

Examiners' Report

June 2025

Int GCSE History 4HI1 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 <https://www.edexcel.com> or <https://www.btec.co.uk>.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our [contact us page](#).



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 <https://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: <https://www.pearson.com/uk>.

June 2025

Publications Code 4HI1_01_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Introduction

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.

Option 5: Dictatorship and conflict in the USSR, 1924-53.

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 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. Questions (c)(i) and (c)(ii) required candidates to explain, analyse and make judgements about key features, events, causes, effects and significance and tested AO1 and AO2.

General comments

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; to move into Level 3 the answer requires analysis of how the impression has been created by consideration of 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 how the given issue in the question has led to/brought about the outcome(s).

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 is made. As well as the precise issue the question is focused on, candidates should pay careful attention to the requisite second-order concept (ie causation, consequence, significance), and the given date range.

Question 3(x)

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

This option was attempted by many candidates and on the whole was answered well.

In question (a) most candidates were able to identify the impression given by the author about the response of the Weimar Government to the Great Depression, typically focusing on something along the lines of it having been limited/ineffective. Candidates who scored marks in Level 2 (3-4 marks) were able to support their inference of the impression by selecting examples of language used by the author. Those candidates who moved into Level 3 (5-6 marks) also considered the author's treatment, emphasis and selection of material in order to explicitly show aspects of how the author created the impression that was inferred. Many candidates attempted to ensure higher level marks by considering both the use of language to create an impression, and the inclusion/omission of material (generally the latter), and most were successful in this. A minority of candidates did refer to the author having omitted facts or issues without demonstrating how this related to the impression or referred to material of limited relevance.

In question (b), most candidates were able to offer material to explain the effects of the Reichstag Fire, with commonly considered effects being increased support, increased power, or the removal of opposition. One defining issue was how well these were related to 'the Nazi Party', as the question asked, although thankfully most responses did relate the material offered to this to at least some degree. What differentiated candidates was the accuracy of the information they used (AO1) and the extent of the explanation in relation to the outcome (AO2). Most candidates seemed sufficiently able to offer supporting material. Some responses wrote at length, whilst others were effective in achieving high marks by clearly demonstrating how the Reichstag Fire brought about the consequences offered, in a succinct and focused manner.

In question (c), candidates who clearly focused material towards the question from the start of points tended to do better. The strongest responses were able to sustain a focus on the demands of the question, deploying knowledge to discussion of the appropriate second-order concept, eg significance or causation. Some responses included effective judgements at the end of each point, eg explaining the relative importance of the point under discussion.

On (c)(i), most candidates were fairly secure in their knowledge of hyperinflation, and the majority of these were able to focus this sufficiently to the question's demands and demonstrate how it was a problem for the Weimar Republic. Candidates chose a range of other points, eg the Treaty of Versailles, Ruhr Occupation, threats from left and right, and the weaknesses of the Weimar Constitution. A good number of candidates really began to analyse the relative importance of these reasons.

On (c)(ii), most candidates were able to offer material on allied bombing, along with other aspects of the German Home Front, most typically rationing and the role of women. A small minority strayed beyond the focus of the home front, eg attempting to discuss the Eastern Front or other aspects of the wider war, although the majority of candidates offered a range of relevant material. Those who did so and were able to focus this on an analysis of significance were more likely to secure marks in Level 4.

Answer TWO questions.

You should spend about 45 minutes on each question.

Indicate your first question choice on this page. You will be asked to indicate your second question choice on page 12.

Indicate which question 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 question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number:

Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☒

Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

Question 6 ☒

Question 7 ☒

Question 8 ☒

- (a) The author gives a very negative impression about the governments response to the Great Depression, portraying it as ineffective and ~~only~~ focusing on the negatives such as 'disparate poverty' and helping the 'violent extremist parties'. The author uses unbalanced language about the ~~Waller~~ harsh effects of the depression such as 'collapsing' and ~~the~~ uses words like 'hunger chancellor' and 'little agreement' to show their ineffective policies and ~~adding to~~ unpopularity. By omitting the fact that many other countries, most of all America, were struggling from the 'Wall Street crash' ^{in 1929} and resultant tariffs, the author creates the impression that it was solely the German government ^{despite the fact there was not a lot they could do} fault. Therefore, by focusing on the struggles during the Great Depression and omitting the fact that there were similar problems in other countries, the author gives a wholly negative impression.

