding marks and centres should note how these strands progress through the levels. Candidates should be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that they draw their evidence in responses from the appropriate time period.

In Section C, candidates were better prepared this year to engage with the elements of the process of change that are central in this section of the examination. This is a breadth question and the questions that are set encompass a minimum of 100 years. Candidates are reminded that, as pointed out in last summer's report, this has important implications for the higher levels in bullet point 2 of the mark scheme. To access bullet point 2 at level 5 candidates are expected to have responded 'fully' to the demands of the question. The requirements of questions will vary and key developments relating to the question may be more specific to the entire chronological range in some questions and options than in others. However, it was judged not possible for candidates to have 'fully met' the demands of any section C question unless at least 75% of the chronological range of the question was addressed. To access bullet point 2 at level 4

candidates need to meet most of the demands of the question. It was unlikely that most of the demands of the question would be met if the answer had a restricted range that covered less than 60% of its chronology.

In both Sections B and C when dealing with AO1, not all candidates demonstrated a secure understanding of what is meant by 'criteria' in terms of bullet point 3 of the mark scheme. Some candidates explicitly state in the introduction to the essay that they are naming the criteria that they plan to use, when in actual fact they are referring to the issues or the factors that will be discussed in the response. 'Criteria' in bullet point 3 of the mark scheme refers to the basis on which candidates reach their judgement, not the issues that are discussed in the process of reaching that judgement.

Q01

There were some very good answers to this question. Many responses were able to identify the causes of discontent among the Russian industrial workers as living and working conditions but also, through their political demands, their anger at their disenfranchisement under the autocratic rule of Nicholas II. With regard to their attitude towards the Tsar, most identified the apparent respect accorded to the throne implied by the language used but many were also able to use their own knowledge to develop this point, questioning the degree of threat to the autocracy indicated by the nature of the workers' demands and discussing the fact that attitudes changed sharply after the events of Bloody Sunday. Most were able to use Gapon's position as author of the petition when considering the value of the source to the enquiry.

On the other hand, weaker responses paid scant attention to the content of the source, instead writing at length about what was not in it, notably the Russo-Japanese War. This might have added sound context to the source material, however explicit links were frequently not made. Comments on the nature, origin or purpose of the source were often generic and not applied in coming to a judgement on its use to the enquiry.

Q02

Answers to this question tended to lack some balance between the two enquiries in the question. Candidates found it more straightforward to discuss the arguments of those in favour of adopting western ideas in China but were less convincing in identifying the nature of opposition they faced. With reference to the former, many responses were able to identify in the speech China's defeat in the Opium Wars and the technological and scientific superiority of the west. Many used their knowledge of the context to note the arguments of the Self-Strengthening Movement in China and the difficulties it faced in encouraging change. Rather fewer were able to infer from Gong's arguments the clear opposition at court to such calls for reform and the attitudes implied by the rejection of the path adopted by Japan at the same time. With regard to the value of the source to the enquiry, many noted Gong's position as a leading westerniser and inferred that his arguments may have a degree of exaggeration in them or that the strength of opinion clear in the reports was itself an indication of the opposition to his proposals among those close to the Emperor.

Weaker responses often tended to paraphrase the source content or paid scant attention to the content of the speech, instead writing at length about what was not in it. Comments on the nature, origin or purpose of the source were often generic and not applied in coming to a judgement on its use to the enquiry.

Q03

Answers to this question often had detailed knowledge of Alexander II's reforms and wrote about them in full, his military changes especially. Some very good answers argued that the reasons for these reforms was a combination of factors, certainly the Crimean War for illustrating so starkly the extent of Russia's failings when compared to its western neighbours, but also the Tsar's own education and outlook and the influence of his ministers. Some also noted the cumulative effect of reform, emancipation of the serfs necessitating administrative reforms in other areas. Weaker answers tended to describe the reforms without really addressing their causes and there was some lack of range and/or depth.

Q04

There were some very good responses to this question which were able to discuss in impressive depth the degree to which the Bolsheviks were able to consolidate their control over Russia after the October Revolution, pointing out their strengths and weaknesses of their position before coming to a nuanced judgement. However many answers to this question wrote at length about events before the October Revolution as if the question was about its causes – in such cases, discussion of the Bolshevik consolidation of power was stunted or, occasionally, omitted altogether. Candidates are reminded of the need to read questions carefully so that they are able to identify its conceptual focus and remain relevant.

Q05

There were few responses to this question. The better answers were able to evidence fully the stated factor, the mistakes of China's leaders in the years 1898-1900 in addressing the causes of the Boxer Rebellion, before going on to consider a range of other factors, particularly the actions of western powers and missionaries. Weaker responses found the stated factor challenging and were far more comfortable discussing the alternatives as causes.

Q06

This was a popular question and often done very well. Many good answers were able to write convincingly about China's improved relationship with the rest of the world after 1978, their role in the UN for example, the visits of Deng and Jiang to the USA, or the rebuilding of relations with Japan. As far as arguments to the contrary went, most focused on the condemnation of China's suppression of the Tiananmen Square protests though concluding that the importance of trade with the rest of the world ensured that little long-term damage was done. Others discussed the importance of China's deteriorating relationship with the USSR and the problems caused by disagreements with Britain over the return of Hong Kong.

Q07

Candidates who attempted this question often knew a great deal about the effects of government policies during this period on the peasantry. The better answers were able to discuss the effectiveness of these policies throughout the period, balancing their successes (often the reforms of Stolypin and the initial attraction of the Land Decree) with their failures (the effects of forced collectivisation for example). Weaker answers tended to use a chronological structure which didn't help them evaluate the question convincingly. They also had a limited chronological range, especially towards the end of the period, running out of evidence when it came to the premierships of Brezhnev and Gorbachev especially.

Q08

Good answers to this question focussed fully on attempts to encourage modernisation in Russian agriculture during this period and were able to evidence, in some depth, the successes and many failures of such attempts to improve agricultural production both under the Tsars and Communists. There were some very impressive considerations of why it was that both regimes failed to embrace modernisation successfully, whether that was due to the political vision of the Tsars or the ill-conceived schemes of Stalin and Khrushchev. Weaker answers tended to lack the knowledge necessary to construct a convincing argument, often using spurious examples of modernisation, and/or lacked chronological range. Simply asserting that little or nothing occurred under the premierships of Brezhnev and Gorbachev is unlikely to satisfy the requirement for chronological cover in Section C answers.

Q09

Not many attempted this question and there were few convincing answers largely because candidates lacked knowledge of transport improvements during the period and were unable to link their importance to industrial development. Most were far more comfortable discussing other factors in China's industrial growth, especially the role of the Self-Strengtheners, the first Five-Year Plan and the reforms of Deng Xiaoping.

Q10

Those who attempted this question were often able to discuss the importance of Mao to economic development in China, comparing his successes and failures (most notably the first Five-Year Plan and the calamities of the Great Leap Forward and Cultural Revolution). This was often balanced by evidence of the role of other important individuals, Li Hongzhang from earlier in the period and Deng at the end, and sometimes TV Soong from the middle. Weaker answers knew surprisingly little of Mao's economic policies though rather more about Deng's and produced unbalanced answers which made a convincing evaluation of the question difficult.