



# **Examiners' Report**

## **June 2023**

**GCSE History 1HI0 P4**

## 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).



### 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 2023

Publications Code 1HI0\_P4\_2306\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

## 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.

Q1 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)

Q2 focuses on analytical narrative and the concepts 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).

Q3 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.

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.

## Question 1

Q1. Most candidates awarded Level 2 explained improving relations between the two superpowers, with agreements made between the superpowers on issues such as arms control or co-operation, with space exploration as clear consequences of détente. Most of these responses included specific details on SALT 1 or the successful US-Soviet Apollo-Soyuz mission. As a second consequence, many candidates explained the increasing co-operation between East and West and used details of the Helsinki Accords and the various 'baskets.' Some candidates also included the USA and the USSR being able to focus more on their own domestic issues. There were also occasional responses that explained the USA's agreement to a peacekeeping force in the Middle East following the Yom Kippur War and the USSR's intervention between the USA and Vietnam. At Level 1, most responses were basic and generalised comments about a consequence such as 'there was more peace', 'they built less bombs', without any explanation or any additional specific information. Some candidates repeated identical points for both consequences and could, therefore, only be rewarded for one of their two responses. A common unrewardable response was the setting up of the 'hotline' between Washington and Moscow as a consequence of détente.

1 Explain two consequences of détente in the 1970s.

1970s

Consequence 1:

One consequence of the détente was the SALT I treaty. The Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty was agreed upon by the two leaders and was the first time that the nuclear weapons were limited on both sides. As a result, military tensions between the two superpowers decreased, as nuclear war was slightly less likely, and this also benefited them economically, especially the USSR. This is because now they didn't have to spend as much money on military equipment and could invest in other things.

Consequence 2:

Another consequence of the détente was the Helsinki Accords. The Helsinki Accords were a series of agreements between the USA and the USSR in which they agreed on providing many human rights, agreed on the current borders of Europe, and agreed not to interfere with other countries' politics. This was good for both parties as the citizens

could finally get better quality of life  
- especially in the USSR - and neighbouring  
countries didn't have to worry as much  
for invasion.

(Total for Question 1 – 8 marks)



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

Top Level 2. Both responses are at Level 2 for both AO2 and AO1, with two distinct consequences explained with specific information added about the topic to support the explanation.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Candidates should always ensure that they provide two distinct consequences rather than repeating the same consequence for their second response. In such instances only one of the responses is rewardable.

## Question 2

Q2. At Level 3, most candidates gave a clear sequence of events leading to an outcome to produce a narrative showing how the relative co-operation between members of the 'Grand Alliance' at the Yalta Conference descended into more strained relations at Potsdam followed by increasing tension due to the telegrams, the USSR's establishment of satellite states, Churchill's 'Iron Curtain' Speech, the USSR's setting up of Cominform, and the USA's announcement of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. These high-level responses were often supported with accurate and relevant information, such as the nature of Germany's division, the USA's use of atomic weapons in Japan, the USSR's use of 'salami tactics' in Eastern Europe and details on Cominform and the Truman Doctrine. Responses remained in Level 2 for three main reasons: the narrative was less coherent, there was no aspect of content beyond the stimulus points (Yalta Conference and Cominform), or a lot of the information added was outside of the period of the question. Many of these responses included the Berlin Blockade and Airlift as part of their narrative which was frequently placed as an event between Yalta and the setting up of Cominform. In these responses many candidates had confused Cominform with Comecon. There was also the occasional detailing of the Tehran Conference at the start of the narrative. Level 1 responses were simple comments with limited knowledge of the Yalta and/or Potsdam conferences. Although much less frequent than in previous examinations there were still a few responses that gave a narrative in the first person. This, as mentioned in previous reports, should be avoided, and will invariably mean that the requirements for AO2 beyond Level 1 cannot be met.