((a) continued)

(b) One effect of the Reichstag Fire on the Nazi Party was the removal of opposition leading to greater control as the communists had been their main opposition politically. In the Reichstag Fire in ~~the~~ February 1933 ~~the~~ communist Van der Lubbe was blamed for starting it, something that already looked badly on the communists and made ^{Weimar} politicians dislike them. It also meant that after the fire, Goering was able to arrest 4,000 communists, effectively removing a large source of opposition. This meant that there was ~~less opposition~~ ^{opposition} to Nazi power and the way that they dealt with it (taking away a threat to the Weimar government) ~~meant~~ meant that they could have been looked upon more favourably by the government, giving them more power.

Another effect of the Reichstag Fire on the Nazi Party was the creation of a police state, giving the Nazis a lot of power compared to other political parties. As a result of the Reichstag Fire and the danger to the ~~the~~ government that it posed, Hitler managed to persuade Hindenburg to pass 'The Law for the Protection of People and State'. This allowed the SA and SS to stand in ~~at~~ Reichstag meetings, giving them opportunity to ~~disrupt~~ ^{alter} the votes by intimidation (as done during the Enabling Act in March), but also the power to search anyone's home, meaning they could weed out the few opponents left and deal with them. Therefore, the Reichstag Fire meant that the Nazis were able to create ~~of~~ a police state, giving them a lot of power.

(b) continued)

(c)(i) OR (c)(ii) I disagree with the statement that ~~the~~ hyperinflation was the main reason for the problems for the Weimar government between 1919-23 as, despite it affecting the whole population, ^{its impact} it ~~didn't last~~ lasted less than a year and ~~potentially~~ led to the farcical international policies of the 1920s. Instead, I think the biggest cause of problems was the Treaty of Versailles as it greatly impacted Germany's military and economic situation, was the root cause to some of the problems and uprising during these years, and had a lasting impact from 1919 to even past 1923. Uprisings from the left and right were also problems however they mostly didn't last long and were ~~dealt~~ dealt with easily.

One cause of problems for the Weimar government was hyperinflation, as it affected the whole population and affected Germany's international position, however it was dealt with by Stresemann within a year. Hyperinflation was caused by the ^{January} invasion of the Ruhr in ~~1923~~ 1923 (where as Germany missed a reparations payment of December 1922) and the decision of passive resistance from the government meant that there was no industrial production in the Ruhr and the fact that they paid 2 million marks to strike also affected the economy, leading to hyperinflation. Hyperinflation had ^{and} huge impacts on everyone in Germany causing ~~hyperinflation~~ ^{hyperinflation} causing ~~hyperinflation~~ ^{hyperinflation} loss of savings ~~and~~ ^{and} led to most people, such that between 1914 and 1923, the price of bread rose from 0.5 marks to 2.1 billion marks, showing the extent of hyperinflation. However, ~~not~~ some groups were not affected such as farmers and other people who owned land, as 'stuff' was worth more than money. Hyperinflation also had a negative effect on Germany's international standing as their currency lost convertibility, the conversion rate ~~becoming~~ ^{becoming} 4.2 billion marks. ~~The~~ ^{Despite this, when} Stresemann was elected in August 1923, he decided to stop passive resistance (Sep) and introduce the Rentenmark, which significantly reduced hyperinflation. Therefore, despite the

(c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued) huge impact it had on people in Germany and their internal image, it didn't affect regime and was significantly ^{improved} ~~settled~~ within a year.

