

Examiners' Report  
June 2015

GCSE History 5HA01 01

## 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](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).

## ResultsPlus

### 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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2015

Publications Code UG041797

All the material in this publication is copyright  
© Pearson Education Ltd 2015

## Introduction

5HA01 2015 is a strengthened paper and has undergone substantial changes from the 2014 incarnation. There are five new question styles and only one style has been retained from 2014 – the 'key features' question. This Report looks at each question and offers some points where, hopefully, the 2016 cohort will be able improve on performance in 2015.

The approach to individual questions is considered in the reports on each separate item. Examples are provided for each question. Please note that on occasions, part answers are given as exemplification. A general summary of issues raised by examiners is given below:

- Candidates must look carefully at the wording of questions. This is a truism, but frequently this year; candidates seem to have focused on one word or a phrase and then ignored the key question word. Perhaps the most fitting example of this was the way in which many candidates ignored the word 'importance' in Q5.
- If dates and names are given in a question, they are there for guidance and should act as a trigger for recall. Far too many candidates ignored the dates/confused names and wasted time including irrelevant material.
- Candidates should be effective and efficient in their use of time – some failed to attempt Question 6 because they had written too much on lower tariff questions. Failure to answer Q6 denies access to 16 marks, some 30 per cent of the paper.
- Marks are awarded for SPaG, based on the response in Q6 and hence candidates need to ensure care in this aspect of the examination.
- Specifically, as has been pointed out in previous reports for 5HA01, it is dispiriting to see the continuing confusion with Nagy-Dubcek, Khrushchev-Gorbachev, Berlin in all its temporal appearances (despite its appearance in Q5), the ubiquity of Stalin as the eternal leader of the USSR, the poor chronology around events concerning Cuba and Afghanistan as an oil-rich nation. Strangely, the chronology of US presidents does seem to be more readily understood.

## Question 1

This question should be fairly straightforward for candidates whose task is to retrieve two relevant pieces of information from a source. Most candidates were able to do this. Some candidates needlessly complicated their answers by trying to put the source into their own words, or providing extra information of 'own knowledge' which is not required (often more able candidates fell into this trap, using time that could have been better used on later questions). On occasions there was also some confusion over the question, with candidates giving their two points as 'socialism with a human face' and 'made Czechoslovakia less repressive', which are not concrete reforms introduced by Dubcek and as such could not be rewarded. At times there was also a misunderstanding of the meaning of the question, with some candidates misconstruing this to mean actually how Dubcek communicated his reforms, e.g. through speeches. Despite the fact this is a low mark question, precision is important. Hence, as in all questions, irrespective of the tariff, the key to securing a good mark was to read the question carefully. The next step was to locate two relevant points in the source, and then write them out in a precise fashion.

It should be noted that some candidates wrote too much: this might have disadvantaged them later on in the paper.

- 1 Give **two** ways from Source A which show how Dubček 'introduced a series of reforms which became known as the Prague Spring' (Source A lines 1–2).

1 'Dubček announced free elections' showing a relaxed attitude to political opposition (2)

2 he also 'announced a reduction in the powers of the secret police' showing fear would not keep dubcek in power



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

The source is mined and two points selected.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Simply select the relevant points. Do not embellish them and then move on to the next question.

## Question 2

Many candidates were able to provide good answers here, the most popular points being developed were the Soviet/Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia, the Brezhnev Doctrine, and the arrest of Dubcek, signing of Moscow Protocol and reversal of reforms. At times there was confusion about when Dubcek was removed from power and by whom he was replaced. This was also a question where confusion with the Hungarian Uprising of 1956 appeared, with some candidates claiming that Dubcek was executed and replaced by Kadar. However, on what again should be a fairly straightforward question some candidates displayed a clear lack of precise knowledge about this aspect of international relations, and when this happened many resorted to making generalised points, or trying to take information from Source A in the same way as in Question 1. Most candidates had however grasped the need to make a developed statement, i.e. to give their point and then amplify it with another sentence or two of extra evidence/information.

As in Question 1, it should be noted that some candidates wrote too much: this might have disadvantaged them later on in the paper.

2 Outline **two** steps that Brezhnev took to oppose the policies of Dubček.

(4)

1 One step Brezhnev took was that he sent Soviet tanks and 500,000 troops into Czechoslovakia to show that Czechoslovakia would remain Communist and to capture Alexander Dubcek.

