



Pearson  
Edexcel

Examiners' Report  
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2019

Pearson Edexcel GCE  
In History (8HI0) Paper 1G

## **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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

## **Grade Boundaries**

Grade boundaries for all papers can be found on the website at:

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

Summer 2019

Publications Code 8HI0\_1G\_1906\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

## **Introduction**

It was pleasing to see candidates able to engage effectively across the ability range in this, the fourth year of the reformed AS Level paper 1G which deals with Germany and West Germany, 1918-89.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting the second order concepts of cause and/or consequence. Section B offers a further choice of essays, targeting any of the second order concepts of cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference, and significance. Section C contains a compulsory question which is based on two given extracts. It assesses analysis and evaluation of historical interpretations in context (AO3). Candidates in the main appeared to organise their time effectively, although there were some cases of candidates not completing one of the three responses within the time allocated. Examiners did note a number of scripts that posed some problems with the legibility of hand writing. Examiners can only give credit for what they can read.

Of the three sections of Paper 1, candidates are generally more familiar with the essay sections, and in sections A and B most candidates were well prepared to write, or to attempt, an analytical response. Stronger answers clearly understood the importance of identifying the appropriate second order concept that was being targeted by the question. A minority of candidates, often otherwise knowledgeable, wanted to focus on causes and engage in a main factor/other factors approach, even where this did not necessarily address the demands of the conceptual focus. Candidates in the main were able to apply their knowledge and understanding in a manner suited to the different demands of questions in these two sections in terms of the greater depth of knowledge required where section A questions targeted a shorter-period, as compared to the more careful selection generally required for the section B questions covering a broader timespan.

Candidates do need to formulate their planning so that there is an argument and a counter argument within their answer; some candidates lacked sufficient treatment of these. 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 do need to 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, the strongest answers demonstrated a clear focus on the need to discuss different arguments given within the two extracts, clearly recognising these as historical interpretations. Such responses tended to offer comparative analysis of the merits of the different views, exploring the validity of the arguments offered by the two historians in the light of the evidence, both from within the extracts, and candidates' own contextual knowledge. Such responses tended to avoid attempts to examine the extracts in a manner more suited to AO2, assertions of the inferiority of an extract on the basis of it offering less factual evidence, or a drift away from the specific demands of the question to the wider taught topic.

### **8H10\_1G\_Q01**

Question 1 asked candidates to consider whether the weakness of Weimar government during the Weimar Republic was the main reason for the growth of the Nazi Party in the years 1919-33. This was overwhelmingly the most popular question in Section A and it consequently produced a range of responses. At the top end candidates kept their focus on reasons for the growth of the Nazi Party and gave appropriate attention to the weakness of Weimar government as a causal factor. In particular successful candidates focused on the key events where government weakness led to Nazi growth. For example, the inability of the Weimar government to overcome the effects of the Wall Street crash was successfully countered by the Nazi's 'Bread and Work' propaganda. Too many candidates failed to think through and plan their answer and attempted to deal with it chronologically. This led to far too much evidence on the 1919-24 period where the Nazis were a minor party. Similarly information on the Treaty of Versailles showed why the Weimar Republic was open to criticism but it was often poorly related to how the Nazi Party used this in their electoral appeal. The key events in the 1930-33 period were too often barely addressed. Lack of planning also led to candidates offering lists of factors that made Weimar weak but not establishing the criteria that could reason a way to level 4. At the bottom end of the range candidates tended to offer a narrative of the time frame, often not getting to the culmination of Nazi victory in 1933.

### **8H10\_1G\_Q02**

Question 2 asked candidates to consider whether political stability was the most important consequence of Konrad Adenauer's Chancellorship in the years 1949-63. This question was taken up by only a small minority of candidates. Nevertheless it was very well done on the whole. At the top end candidates were able to show clearly why political stability was an important consequence, and how it fed into other important consequences such as economic growth. These candidates were able to show the links between political stability and other important outcomes on the one hand, and then show how this in turn resulted in further

political stability. This way of answering the question resulted in the establishment of criteria by which to evaluate the issues and gain access to level 4. Less able candidates tended to focus their answers on the Basic Law and denazification and often turned the question into the consideration of reasons for political stability.

### **8HI0\_1G\_Q03**

Question 3 asked candidates to consider the extent to which German living standards changed little in the years 1918-45. This was the more popular question in section B. However, the overall results for this question were disappointing. Although candidates at the top end were able to offer some good detail on changing living standards and develop the criteria by which to evaluate successfully, the majority of candidates did not manage this. The best responses usually offered detail on the post World War One issues caused by the allied blockade, the crisis of 1923 and the 'Golden Years', and the extent to which the Nazis overcame the devastation caused by the Wall Street crash. However there were a smaller number of level 4 answers than expected. A sizeable number of candidates simply did not know what the term 'living standards' referred to. Less successful candidates typically either mapped economic change and asserted that this would in turn change living standards, or alternatively they wrote about the quality of life in Germany. The latter approach led candidates to write about women's rights, the plight of Jews and other ethnic minorities, or even culture. Candidates rarely considered changing diet, real wages or housing. Candidates at level 3 did manage to include references to the misery unemployment and hyperinflation caused but this tended to be an illustration that change occurred rather than an attempt to weigh the extent of change and continuity. Candidates at the bottom of the range tended to write about one or two points of extreme distress such as 1923 or the war years.