However, I believe the greatest cause of problems to the Weimar Republic (1919-23) was the Treaty of Versailles as it was the root cause to a lot of opposition and economic problems of the Weimar government, all the sanctions also having the lasting effects ~~regarding~~ up to 1923 and beyond. The Treaty of Versailles, signed 28 June 1919 caused a lot of dislike and opposition toward the government as people thought it was a 'dictat' (dictated peace) and the Article 231 (The 'War Guilt Clause'), blaming Germany for the damage and destruction of the war only exacerbated this, leading to uprisings. ~~Furthermore~~ The Treaty also imposed military sanctions such as ~~the~~ limiting the army to 100,000, meaning many soldiers were disbanded as Freikorps, leading to the ^{Kapp} ~~Kapp~~ Putsch Uprising of March 1920. It also ~~led~~ led to economic difficulties as there was £6.6 billion reparations, the root cause to the invasion of the Ruhr, hyperinflation and many economic difficulties. Therefore, the fact that the treaty of Versailles was the root cause to many problems, affected everyone in many areas of life and lasted a long time meant that it was the most important cause of problems.

Another cause of problems was uprisings, such as the Spartacist Uprising in January 1919 and the Kapp Putsch, however they were defeated without too many problems and little long-standing impacts. On 5-11 January 1919, Spartacists led by Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht revolted in Berlin, and although they captured the newspaper headquarters and telegraph bureau, they were defeated easily by Freikorps only 13 Freikorps fighting 100 Spartacists. However this also encouraged violence against communists, having a small impact on the government. The Kapp Putsch ^{March} of 1920 was

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued) also a problem as Ebert had to rely on the people in a general strike, however it was ^{effective} ~~deadly~~ until and shocked the people supported the government. Therefore, the fact that the uprisings were ineffective and not long-lasting meant they weren't a huge cause of problems.

Therefore the biggest cause of problems 1918-23 was not hyperinflation as it lasted less than a year despite its negative effect on many people, and instead the Treaty of Versailles was more of a problem as it affected everyone, was a root cause to many problems and lasted a long time. Uprisings were not as significant as they were defeated easily and did not last a long time.

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued)

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued).

(Total for Question = 30 marks)



The answer for question (a) saw the candidate identify an impression and support it with detail from the extract and consider emphasis and selection to achieve a top Level 3 mark. In question (b) the candidate was able to identify two effects, support them with knowledge and show how they led to an outcome and so satisfied fully the requirements of Level 3. In question (c) the candidate accessed the top of Level 4 as there was analytical explanation, accurate and precisely selected information and a judgement. Criteria for the judgement were offered and justified.

Answer TWO questions.

You should spend about 45 minutes on each question.

Indicate your first question choice on this page. You will be asked to indicate your second question choice on page 12.

Indicate which question 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 question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒ Question 2 ☒ Question 3 ☒
 Question 4 ☒ Question 5 ☒ Question 6 ☒
 Question 7 ☒ Question 8 ☒

(a) The author gives the impression that the response of the Weimar Government had on the Great Depression was unuseful for the Germans struggling. The author uses a mocking tone to state "lose him the support of the unemployed." This emphasises that the Weimar Government did nothing to help the national struggles - to which Brüning earned "hunger chancellor."

(a) continued)

(b) One effect of the Reichstag Fire on the Nazi Party was that it helped them get rid of communists. This was because they were able to accuse and arrest communists for starting the fire. This meant that the Nazi Party could get rid of the threat of communism and gain more voters for themselves.

Another effect was it allowed Hitler to create the Enabling Act. This meant he could pass laws without the consent ~~to~~ of the government. This allowed Hitler to take away people's freedom and make Germany a one-party country. This was a significant step towards his dictatorship.

((b) continued)

(c)(i) OR (c)(ii) (c)(i)

I agree that hyperinflation had a significant role to why the governments ~~had~~ of the Weimar Republic had problems. However, other things contributed to their problems, such as the Treaty of Versailles, and Germany's poor relationship with allies during 1919-23.

Hyperinflation caused the governments of the Weimar Republic massive problems. During this period, the value of mark was nothing, and by the end of 1923 - it cost around 4 billion marks to 1 dollar. Due to hyperinflation, businesses shut down, and the unemployment levels sky rocketed. This cause the Weimar Republic many problems. This was because the economy was already struggling after WW1, and they were not stable. Eventually, they had to drop unemployment benefits as

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued)

they did not have the money to be paying all the people. Overall, hyperinflation caused many problems - and Germans started to lose faith in them and their country.

