



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

November 2023

Pearson Edexcel International GCSE
In History (4HI1)
Paper 1: Depth Studie

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 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.

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

November 2023

Publications Code P74643A

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

History iGCSE November 2023
Principal Examiner Report
4HI1 01

Paper 1 : Depth Studies

The assessment requirement was that candidates answer a set of questions from **two** options from a choice of eight. The most popular options were:

Option 3 : Germany: development of dictatorship, 1918-45

Option 6 : A world divided: superpower relations, 1943-72

Option 7 : A divided union: civil rights in the USA, 1945-74

and the most popular combination of options was:

Option 3 and 6

Option 3 and 7.

All eight options required candidates to answer three sub-questions on the option topic. Each sub-question had a different focus and tested a range of assessment objectives. Question (a) required candidates to identify the impression given by an author based on a small written extract and tested AO4. Question (b) required candidates to explain two effects and tested AO1 and AO2. Question (ci) and (cii) required candidates to explain, analyse and make judgements about key features, events, causes, effects and significance and tested AO1 and AO2.

General comments

The entry for this series was very small.

Across all eight options the following generic comments in relation to each sub question should be noted:

- In question (a) selecting information to support the impression will limit the answer to marks within level 2. In order to move in to level 3 the answer requires consideration of how the impression has been created by considering the author's selection of evidence, tone, emphasis or omission.
- In question (b) knowledge of the effect is not in itself sufficient, there is a requirement to explain the effect in terms of outcomes.
- In question (c) knowledge needs to be used to develop an answer that considers the issue raised by the question and a criteria based judgement needs to be made.

Option 3: Germany: development of dictatorship, 1918-45

This option was attempted by many candidates.

In question (a) many candidates were able to identify that the impression given by the author about Nazi rule was that they did not have complete control. This was supported from the extract with terms such as, 'told jokes', 'protested' and 'complaining'. This secured marks in Level 2. Those candidates who also considered the emphasis the author put on lack of control by ignoring the control the Nazi did have through DAF, or the Gestapo secured marks in Level 3.

In question (b) many candidates were able to explain the effects of the Second world War on the role of women in Germany. Many candidates suggested that considering how the Nazi's had significantly restricted the role of women during the 1930s. as a consequence of war, women were now needed to work in armaments production, factories and supportive roles within the armed services. Higher scoring candidates then suggested that this meant the war had significantly changed the role of women in Germany as they were now doing things contrary to Nazi ideology. Candidates also suggested that the war had a significant emotional impact on women in Germany. This was seen as credit worthy by examiners but the support for this effect tended to be generalised. Therefore, some candidates had one very well explained effect with an outcome and a second less well explained effect. This resulted in a low Level 3 mark. Candidates who explained two effects with no outcomes were awarded a mark in Level 2. Candidates who only had one valid effect could only be awarded up to a maximum of 4 marks.

In question (c) (ci) was slightly more popular than (cii). It was noticeable in both questions that many students had limited knowledge (AO1) of the factor or issue stated in the question and limited knowledge of other content that could be used to help develop the answer. In (ci) some basic information was given about reparations, but knowledge about loss of land was often generalised and knowledge of other aspects of the Treaty of Versailles were limited. Similarly, in (cii) knowledge of the Locarno Treaties was very limited (and in some cases totally inaccurate) as were other aspects of Stresemann's work. Therefore, explanation (AO2) was often unsupported, or had limited support or was generalised. As a consequence, when coming to a judgement candidates tended to state that something was more important or significant without applying and explaining criteria, or judgment was asserted or lacking completely. Candidates who had precise knowledge, developed and sustained an argument and made a supported judgement secured marks in level 4.

Example script: Option 3: Germany 3x Doc id. A_0534000097108

(a)

The candidate suggests that the impression given by the author was that German people did not fully respect Hitler. This was then supported using words and phrases from the extract. The candidate focus is on what the extract shows. This answer was awarded a mark in Level 2 as there was no focus on selection, tone or emphasis, and, therefore, could not be awarded a mark in Level 3.

(b)

The candidate is aware of how women were regarded by the Nazis during the 1930s and suggests that an effect of war is that they now go back to work and there is some support given, but some is generalised. However, the second effect is more about what was happening in the 1930s rather than an effect of the war. This answer was awarded a mark in mid-Level 2.

(c)

The candidate suggests that reparations were important and briefly explains how the issue led to the problems in the Ruhr. It lacks the precise knowledge that would help explain why many German people disliked this aspect of the Treaty of Versailles. Blame for the war is also briefly considered but, again, it lacks precisely selected knowledge and development of why many Germans disliked this. Loss of land is given as a third factor with limited explanation other than it separated German people. The judgement is stated with little explanation. This answer was awarded a mark in mid-Level 3.

Option 6: A world divided: superpower relations, 1943-72

This option was attempted by some candidates.