2 A second step was that he introduced the Brezhnev doctrine <sup>1968</sup> which meant that the USSR would invade / intervene with any country in Eastern Europe where Communism was under threat.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

Points are made and amplified, securing maximum marks. The candidate has written about the right amount.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Make a point and add to it without writing too much. The allotted space should be adequate. If a candidate has large handwriting, there is space underneath.

### Question 3

On the whole this question was not answered well, and there were very few 9 or 10 mark responses. Most responses reached the top of Level Two or low Level Three. This was surprising, since candidates are expected to tackle a not wildly dissimilar question on Unit 3 (albeit dealing with reliability rather than utility). Most candidates appreciated the need to discuss both content and NOP, although there were still quite a few answers that only discussed one or the other. There were still many generalised comments regarding NOP, e.g. 'it is not useful because it is in an American newspaper and therefore will be biased'. However, the main issue here seemed to be lack of additional recalled knowledge used to evaluate the usefulness of the sources, and as a result many marks were capped at 6. The more able candidates could see the link between the Berlin blockade and Source B, and could use this effectively as a reason why NATO was formed. That said, even the more able candidates struggled to use much additional knowledge in their evaluation of Source C. Few candidates were able to discuss either the Allied actions in 1947/8/9 or even those of the Soviet Union during the same period (apart from the Blockade and Airlift).

As a new style of question on the paper this should be a key area of focus in preparing candidates for this exam, especially with regards to practising source evaluation using contextual knowledge. Candidates do not need to compare the two sources – there is no command in the question to do this.

It was surprising the number of candidates who used the word 'unuseful'.

This candidate mistakenly named the sources A and B - as did many. It was clear which sources were being used and common sense was applied.

3 How useful are Sources B and C as evidence of the reasons for the USA's involvement in the formation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) in 1949?

Explain your answer, using Sources B and C and your own knowledge.

(10)

Source B's nature is a cartoon, so its usefulness may be questionable, as on the whole cartoons generally tend to have a bias towards a specific political belief. Here it seems that the bias is towards America and their stance in Berlin. The eagle represents America, and the bear represents Russia. This was during the time of the Berlin siege + airlift and so it shows that America may want to resist Communist Russia, a valid reason for setting up NATO. The origin of the source is an American Newspaper, so again we expect a certain bias towards the American ideology. And the purpose of the source is to

shows the American people how strong America is in comparison with Russia, so propaganda.

The Nature of source B is a letter, which again may have a certain degree of opinion, depending on the individual writer's political stance. The origin of the source is Phillip Jessup, presumably a capitalist, who is head of the UN, so he would have first hand experience about what to do to deal with Communism and the purpose of the source is to give guidance on the matter of containing Communism and what may stop a series of conflicts.

Whilst Source A is good at depicting the situation in Berlin, it gives us no additional background information, although we can infer it is ~~showing~~ showing the west's Berlin airlift, which is a valid reason to setup NATO, to prevent another siege of Berlin. Source A <sup>was</sup> also ~~has~~ <sup>have</sup> a strong bias as it is an American cartoon, drawn by a cartoonist who probably hasn't seen the siege with his own eyes, and is thus a secondary source. This means that I think that source A has a little use, as we have to infer a reason for setting up NATO.

Source B, on the other hand is far more useful. This is because it is a primary source, meaning it comes from someone with first

hand experience. It's also shows American attitudes at the time, and most importantly it gives us clear reasons as to why the <sup>USA</sup> ~~US~~ helped set up Nato. 'The united states can help reduce or end this insecurity by making a strong and clear statement'.  
(Total for Question 3 = 10 marks)



### ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

The candidate looks at content, nature/origin/purpose and context of both sources and clearly tries to address the question. Hence a top Level Three mark was awarded.



### ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

It is crucial that the attribution of the sources is examined together with content and context as well as focusing on the angle of the question. There is much to do here but content quickly leads to context and the attribution helps with context and also nature, origin and purpose. Hence, much of the answer is in front of the candidate. It is very much like assembling a jigsaw.



## Question 4 (a)

Most candidates answered this well with commendable knowledge about the decisions made at Potsdam particularly about the division of Germany and Berlin and its purpose, and the punishment of Nazi criminals. The nature of reparations as decided was not so well understood.