After Germany's loss in WW1, the Weimar Republic signed the Treaty of Versailles. This meant that they had to take blame, lower their army to 100,000, pay reparations of 136,000 million marks, and give up land. This caused massive problems, as their economy was so unstable after the war that they struggled to pay reparations. Many Germans felt they were humiliated and 'stabbed in the back' after the treaty. Overall, the treaty did cause problems for the governments of the Weimar Republic, especially since their citizens were starting to lose faith in them.

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued) During the period of 1919-23, Germany had a poor relationship with Allies. After the defeat, Allies were very harsh with Germany. During their economic instability, Germany could not ask for loans, as they were meant to be paying reparations to Britain and France. Their defeat also meant they could not join the League of Nations which really pushed Germany back. This caused problems as the Weimar Republic had to find ways to deal without any support.

In conclusion, I agree that hyperinflation did cause the governments of the Weimar Republic problems. However, it was not the 'main reasons'. The three attributes combined was really the cause of all their problems. And maybe without some of these issues - the problems would have been solved earlier.

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued)

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued)

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued)

(Total for Question = 30 marks)



The answer for question (a) saw the candidate identify an impression with some support, to achieve a Level 2 mark. In question (b) the candidate was able to identify two effects. The response attempts to use knowledge to explain how the Reichstag Fire brought about these effects, but does not fully develop these, and so achieves a secure Level 2. In question (c) the candidate attempts to develop the reasons why the Weimar government faced problems in these years, producing a response which achieves mid-Level 3. The explanation is mainly directed at the demands of the question, and sound, accurate and relevant material is used, although it could be both more precisely selected, and more carefully developed towards the question's demands.

Question 5(x)

Option 5: Dictatorship and conflict in the USSR, 1924-53

In question (a) most candidates were able to identify a valid impression, typically along the lines of Stalin being clever or manipulative. Many candidates supported this by selecting the author's language, and those who explicitly considered how the author's choice of words or selection of material helped form this impression moved into Level 3 (5-6 marks).

In question (b) most candidates were able to offer material focus on the effects of policies on ethnic minorities. A discriminating factor in the success of these was the quality of the supporting material. There were many strong responses, offering specific material on ethnic minorities, most commonly Koreans, Ukrainians and Germans.

In question (c)(i) candidates generally had good knowledge of collectivisation and its various consequences, although in general, candidates tended to be stronger on factors other than the given issue of living conditions. That said, the majority did manage to offer some focused explanation and analysis on the given consequence, as well as other consequences, most typically the removal of kulaks, the impact on grain production, and to a lesser extent, political control.

In (c)(ii) many candidates showed good knowledge and a clear analytical focus, with precise and well-reasoned argument. Candidates seemed secure on the purges, and most were able to link this as a cause for the difficulties faced in 1941-42. Most candidates also dealt well with Stalin's leadership as a reason for setbacks in the initial part of the Soviet Union's involvement in the Second World War, although a minority offered generalisations about Stalin's leadership that were less securely linked to the specific question. The most commonly considered other factors were the nature/effectiveness of German forces in Operation Barbarossa, and weaknesses resulting from the preparedness of the Soviet economy.

Question 6(y)

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

This option was attempted by many candidates and on the whole was answered well.

In question (a) most candidates were able to identify a valid impression, typically along the lines of relations being poor or having deteriorated.

Many candidates supported this by selecting the author's language, and those who explicitly considered how the author's choice of words or selection of material helped form this impression moved into Level 3 (5-6 marks).

In question (b) most candidates demonstrated understanding of peaceful co-existence and were able to offer effects of this. Many candidates emphasised how it led to an improvement in relations, eg with increased dialogue, with some also explaining how this was short-lived or somewhat superficial. Other candidates explained how events such as the Hungarian Uprising were related to peaceful co-existence. What tended to distinguish between the success of responses was the extent to which explanations were clearly focused on the effect on the Cold War, and the quality of supporting knowledge.