In question (a) many candidates were able to suggest that the impression of relations between Stalin and Truman at Potsdam was that they were poor. This was then supported using words and phrases from the extract such as 'rivalry', 'suspicion', and 'unhappy'. This secured marks in Level 2. Those candidates that also considered the emphasis the author put on relations being poor and had ignored how much actual agreement there had been at Potsdam secured marks in Level 3.

In question (b) candidates tended to have good knowledge regarding the Marshall Plan. Some gave very precise information about how much money was given and the range of countries that took it. Those that then used this knowledge to explain the effect on the Cold War were able to access the higher Levels and marks of the mark scheme. Many candidates suggested that effects included the economic recovery of western Europe after the war, Stalin's suspicion of 'dollar imperialism' and the USSR response with Cominform and Comecon. Those that then suggested that this increased tension in the Cold War scored the highest marks.

In question (c) (ci) was slightly more popular than (cii). In (ci) there was some clear understanding of the actual invasion of Hungary by the USSR, but this was often in narrative form and not explicitly connected to the focus of the question. There was also some reference to Soviet control, the refugee problem that followed and some negative international reaction, though at times this was very generalised. In (cii), there was some understanding of the crisis in Czechoslovakia in 1968, but answers tended to be poorly constructed and organised. As a consequence, in both (ci) and (cii), when coming to a judgement candidates tended to state that something was more important or significant without applying and explaining criteria, or judgment was asserted or lacking completely. Candidates who had precise knowledge, developed and sustained an argument and made a supported judgement secured marks in level 4.

Example script: Option 6: Superpowers 6x Doc iD. A_0534000115813

(a)

The candidate suggests that the impression given by author was one of disagreement. That is supported by words and phrases from the extract such as, 'rivalry and suspicion' and 'appreciate the others point of view'. The candidate then considers that the author has ignored the significance of the development of the atomic bomb, which moves the answer in to Level 3. This answer was awarded the highest mark in Level 3.

(b)

The candidate very clearly identifies two effects of the Marshall Plan on the Cold War. In the first paragraph there is the context of the Truman Doctrine and the impact that the Marshall Plan aids the economic recovery of Europe, which Stalin sees as 'dollar imperialism' and this leads to increased tension in the Cold War. In the second paragraph there is an explanation of the effect being the USSR's response through Cominform and Comecon. This is supported with the outcome. This answer was awarded the top mark in Level 3.

(c)

The candidate makes an initial judgement in relation to the issue raised by the question in the first few lines of the answer. While at this stage this judgment is unsupported, it is a possible indication of a line of argument that might then follow. This suggests at this stage that this may become a high level answer. The candidate then considers a number of factors relevant to the question, with each one having explanation and development. There is reference to de-Stalinisation, reaction by the USA, other international reaction, Soviet control and the impact on satellite states. These are developed as part of the argument stated in the early lines of the answer. There is then a judgement which is based on criteria and has some justification which is supported. This answer was awarded a high mark in Level 4.

Option 7: A divided union: civil rights in the USA, 1945-74

This option was answered by some candidates.

In question (a) some candidates were able to suggest that the impression given by the author was that Schiafly was important or a driving force in the opposition to the women's movement. They supported this using words or phrases from the extract such as. 'mobilised', 'tireless campaigner' and 'persuaded'. This secured a mark in Level 2. Those that considered that the emphasis placed on her importance by the author ignored that she was challenged by many women for her views, moved it into Level 3.

In question (b) candidates had knowledge about Emmett Till and what he had allegedly done, but not all candidates used this to consider the effect on civil rights. Those that did suggested that the case raised awareness of civil rights issues across the USA, had significant media coverage, and prompted particular movements to act, namely NAACP and the Montgomery Bus Boycott. Many candidates

made reference to the significance of Emmett Till's open coffin as significant. All this was credit worthy and allowed some students to access Level 3 and the highest marks.

In question (c) (cii) proved to be slightly more popular than (ci). In (ci) candidates knew some relevant information about McCarthy and the Red Scare but often used it in descriptive paragraphs that were not related to the focus of the question. These types of responses were awarded marks in Level 2. However, there were candidates that considered McCarthy in relation to the Red Scare, investigations, the cases of the Hollywood 10, Alger Hiss, the Rosenbergs and the impact on US citizens. These types of answers moved into Level 3 and sometimes the lower end of Level 4. Candidates who had precise knowledge, developed and sustained an argument and made a supported judgement secured marks in level 4.

Example script: Option 7: Divided Union 7y Doc iD. A_0534000099521

(a)

The candidate suggests that the impression given by the author was that Schiafly helped stay-at-home mothers. This is then generally supported from the extract. The candidate then offers another impression, which is not required. The answer was awarded a mark in Level 2.

(b)

The candidates identifies two valid effects of the Emmett Till case on civil rights. However, there is limited knowledge (AO1) and limited explanation (AO2). The answer was awarded a mark in Level 2.

(c)

The candidate gives some relevant information about McCarthy and the Red Scare. However, there is little attempt to develop other possible lines of argument, and the judgement is asserted. This answer was awarded a low mark in Level 2.