Other candidates deployed significant knowledge about what was disagreed at the Conference rather than decided on, and/or the relations between the leaders. As ever, it is a case of reading the question carefully. In addition, many confused Potsdam with Yalta or even the Versailles Peace Conference of 1919.

The main issue here was a lack of focus on the actual question, with some candidates discussing, often at great length, the disagreements and tensions of the conference, rather than the decisions that were agreed there.

### EITHER

- 4 (a) Describe the key features of the decisions made about Germany at the Potsdam Conference, 1945. *• Germany in zones*  
*• UN to be set up*  
*• War criminals* (6)

### OR

- 4 (b) Describe the key features of the Bay of Pigs invasion, 1961. (6)

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box  and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number: Question 4(a)  Question 4(b)

The key features of the decisions made about Germany at the Potsdam conference were that there was to divide Germany into four zones where each of the zone belonged to the US, Britain, USSR and France. Also ~~to be~~ Berlin was also to be divided into 4 zones similarly.

Secondly another feature was the decision made about agreement of putting war criminals into trials and were these war criminals were held at the international law of justice in Nuremberg in 1946. Furthermore ~~was~~ the Nazi party was dissolved and also arrested the it's members.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Comments

This candidate has written about the division of Germany and Berlin with amplification and moved to Level Two in so doing. A further paragraph on the dissolution of the Nazi Party and holding trials places the response at the top of Level Two.



## ResultsPlus

### Examiner Tip

Make the point and amplify to access Level Two - a second amplified point secures top of the Level.

## Question 4 (b)

Most candidates understood the Bay of Pigs invasion well, although many answers overemphasised the reasons for hostility between Castro's Cuba and the USA and drifted into the Cuban Missiles Crisis. Even strong candidates confused chronology and saw the Bay of Pigs either as part of the Missiles Crisis or even a consequence. Of those scoring 6 marks, they typically considered the plan, the invasion itself and reasons for its failure or the consequences in terms of Castro's relations with the USSR.

This response could have been shortened and is an example where a more direct answer would have saved the candidate time - time which could then have been employed in the higher tariff questions at the end of the paper.

### EITHER

- 4 (a) Describe the key features of the decisions made about Germany at the Potsdam Conference, 1945. (6)

### OR

- 4 (b) Describe the key features of the Bay of Pigs invasion, 1961. (6)

- ~~• Kennedy thought support was weak~~
- ~~• August attacked~~
- ~~• Failed rebellion - no longer friendly co-operation~~

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross . If you change your mind, put a line through the box  and then indicate your new question with a cross .

Chosen Question Number: Question 4(a)  Question 4(b)

One key feature of the Bay of Pigs invasion was that Kennedy believed it would lead to America being able to control Cuba once again by overthrowing Fidel Castro, Communist leader of Cuba who was non-sympathetic towards America. The CIA had informed him that the people of Cuba were unhappy with the new government and that therefore if the US attack minded with a small group of 1000 specially trained Cuban rebels, the people of Cuba would support them. However, when they attacked, the people of Cuba fought against them in retaliation.

Another key feature was that this greatly soured relationships between America and Cuba. For a because of the secret mission, Cuba could no longer trust America, which led to the end of amicable relations, which rendered trading opportunities and left Cuba near to bankruptcy, as America refused to buy Cuban sugar.

Another key feature was that this caused Cuba to turn to the USSR and ask for help both economically and militarily. The USSR helped the Cuban economy and offered military support ~~which was~~ by sending secret nuclear weapons to Cuba from September - October 1961, which was significant because it meant nuclear weapons were now in the range of America.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Comments**

The features are discussed - CIA, worsening relationship and further involvement with the USSR, but in some places development could be excised.



**ResultsPlus**

**Examiner Tip**

As in all questions so far - a point can be made and then amplified, but here three lengthy paragraphs consumes time.

