



Pearson  
Edexcel

Examiners' Report  
Principal Examiner Feedback

November 2020

Pearson Edexcel International GCSE

History (4HI1/01R)

Level 1/2

Paper 1: Depth Studies (R paper)

## **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](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).

## **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)

October 2011

Publications Code 4HI1\_01R\_pef\_20210211

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2011

## **History iGCSE November 2020**

### **4HI1/01R**

Paper 1 : Depth Studies

This paper was sat by a very small cohort of candidates as it was a 'time-zone' paper, and 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

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 an 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 Germany in the years 1924-29, inferring that it was 'improving', 'booming', 'flourishing' or 'prosperous'. 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 Nuremberg Laws on Jews living in Germany. Typically many focused on loss of rights, citizenship, economic opportunity and imprisonment. 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). It is

important for candidates to realise that this question it is about the effect 'of' something 'on' something.

In question (c) (ci) was more popular than (cii). 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 answered reasonably well.

In question (a) many candidates were able to identify the impression given by the author about the SALT talks, inferring that it was they were 'not successful', or 'they were difficult'. 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 of the ideological differences between the Soviet Union and the USA but did not relate them to 1943-49. There were lots of comments about the differences between capitalism and communism but these were not linked to the events of 1943-49.

In question (c) (ci) was more popular than (cii). 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.