In question (c)(i) candidates generally had good knowledge of relevant issues, typically writing about issues such as the blockade of Berlin, or the expansion of Soviet influence in the satellite states to support explanation and analysis of the given reason. In terms of other factors, Bizonia and the actions of the Western Allies in the Western zones of Germany, Marshall Aid, and the initial decisions made concerning Germany in 1945 were commonly cited. Most candidates were able to thus offer a good range of material, and those who were able to shape this to the demands of the question consistently, and reach clear judgments on the importance of these reasons, were best placed to achieve the highest marks.

In (c)(ii) many candidates showed good knowledge and a clear analytical focus, with issues covered including a reduction in Cold War tension, ending, or at least it significantly reducing, the refugee crisis and its impact on East Germany, humiliation for the communist powers, the impact on the population of the German states, and relations between the two countries. A small minority of responses did conflate or confuse material relating to the first Berlin Crisis.

Indicate your second question choice on this page.

Indicate which question 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 question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒ Question 2 ☒ Question 3 ☒
 Question 4 ☒ Question 5 ☒ Question 6 ☒
 Question 7 ☒ Question 8 ☒

(a) The author creates an impression that the relations between the Soviet Union and the West were strained at the end of the Second world war due to Stalin's actions. By focusing on negative ~~and the~~ language like 'differences become increasingly evident' and 'alarmed', it creates an impression that tension was rising between Superpowers. By focusing on Stalin's action in the context of salami tactics 'soviet ~~army~~ army was in occupation of most of Eastern Europe' and that 'Stalin was determined to expand communism' it emphasized that it was Stalin's fault for the increasing strain and that the West were powerless 'little could do about it' creating a difference. ~~However, by focus it also,~~ as ~~they~~ the superpowers had 'put aside their differences' to fight the common enemy' it suggests that the ~~tense~~ cooperation was temporary. By omitting the fact that during the Potsdam conferences they were some agreements like the creation of United Nations for peace and

((a) continued) the council of foreign ministers for communication; it suggests that the relations were immediately switched back to enemy enemies. As a result, the author gives an impression that ~~rela~~ superpower relations were strained and tense after ~~was~~ WWII due to Stalin.

(b) One effect of Khrushchev's peaceful co-existence policy is that it was positive between the superpowers, slowing down the cold war. The fact that Khrushchev was a more mod the policy reopened communication between the superpowers with the 1955 Geneva summit and 'spirit of Geneva' meant that diplomatic ~~relations~~ relations were reformed causing less tension. In addition, Khrushchev was a moderate leader who distanced himself from Stalin through his 1956 destalinization speech, ~~giving a better~~ improving the Soviet Union's image to the West (before in Truman Doctrine was 'terror and oppression'). As a result, Khrushchev's peaceful coexistence policy slowed down the cold war ~~as~~ and the ~~US~~ west didn't become involved in the Soviet Invasion of Hungary.

Another effect of Khrushchev's peaceful coexistence policy is ~~that the cold war was it had problems~~ as the cold war continued. The fact that there was military escalation in the 1950s with SEATO Armed in 1954 and the Warsaw Pact in 1955 meant that ~~the~~ tension remained. Also, the arms race escalated in the 1950s with the 1952 hydrogen bomb and 1957 sputnik so there is still a competition between superpowers.

((b) continued) As a result, Khrushchev's peaceful & co-existence policy ~~failed~~ didn't stop the cold war. Especially as espionage continued with the U2 spy plane flying over Soviet missile sites starting in 1956.

(c)(i) OR (c)(ii) ci.)

I disagree to some extent that the main reason for the Berlin Crisis in 1948-1949 was the Soviet Union's actions. Although the blockade triggered the crisis, the Soviet Union was provoked by the West's actions which were based on the root cause - ideological differences.

The 1948 Berlin Crisis was caused by some of the actions of the Soviet Union. The fact that the Soviet Union used salami tactics closed with the declaration of liberated Europe (1 million non-communists taken off the registers in Poland) meant that the West saw the Soviet Union as a threat and were more motivated to show their superiority. In addition, the blockade between West and East Berlin was formed under Stalin's order. This blockade stopped the supplies to Western Berliners potentially letting 2.5 million people suffer. In order for Stalin to assert his dominance to the West and intimidate them to surrender Berlin creating a crisis. As a result, the However, the Soviet actions were fuelled by ideological differences which was triggered

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued) by the West's introduction of a currency reform. Thus, ~~the~~ Soviet actions ~~are~~ were ~~not~~ the 'simply a trigger to the Berlin crisis'.