### **8HI0\_1G\_Q04**

Question 4 asked candidates to consider how far the economy was the main factor influencing the changing role and status of women in the years 1918-89. This question was marginally less popular than question 3, but was tackled more successfully. At the top end candidates planned their answers and selected the key evidence across the time frame to build their response around. For example, periods of market growth in the 1920s and 1980s saw women getting access to higher status jobs, whereas economic growth in the Nazi period did not give women access to the professions. Even where candidates did not offer extensive material on the economy and women's status, they were still able to access level 4 by comparing economic causes to ideological and political causes. This approach allowed candidates to develop the criteria by which they could make judgements and focus on the

second order concept of significance. Candidates who took a chronological approach tended to restrict their answers to the earlier period, typically not getting much further than the 'rubble women' in the FRG. Less successful candidates tended to focus on the Third Reich where the comparison of ideological and economic factors was easier.

### **8H10\_1G\_Q05**

Question 5 asked candidates to consider whether Germany invaded Poland only because Hitler saw it as an opportunity for an easy victory. The section C question this year proved to be accessible with the majority of candidates showing understanding of the extracts and being able to explain and develop key points of argument within them. There is still a tendency to immediately label the authors as 'structuralists' and 'intentionalists' and use this as the framework to answer the question. This worked where the candidate remembered that the question was whether Hitler invaded Poland because he thought it was an easy victory. However a sizeable number of candidates forgot the focus of the question and thereby lost the key points of comparison within the extracts. Candidates showed good knowledge both of the controversy and the key evidence needed to make the argument. This meant that the bulk of candidates reached levels 3 and 4. Most candidates could explain how Hitler had broken the Versailles Treaty by re-arming, marched into the Rhineland in 1936 and united with Austria in 1938. They were also able to explain how Hitler ripped up the Munich Conference agreement in 1938 by invading Czechoslovakia and thereby offer a critique of appeasement. At the top end candidates offered some good discussion on why Hitler invaded Poland and had a good grasp of the conflicting pressures on Hitler as well as his own cunning and ideological obsessions. A minority of students at the bottom end denounced the extracts for being secondary sources and wasted time on trying to analyse their provenance.

## Paper Summary

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

Section A/B responses:

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels were:

- Candidates paying close attention to the date ranges in the question
- Sufficient consideration given to the issue in the question (e.g. main factor), as well as some other factors
- Explain their judgement fully – this need not be in an artificial or abstract way, but demonstrate their reasoning in relation to the concepts and topic they are writing about in order to justify their judgements
- A careful focus on the second-order concept targeted in the question
- Give consideration to timing, to enable themselves to complete all three question with approximately the same time given over to each one
- An appropriate level, in terms of depth of detail and analysis, as required by the question – e.g. a realistic amount to enable a balanced and rounded answer on breadth questions.

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Pay little heed to the precise demands of the question, e.g. write about the topic without focusing on the question, or attempt to give an answer to a question that hasn't been asked – most frequently, this meant treating questions which targeted other second-order concepts as causation questions
- Answer a question without giving sufficient consideration to the given issue in the question (e.g. looking at other causes or consequences, with only limited reference to that given in the question)

- Answers which only gave a partial response, e.g. a very limited span of the date range, or covered the stated cause/consequence, with no real consideration of other issues
- Assertion of change, causation, sometimes with formulaic repetition of the words of the question, with limited explanation or analysis of how exactly this was a change, cause, of the issue within the question.
- Judgement is not reached, or not explained
- A lack of detail

Section C responses:

Features commonly found in responses which were successful within the higher levels:

- Candidates paying close attention to the precise demands of the question, as opposed to seemingly pre-prepared material covering the more general controversy as outlined in the specification
- Thorough use of the extracts; this need not mean using every point they raise, but a strong focus on these as views on the question
- A confident attempt to use the two extracts together, e.g. consideration of their differences, attempts to compare their arguments, or evaluate their relative merits
- Careful use of own knowledge, e.g. clearly selected to relate to the issues raised within the sources, confidently using this to examine the arguments made, and reason through these in relation to the given question; at times, this meant selection over sheer amount of knowledge
- Careful reading of the extracts, to ensure the meaning of individual statements and evidence within these were used in the context of the broader arguments made by the authors



- Attempts to see beyond the stark differences between sources, e.g. consideration of the extent to which they disagreed, or attempts to reconcile their arguments

Common issues which hindered performance:

- Limited use of the extracts, or an imbalance in this, e.g. extensive use of one, with limited consideration of the other
- Limited comparison or consideration of the differences between the given interpretations
- Using the extracts merely as sources of support
- Arguing one extract is superior to the other on the basis that it offers more factual evidence to back up the claims made, without genuinely analysing the arguments offered
- Heavy use of own knowledge, or even seemingly pre-prepared arguments, without real consideration of these related to the arguments in the sources
- Statements or evidence from the source being used in a manner contrary to that given in the sources, e.g. through misinterpretation of the meaning of the arguments, or lifting of detail without thought to the context of how it was applied within the extract
- A tendency to see the extracts as being polar opposites, again seemingly through expectation of this, without thought to where there may be degrees of difference, or even common ground