## Question 5

Overall many candidates found this question the most challenging. Most candidates did understand the need to discuss the importance of the events in terms of international relations but equally many did not. Many candidates tried to answer this as with 4(a) and 4(b), as developed features of the events; while knowledge here was often excellent, without discussion of their importance, only 1 mark could be awarded. This was particularly true of the Hungarian Uprising with lots written about Rakosi and 'salami tactics' but less about the international significance of the uprising and its suppression. Even stronger candidates often struggled to discuss the events in terms of wider international significance; few for example understood how the Berlin Wall actually reduced tensions – even though Kennedy's quote about a wall being better than a war was commonly cited – although without explanation – ditto, 'I am a doughnut'. Many understood the significance of the ending of the Warsaw Pact in terms of the ending of the Cold War but comparatively few candidates actually focused on the ending of the Pact itself and its particular military significance. Of the four options, the Truman Doctrine was probably the one most confidently discussed in terms of international importance. It was noticeable that the three sections in quite a few responses scored differently- there could be a range of marks e.g. 2, 3, 4.

Having said all this many responses were excellent, warranting Level 3 marks. This was, nevertheless, the question which most differentiated between the more able candidates and their less confident fellows.

One issue that occurred in this question was the occasional confusion by candidates who thought that their three choices had to be somehow linked together, or prioritised in terms of importance when this is not the case – the events should be treated discretely and do not need to be compared in any way. Once again, this is an issue of reading the question carefully. Moreover, some candidates clearly wasted time in adopting this approach.

The response about the Truman Doctrine below forms a template for an answer to this type of question, as discussed below.

**Indicate which part you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new topic with a cross ☒.**

The Truman Doctrine, 1947 ☒

The Hungarian Uprising, 1956 ☒

The construction of the Berlin Wall, 1961 ☒

The end of the Warsaw Pact, 1991 ☒

In 1947 Britain ~~could~~ declared that it could no longer afford to pay for ~~the~~ occupying armed forces in ~~the~~ Greece.

There was a clear suggestion that ~~if~~ if they left, then surely Greece would fall to ~~communism~~. ~~but~~ The USA and president Truman did not want this. Later in the year Truman announced that America would supply British

troops and would support any other Nation that wanted to ~~fight~~ resist against Communism. This later became known as the ~~Truman~~ Truman doctrine. ~~It~~ The Truman doctrine was important because it was the beginning of a ~~robust~~ tougher American foreign policy and because it ~~is~~ told everyone that Truman would ~~not~~ stop at nothing to stop the spread of communism. The Truman doctrine was also important as it lay the foundations for the ideas behind the Marshall plan which came later on in the Cold war.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Candidates often gave a description of the selected item without any focus on importance or international relations.

The Doctrine is discussed and its importance is focused on. There is then the explanation of its importance in terms of its impact - the Marshall Plan and Cold War itself.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

It is essential that the word importance is focused on - it is a key question word. Moreover, international relations have to be considered and here the candidate refers to the robust US foreign policy and the Cold War. Hence a Level Three mark was awarded.

There are three choices to be made in this question and it is imperative that consistency of approach is maintained.

## **Question 6**

The 1980s are generally well known. Knowledge of the invasion of Afghanistan and the Carter Doctrine was particularly impressive – so much so that candidates should beware too much detail of the former as it can begin to detract from question focus. While candidates equally know the Reagan ‘evil empire’ period and SDI, the conferences with Gorbachev were less often cited – although many considered the significance of the INF treaty. Most candidates were able to explain at least two causes and many of those who considered three went on to prioritise – although linkage was more common among the L4 responses. Some stronger candidates did not attempt either linking or prioritisation and were limited to 10 marks as a result.

Weaker responses tended to confuse the 1980s with the period of détente – SALT1 and the Soyuz-Apollo link up were often cited, while some confused the Carter and Truman Doctrines. Interestingly this was not the case with responses to Q5. Often the information concerning Gorbachev veered towards description - glasnost, perestroika, ‘Gorbymania’ and the wives getting along famously, without specific or only descriptive focus on how this impacted on relations with the USA. Moreover, even those candidates who had a more secure understanding of chronology sometimes became an issue – for example, several answers tried to include the falling of the Berlin Wall, CFE treaty, START talks, Sinatra Doctrine and end of the Warsaw pact which all happened after the date range specified in the question. Once again, careful reading of the question is paramount.

### **SPaG**

In most answers, SPaG generally attracted 2 or 3 marks. Technical terms were usually spelled correctly; work was grouped into paragraphs with appropriate punctuation. Inevitably perhaps where the response was poor SPaG was often less successful. Examiners reported that it was heartening to see a reduction in the frequency of ‘would of’, ‘could of’ and ‘majorly’.