2 Write a narrative account analysing US-Soviet relations in the years 1945–47.

(8)

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

- Yalta Conference (February 1945)
- Cominform (1947) *Truman doctrine - Marshall aid -*

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

After the Yalta Conference, US-Soviet relations were still very positive and as allies and members of the Grand Alliance their relationship was strong. In June 1945 was the Potsdam Conference and the third time that the Grand Alliance came together and by that time the countries in the Grand Alliance had agreed on how to split Germany after the war and that the capital city, Berlin, would also be split. Both the US and the Soviet Union were in agreement with the decision however Berlin was part of the Soviet's part of Germany so there was a bit of resentment in that regard.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

The response is mid-Level 2. The response shows a sequence of events but with only some analysis of the linkage between them. Some accurate and relevant information is added to show some knowledge and understanding of the events.



Candidates should try and cover the date range stated in the set question which will allow them show sufficient information and knowledge for higher marks to be awarded for AO1.

2 Write a narrative account analysing US-Soviet relations in the years 1945-47.

(8)

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

- Yalta Conference (February 1945)
- Cominform (1947)

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

Firstly, relations started positive with the Yalta Conference. The USSR and USA had agreed to both fight Germany as well as Japan together. This meant they had a common goal. However the US deployed the atomic bomb on Nagasaki and Hiroshima in August 1945. This led to the beginning of the arms race as the Soviet Union felt intimidated by the sudden American display of power and wanted to catch up. The arms race began after the dropping of the atomic bomb and involved a souring of relations as the two were now directly competing with each other. It was compounded by the Long and Novikov telegrams which both highlighted anxieties at the other and the need for the preparation of war. It also highlighted ideological differences. This led to the Truman Doctrine and Cominform as the two countries also sought to settle their ideological dominance. The Truman Doctrine focused

on the containment of the spread of communism and therefore resulted in Marshall Aid being given to European countries to alleviate their <sup>economic</sup> struggles after the war, making them less likely to turn to communism. Cominform was created by the Soviets as a direct response to this and organised communist countries, urging them to reject the Marshall plan. This therefore increased tension between the two countries as they were competing against each other for the control of Europe and therefore US-Soviet relations decreased in 1947.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This is a high Level 3 response. For AO2 there is a clear narrative giving a clear sequence of events leading to a conclusion and there is clear linkage between the events. For AO1 accurate and relevant information shows good knowledge and understanding of the key features and characteristics of events within the specified time period of the question.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Candidates can only access Level 3 by going beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points. In this response there is a wide range of material outside of the aspects prompted by the stimulus points.

### Question 3

Q3. Those candidates that chose the importance of the formation of the Warsaw Pact for Superpower relations reached Level 3 by analysing how it increased tension by countering the threat from NATO, the USSR's deployment of armed forces in its satellite states, cementing the division of Europe and its implications for the USSR's intervention in Hungary in 1956. Level 3 responses frequently made explicit links to the question by explaining that its formation followed the decision that West Germany joined NATO and that its action meant the USA appeared weak. There were also some responses that included longer term implications of the formation of the Warsaw Pact for the Prague Spring and the consequent Brezhnev Doctrine. Some candidates also explained ways in which the Warsaw Pact could be regarded as reducing the likelihood of direct conflict between the Superpowers as it created more of a basis for peaceful co-existence. At Level 2, most responses were less explicit about importance and frequently gave a more narrative account of the actions of the Warsaw Pact or stated that its formation was a response to NATO and then explained far more about the nature of the West's military organisation. Level 1 responses were mostly generalisations such as 'it made the USSR stronger' and 'Europe was more divided.' At this level, many candidates saw Stalin as responsible for the creation of the Warsaw Pact.

