



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

November 2020

Pearson Edexcel International GCSE

History 4HI1/01

Level 1/2

Paper 1: 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

October 2011

Publications Code 4HI1_01_pef_20210211

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2011

History iGCSE November 2020

4HI1/01

Paper 1 : Depth Studies

This paper was sat by a relatively small cohort of candidates as it was a retake paper.

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 in to level 3 the answer requires considering of how the impression has been created by considering author 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 answer that considers the issue raised by the question and a criteria based judgement is made.

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

This option was on the whole was answered well.

In question (a) many candidates were able to identify the impression given by the author about the July Bomb Plot, inferring it 'failed', 'was unsuccessful', 'failed due to unforeseen factors'. 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 create the impression that was inferred.

In question (b) many candidates were able to explain the effects of the work of Stresemann on Germany. Typically many focused on economic developments and international developments, with explanation that Germany's reparation issue was addressed and Germany's international standing was improved. It is important for candidates to realise that in this question it is about the effect 'of' something 'on' something.

In question (c) (ci) was more popular than (cii). In (ci) there was good knowledge about the threats from the Left and the Right, In (cii) knowledge about propaganda tended to be generalised. It was noticeable in both questions that many students had in depth knowledge but when coming to a judgement tended to state that something was more important or significant without applying and explaining criteria. Candidates who did secured marks in level 4.

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

This option was on the whole was answered well.

In question (a) many candidates were able to identify the impression given by the author about de-Stalinisation on Soviet control of Hungary, inferring it 'reduced Soviet control'. Many supported this by selecting the author's language, and those who considered the author's selection and lack of balance moved into level 3 (5-6 marks).

In question (b) many candidates had thorough and precise knowledge regarding the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia, but it was those who applied it to effects on 'international relations' that moved into the higher level. Typically candidates suggested it made USA/USSR relations worse and impacted on Soviet relations with some European countries.

In question (c) (ci) was marginally more popular than (cii). In (ci) candidates were well versed in the causes of the 1948-9 Berlin Crisis and in (cii) candidates were very knowledgeable in relation to aspects of Détente. It was noticeable in both questions that many students had in depth knowledge but when coming to a judgement tended to state that something was more important or significant without applying and explaining criteria. Candidates who did secured marks in level 4.

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

This option was on the whole was answered reasonable well.

In question (a) many candidates were able to identify the impression given by the author about anti-Vietnam protests, inferring 'very violent', 'extremely violent', 'very confrontational'. Many supported this by selecting the author's language, and those who considered the author's selection and lack of balance moved into level 3 (5-6 mark).

In question (b) candidates had limited knowledge of the effects of Black Power. It was often generalised to 'more violent'. There was also some confusion as to what exactly Black Power was and who was involved.

In question (c) (ci) proved to be more popular than (cii). Awareness of the significance of the Supreme Court, Montgomery Bus Boycott, Brown versus Topeka and Little Rock was very evident, with many candidates able to analyse their impact on the development in civil right rather than just narrate the events. In (cii) many wanted to narrate the events of Watergate, rather than answer the set question – which was about the consequences of it. It was noticeable in both questions that many students had in depth knowledge but when coming to a judgement tended to state that something was more important or significant without applying and explaining criteria. Candidates who did secured marks in level 4.