It should be noted that – obviously – when a candidate fails to answer Question 6, nothing can be awarded for SPaG and thus the candidate has no access to 16 marks – some 30% of the paper’s marks.

This candidate approached the essay by offering explained reasons with some judgements made in the body of the essay. Though there are one or two points which go beyond the timeframe, they did not detract from the overall answer - the candidate is not penalised for this.

**Spelling, punctuation and grammar will be assessed in this question.**

\*6 Explain why relations between the USA and the Soviet Union changed in the years 1979-87.

(13)

You may use the following in your answer.

- The Carter Doctrine
- Mikhail Gorbachev

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

The years preceding 1979 were known as détente, and represented an easing of tensions in the Cold War. 1979, ~~was~~ conversely, was the start of the 'Second Cold War' due to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan due to the Islamic government which the Soviets feared might cause the Muslims in the Soviet Union to demand Islamic states, and because they wanted to install a friendly Soviet government. America condemned this and created the Carter Doctrine as a result which stated that America would intervene in the Middle East to try and limit Soviet influence and grow American influence. As a result they supported the Mujahideen who were fighting the Soviets with weapons and money, turning Afghanistan into a huge drain on Soviet resources. This resulted in a worsening in relations and was a very important reason for future reasons in Soviet weakness.

With the new Cold War up and running and tensions high



America elected Ronald Reagan into the presidency. Reagan made a speech in 1983 calling the Soviet Union an 'evil empire' and announced the SDI or space defence initiative, commonly known as Star Wars. He also ramped up government spending and lowered taxes in America, creating a widening production base between America and the Soviet Union, all while the Soviets were sinking resources into a war without much progress in Afghanistan contributing to a failing economy, this put the Soviet Union under a lot of pressure.

Perhaps because of this economic pressure created by American competition and Carter Doctrine causing the Soviet Union to commit resources to a failing war to save face, the Soviet Union began to fall on hard economic times. As a result the new leader of the Soviet Union Mikhail Gorbachev, though initially cold to the American regime, gradually warmed as he realised the Soviet Union could no longer compete with America on initiatives such as SDI. This meant Gorbachev tried to ease tensions by withdrawing from Afghanistan, asking America to cancel their Space Defence Initiative. Reagan was not willing to backdown and so Gorbachev implemented reforms such as Glasnost (<sup>Openness</sup>) and Perestroika (Restructuring) making the Communist party more accountable and implementing reforms to move towards a free-market economy. This

ment in the year that Gorbachev was seen as a moderniser and his role is one of the most important in the gradual collapse of the Soviet Union during this time period.

The most important reason as to why relations changed between 1979-87 is because of Mikhail Gorbachev's reforms that allowed for Soviets to demand more and more freedom that eventually saw the destruction of the Soviet Union, which these reforms were forced on Gorbachev due to Ronald Reagan's aggressive expansion of the American economy and defense spending to combat what he saw as an 'evil empire', making Ronald Reagan's presidency the second most important reason that affected international relations in this period, followed by Carter Doctrine which caused America to drag the Soviet Union into a costly war against Afghanistan, compounding the economic malaises it was already experiencing and increasing the effectiveness of a powerful American economy on the Soviet Union, which eventually led to its downfall.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Comments

Three reasons are offered and the causes are clearly linked moving the answer from the top of Level Three to Level Four and then in the final paragraph the candidate makes some comparative prioritisation pushing the answer to the top of the level. SPaG was marked at High Performance.



### ResultsPlus Examiner Tip

Ensure that reasons are clearly explained; linked and then a clear judgement made about why one was more important than the other. It is important that here there is no assertion - there must be clarification.

## **Paper Summary**

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

- Candidates must ensure questions are read carefully.
- Most questions are brief and thus command words, topic words and names and dates are critical and they are not lost in lengthy sentences.
- Precision is required in all answers.
- Spelling, punctuation and grammar are critical ingredients of the final answer and assist in the acquisition of more marks. Candidates must again ensure they focus on the various demands of Q6. There are 16 marks available here.
- Time must be used effectively. Low tariff questions should not be given a disproportionate amount of time.

## **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>



Ofqual



Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru  
Welsh Assembly Government



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