For the Cuba question, at Level 3, responses explicitly focused on the importance of Soviet relations with Cuba for tension between East and West in 1960s. Most of these responses explained in their analysis aspects such as the impact of the Bay of Pigs on increasing the USSR's links with Cuba and therefore increasing tension between the USSR and the USA, and the consequences for East-West relations of the siting of Soviet missiles in Cuba with superpower relations deteriorating almost to the point of full-scale nuclear war. At this level, many responses also explained the easing of tensions after the Missile Crisis with attempts made to improve East-West relations, for example the setting up of the 'hotline.' Level 2 responses frequently had significant elements of a narrative account of events in Cuba, from the USA's failed Bay of Pigs invasion to the events of the Cuban Missile Crisis with only an implicit focus on why relations between Cuba and the Soviet Union led to issues between the East and the West. Level 1 responses were often simple comments on increasing fears of communism in the USA due to Cuba's proximity or statements about the Missile Crisis.

For the question on the USA's Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) question, Level 3 responses focused on its importance for US-Soviet relations. The analysis at this Level commented on how it both soured relations in the short-term, such as the breaking of the 1967 Outer Space Treaty, and was seen by Andropov as the USA preparing to strike the USSR, as well as its significant contribution to Gorbachev's 'new thinking' and the consequent increased co-operation between the USA and the USSR. These responses often included accurate and relevant information such as the summits held, and agreements made, such as the INF treaty. Some responses also explained that the SDI meant that the MAD theory was made obsolete and that the programme was a deliberate 'bluff' by Reagan. Level 2 answers were more often descriptions of the SDI, Gorbachev's new ideas, or the collapse of the Soviet Union rather than an explicit focus on the impact of SDI on US-Soviet relations. At Level 1, there were often simple and generalised responses on the USA now having more power, the USSR now appearing weak, or some general information about the technology itself.

- ☒ The importance of the USA's Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) for US-Soviet relations.

Ronald Reagan's Strategic Defense Initiative, also known as Star Wars, was important for US-Soviet relations because it made the USSR think the USA were further ahead in the arms race than them, increasing tensions.

SDI was a plan to place a satellite in <sup>space</sup> ~~the sky~~ that would shoot down Soviet missiles with lasers. Star Wars was very far from actually being put into action, however Reagan knew that by announcing their plan to USSR, it would seem that it was not far away. Meaning USA had developed the technology so quickly, that USSR was behind in the arms race.

Margaret Thatcher's involvement decreased US-Soviet relations because now Britain were becoming involved, the world would see that the west

were winning the arms race, so favour Capitalist ways over communist. Also they would put their trust in the west as it's technology was greater, decreasing ~~relations~~ relations between US and Soviet Union

- ☒ The importance of Soviet relations with Cuba for tension between East and West in the 1960s.
- ☒ The importance of the USA's Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) for US-Soviet relations.

Soviet relations with Cuba increased tension between East and West in the 1960's

Khrushchev's good relationship with Castro meant that Soviet missiles were placed in Cuba. This increased tensions between USA and USSR because Soviet missiles were now close enough to be able to bomb the Capital, Washington and the White House where Kennedy was living. This increase in tensions put East and West on the edge of potential nuclear war. This forceful move by the USSR was important in the worsening of East West relations and potential MAD (mutually assured destruction).

Also, Soviet Union and Cuba started trading, and USA and Cuba's trade was stopped. This was detrimental for the USA's economy as it relied

on trade with Cuba heavily. This is important in the increase of tensions between East and West in the 1960's as USSR took key trade from the USA, worsening their already bad relationship USA did not trust USSR at all.



The first response is high Level 2. For AO2 there is some analysis in the first paragraph and AO1 is also at Level 2 (accurate and relevant information). The final comment is disregarded as an unrewardable comment regarding trust in the West due to its technology. The second response is low Level 3. The stronger performance of AO2 allows entry into Level 3 but performance at AO1 is relatively weak and therefore gives an overall mark of low Level 3.



To gain high marks within Level 3 candidates need to show strong performance for both AO1 and AO2.

## Paper Summary

Based on the performance seen on this paper, students 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 simply describe or state something that happened. Focus on what happened as a result of the event.
- Q2: focus on the date range specified in the question and ensure 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 a noticeable increase in the number of responses with illegible handwriting. Students 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>