A The Soviet Union's actions triggered the Berlin Crisis because the West's actions acted as a catalyst. The West had ~~also~~ created Trizonia, and then Bizonia by merging USA, French and Britain's zones together making it appear that they were confronting Stalin and making ~~Stalin~~ Stalin more fearful and pushing him to ~~a~~ act. In addition, the West ~~agreed~~ decided to make their own policies without the Soviet Union reinforcing Stalin's fear. In addition, Marshall aid (\$1.3 billion) was given to West Germany creating not only a political divide but economic ~~and~~ divide, although this was already apparent as the Soviet Union stripped East Germany for reparations. More crucially, the West ~~introduced~~ ^{created} the currency reform in 1948 by introducing the Deutschmark. As the Deutschmark was worth ~~24~~ 7x more than the Ostmark (East Germany) it acted as propaganda for the West and highlighted the political and economic divide ~~to~~ forcing Stalin to respond. As a result, the West's actions were a

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued) catalyst to the Berlin Blockade as ~~the~~ ~~the~~ their actions accumulated hostility towards the Soviet Union.

Although ^{the} Soviet Union's actions and West's actions had an important role in ~~causing~~ causing the Berlin blockade, ideological differences laid the foundation for tension between them. The fact that ideological differences had created a history of conflict with Soviet Union not included in the 1919 Paris conference for the Treaty of Versailles meant that a clash between was inevitable. In addition, ideological differences played a huge role in ~~a~~ decisions made at Potsdam including the splitting of ^{Berlin} Germany in 4 zones. If ^{Berlin} Germany wasn't politically divided from ideological differences (democracy and free elections/trade versus communism and state control) then the Berlin Crisis would have never occurred. ~~In~~ Also, ideological differences acted as an incentive for both sides to ~~try~~ intimidate the other as they both saw the other as a threat leading to the hostile actions ~~be~~ from the West and Soviet Union causing the Berlin Crisis. Furthermore, ~~the~~ these ideological ~~deets~~ differences were made more visible from the geographical position of Berlin where both sides faced each other.

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued) making the economic divide (created from Potsdam as the Soviet Union was allowed to take reparations) leading to a tension rising from propaganda from the currency reform as well as allowing West Berliners to exploit East Germany by using the Deutschmark ~~anger~~. This angered Stalin. As a result, ideological differences was the ~~in root~~ ~~cause~~ cause for the Berlin crisis that contributed to all other factors.

In conclusion, I disagree to some extent that the Berlin crisis was because main reason behind the Berlin crisis was the Soviet Union's actions. Rather the West's actions and ideological differences ~~had~~ underpinned the Soviet Union's action acting as a catalyst and root cause leading to the Berlin crisis.

① Also, there was salami ~~cont~~ tactics in the context of East Berlin too as the Soviet Union had launched a communist government by ~~arresting~~ 200,000 German Social Democrats ~~angering~~ threatening the West. In addition, this ~~create~~ strengthened the political divide between Berlin as 82% of West Berliners ^{who polled} refused to have a communist government ~~in it~~ whereas East Berlin no longer had free elections.

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued)

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued)

(Total for Question = 30 marks)

TOTAL FOR PAPER = 60 MARKS



The answer for question (a) saw the candidate identify an impression and support it with detail from the extract and consider emphasis and selection and achieve a top Level 3 mark. In question (b) the candidate was able to identify two effects, support them with knowledge and show how they led to an outcome and so satisfied fully the requirements of Level 3. In question (c) the candidate accessed the top of Level 4 as there was analytical explanation, accurate and precisely selected information and a judgement. Criteria for the judgement were offered and justified.

Question 7(y)

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

In question (a) many candidates were able to identify an impression given by the author regarding the contribution of Rosa Parks, such as it was crucial. The vast majority of candidates were able to support these using evidence from the extract, and many demonstrated how this had been created by emphasising the phrases used by the author, or with reference to material that was omitted, such as the role played by others including Claudette Colvin.

