



Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback
Summer 2024

Pearson Edexcel International GCSE
In History (4WHI1/01R)
Paper 01R: Depth Studies

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

Summer 2024

Publications Code 4WHI1_01R_2406_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

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

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. Question (ci) and (cii) required candidates 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 (i.e. causation, consequence, significance), and the given date range.

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) many candidates were able to identify the impression given by the author about the White Rose Group, usually along the lines of that they were too small to have a serious impact, or that their efforts were brave but futile. 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.

In question (b) many candidates were able to explain the effects of the work of Stresemann on Germany in the years 1924-29, with common points being that his efforts helped bring about an economic recovery in Germany, restored its international standing, or increased political stability. All were credit worthy and 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 to have a good understanding of the this period.

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, e.g. significance or causation. Some responses included effective judgements at the end of each point, e.g. explaining the relative importance of the point under discussion.

On (ci), most students were fairly secure in their knowledge of the Spartacists Uprising and the Kapp Putsch, although only some were perhaps too dismissive of the challenge posed by these because they were deemed to be over fairly quickly. Stronger responses were more likely to explore the level of challenge, e.g. recognise that the reliance on the Freikorps to defeat the Spartacists undermined the legitimacy of the Weimar Republic. A good number really began to analyse the relative significance of these. Candidates chose a range of points, e.g. the Munich Putsch, Treaty of Versailles, Ruhr Occupation, and hyperinflation.

On (cii), most candidates were able to offer a sufficient range of reasons as to why the Nazis were able to establish a dictatorship, typically from the Enabling Act, the death of Hindenburg, the Reichstag Fire, the Night of the Long Knives, or the earlier actions of the Nazis in attaining a plurality in the Reichstag. A minority of candidates did confuse the chronology of events in this period. A small number did drift into discussion of material on the features of the dictatorship. Similarly, whilst it was valid to include material on how the Nazis came to be the largest party, it was those responses who could effectively link this to setting up a dictatorship who were more successful (e.g. arguments along the lines of disillusionment with Weimar democracy meant the public / political elite were more likely to support the use of measures which enabled a dictatorship). Those who could ensure that reasons were clearly linked to the question were more likely to secure marks in level 4.

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 that relations were tense, negative or increasingly hostile. Many 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) many candidates had thorough and precise knowledge regarding the effects of Imre Nagy's actions on events in Hungary; it was those who explained how this brought about the effects they chose to write about who achieved the higher level. The most commonly featured points were that his actions led to hope, protest and reform in the shorter-term, but ultimately led to the Soviet invasion, destruction, suffering or a return to oppression. Some candidates wrote about the consequences for the USA, Soviet Union or other international aspects of the crisis – whilst in some cases this was related to the question, in others, it led to a loss of focus from the question where they did not relate this to the question focus of the effect on events in Hungary.

In question (ci) candidates generally had good knowledge of relevant issues, with candidates typically writing about issues such as the Truman Doctrine or Marshall Aid to consider the question's proposition. There was generally good knowledge of the Berlin Crisis and other issues, such as the setting up of NATO, developments preceding the Berlin Crisis (which was sometimes used to support the argument that the actions of the USA were the main reason), the setting up of Cominform and Comecon, and events in China. Only a minority considered the part played by the setting up of Soviet satellite states in Eastern Europe. Where the knowledge was of sufficient quality, most were able to relate this to the question's conceptual demands.

In (cii) many candidates showed good knowledge and a clear analytical focus, with issues covered including the crisis over Cuba (with a good number treating the consequences of the Cuban revolution and the Bay of Pigs as a separate but related point, for which they were rewarded), The crisis over Berlin, often framed around the U2 Crisis or the Berlin Wall, and the Czechoslovakian Crisis. Some responses did cover events outside of the 1950s, which could not be credited, e.g. the Hungarian Uprising.

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 Gerland Ford's pardoning of Nixon, with answers typically being along the lines of it had a damaging or negative effect. 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.

In question (b) most candidates were able to write about some relevant effects of Phyllis Schlafly's effect on the women's liberation movement, with the more commonly cited points being she created opposition to it, helped block constitutional measures such as the Equal Rights Amendment, or that she raised the profile of traditional perspectives which contrasted with the progressive direction of protests that had previously been dominant. The strongest responses were able to offer clear detail and use this to explain how Schlafly's efforts led to the consequences offered, although there were a significant minority of candidates who seemed less secure in detail on this topic, or confused Schlafly with other figures, i.e. seeing her as a progressive leader.

In question (ci) tended to well answered, with most candidates being able to offer focused reasons for progress in civil rights the 1950s. Alongside the given points of the contributions made by the Supreme Court and President Eisenhower, candidates typically covered the Montgomery Bus Boycott, the Emmett Till case and/or Little Rock. Some candidates examined the links between issues, e.g. the role of organisations such as the NAACP in taking cases to the Supreme Court, or the interaction between the Supreme Court, Eisenhower and the individuals involved at Little Rock. A small minority went beyond the time frame of the 1950s.

In question (cii) most candidates were able to cover a range of issues from the 1960s. The majority were able to offer valid material on the given issue of Black Power, although a minority did confuse this with other aspects of the civil rights movement, typically covering issues, individuals or events such as Martin Luther King and his contribution at events such as Birmingham, Selma or the March on Washington, the Civil Rights Act or the Voting Rights Act. Most candidates were able to offer a range of issues. Stronger responses, as well as offering more specific detail, were more likely to focus this carefully towards an analysis of significance.