In question (b) most candidates were able to write about some relevant effects of Watergate, with common points being that it led to a lack of trust, weakened the office of the presidency, led to new laws, ended Nixon's career, and benefitted the Democrats. Candidates who had precise knowledge were usually able to explain the effects on US politics and produce strong responses.

Question (c)(i) tended to be well-answered, with most candidates being able to offer focused reasons for the downfall of McCarthy. Alongside the given points of the role of the media and the army, candidates typically covered increasing repugnance at McCarthy's manner and methods, and how the lack of credible evidence demonstrated the exaggerated nature of the red scare. A minority of less successful responses lacked secure material on McCarthy's attack on the army and the hearings, or how the media increasingly opposed him and exposed his methods. Stronger responses, whilst also being secure on such issues, tended to explore the interaction between different factors.

In question (c)(ii) most candidates were able to cover a range of consequences of the women's movement. Most tended to illustrate and examine the given consequence of opposition via consideration of Phyllis Schlafly and Stop-ERA, or the reaction to more radical aspects of the women's movement. Most candidates were able to offer material on other issues, eg legal, social and economic changes, or active membership of women's groups. Stronger responses, as well as offering more specific detail, were more likely to analyse the relative importance of these changes.

Indicate your second question choice on this page.

Indicate which question 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 question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number:

Question 1 ☒

Question 2 ☒

Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒

Question 6 ☒

Question 7 ☒

Question 8 ☒

(a) The author gives us the impression that Rosa Parks was essential to the Boycott. Words like "remarkable" "unity" and "great personal risk" are used to positively describe her and her actions. She is described as brave, as she "refused" to conform to the racist rules, and so "black Americans formed carpools, hitchhiked or simply walked". This clearly informs us the author is saying she had a huge pivotal role in the Boycott. However, the author fails to mention Martin Luther King who was the head of MIA and organised the 391 day boycott; he was equally as important as Rosa Parks who acted as the head of the boycott and the catalyst.

(a) continued)

(b) One effect of Watergate on US politics was the fact that the president and the white house was now a lot less trusted. The fact that "Pinky Dinky" had lied publicly, stole ~~about~~ over \$500,000 in ~~the~~ unpaid taxes, spied and blackmailed and was vulgar and rude in office (he was regularly seen swearing on the "smoking gun" tapes) appalled the ~~people~~ people as they subsequently lost ~~of~~ all faith in the government, as they now knew they could not be trusted. This was amplified by the fact that Nixon was pardoned by president Ford, as many people believe Ford was involved but he pardoned Nixon to protect himself, suggesting to the public the deep corruption was rooted even deeper than originally thought in the white house. Even today this event creates distrust in the US government, as the scandal shows how much power the officials have and how they can abuse it, and that the main culprit, Nixon, did not even go to prison, undermining almost all citizens' trust in the US presidency system, which has ever had lasting impacts to this day.

Another effect of the Watergate scandal on US politics was the introduction of new laws to limit the power of the "imperial presidents" that could essentially do anything they wanted with the CIA and FBI. A series of ~~of~~ acts were introduced. The Privacy Act was introduced to limit the information the Federal Government could hold on you,

((b) continued) and to let individuals see the information held on them if requested. A War Act was passed in order to limit the power of the president by having the Congress have to allow the army to declare war with a vote; the president can no longer instantly declare war. Another act was passed to ~~limit the power~~ monitor and limit what the president could spend government money on, as Nixon regularly used it to buy luxurious houses etc. Finally the Congress Budget Act was passed to limit donations to political party groups ~~to \$5000~~ to \$5000 per person to prevent fraud and corruption, as Nixon was doing with government contractors. A number of smaller acts have been passed since, and all of these still have huge long-lasting impacts today, as they are still extremely relevant, and even today having huge impacts on US politics.

(c)(i) OR (c)(ii)

((c)(i) OR (d)(ii) continued) I disagree that the main consequence of the women's movement being the creation of the opposition to their own movement. Its legal changes as well as rights on women's feelings and thoughts.

Opposition to the women's movement was met by traditional people such as Phyllis Schlafly who believed women should be traditional housewives, and argued if there was true equality, women would have to be drafted to war, and do hard labour jobs. The group ~~stop~~ Stop-ERA was founded to as the name states try and stop the Equal Rights Amendment from being passed into the Constitution, and they succeeded, as only 35 out of the 38 needed states agreed to pass the ERA into the Constitution. Stop-ERA was formed by the conservative traditional Phyllis Schlafly who believed in very traditional roles and stated that if there was equality, then women would have to do things such as be drafted into war and hard labour jobs, and so she gained lots of support. Furthermore, opposition was created due to extreme women rights groups who were ridiculed and negatively publicised, as they often ~~throw~~ throw hysterical acts and threw other things, even putting a crown on a sheep to criticize the Mrs Tremain beauty competition, obviously this lost the women movement a lot of support as it was not seen as serious.

Legal change was a huge effect of the women's movement as

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued) The Equal Rights Amendment, although not passed in all states, was passed in some, and this gained women equality. Furthermore, abortion was made legal by the supreme court, as a woman going by the anonymous name Jane Doe fought in the Roe v Wade case, and made abortion a right ruled by the supreme court under the 14th amendment. Additionally, the contraceptive pill was also allowed in ~~other~~ another supreme court case, allowing women to now have more freedom over their body just as the activists wanted. The legal changes brought huge impacts as they directly bettered the women's lives, tied with the 1964 civil rights act that deemed segregation and discrimination illegal based on race and sex, allowed women to be even more free, and had almost as many opportunities as men under the law (although this was not always enforced in practice). ERA made the gender pay gap illegal.

The publication of the inequality women were exposed to was also significant as a consequence of the civil right movement, as books such as the "Feminine Mystique" informed the world that women would rather be free and equal than trapped in "comfortable prisons" as described by Betty Friedan (the author of the book and one of the founding members of NOW). This exposed the harsh truth of conforming to the traditional gender roles, and encouraged many women to defy them.

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued) Furthermore, a report made by Roosevelt's widow on women's equality concluded that women were paid up to 60% less than men doing the same jobs, ~~was~~ which is huge. This further encouraged women to protest and rebel just like the successful civil rights movements in the 1960s, as women were also tired of receiving a tiny bit of pay for the same work, furthermore, they had proved they could work men's jobs as they did during the war. The advancement of technologies such as dishwashers and fridges also meant there was less need for tasks at home for the ideal housewife and more need for more money to pay for the technological tools, so more women wanted jobs. These are the things that increased the support in the women's movement, and ultimately gave it power.

To conclude, I think that the ~~Civil Rights~~ Legal Changes that the movements pushed for were the main consequence of the women's movement campaigns, as this was their goal and what they wanted to achieve. Despite some of the legal changes not having huge immediate success, they definitely paved the way for women's rights as we know today, and they gradually became indispensable.

(c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued)

((c)(i) OR (c)(ii) continued)

(Total for Question = 30 marks)

TOTAL FOR PAPER = 60 MARKS



The answer for question (a) saw the candidate identify an impression and support it with detail from the extract and consider emphasis and selection to achieve a top Level 3 mark. In question (b) the candidate was able to identify two effects, support them with knowledge and show how they led to an outcome and so satisfied fully the requirements of Level 3. In question (c) the candidate accessed the top of Level 4 as there was analytical explanation, accurate and precisely selected information and a judgement. Criteria for the judgement was offered and justified.

Paper Summary

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

- In general, candidates who used their time effectively did best, eg through not writing excessive amounts for the (a) and (b) questions, to ensure sufficient time for the (c) essay questions.
- For (a) questions, candidates do not need to demonstrate multiple impressions – it is better to clearly explain one, and try to demonstrate how it has been deliberately created, eg via the author's use of language or selection of material.
- Responses which focused carefully on the precise demands of the question were more successful, eg for the (b) questions, ensuring that they write about not just the event or issues behind the effect, but the effect on what exactly.
- For the (c) questions, ensuring the response is consistently focused on the appropriate second-order consequence, eg cause, consequence or significance.
- For (c) questions, candidates who reach and explain judgements at the end of the paragraphs in the main body of their essay (eg each reason or consequence) are generally best placed to give a conclusion which weighs these up.

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>

