



Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

November 2021

Pearson Edexcel International GCSE in
History (4HI1 1A)

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

November 2021

Publications Code 4HI1_1A_2111_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2021

4HI1/ 1A

Paper 1: Depth Studies

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

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 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 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 the reactions to the Treaty of Versailles by inferring that it was, 'negative', 'hated' or 'despised'. 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 Munich Putsch on the Nazi Party in the years 1923-28. Typically, many focused on how it gave Hitler the opportunity to reconsider the tactics of the Party, how it gained Hitler a national stage and notoriety. Some suggested that it had short and long term effects, for example, it set the Party on the path to slowly winning seats in elections. It is important for candidates to realise this type of question it is about the effect 'of' something 'on' something. Candidates who just described the Putsch were not meeting AO2, which requires explanation, analysis and judgement.

In question (c) (ci) was more popular than (cii). In (ci) there was good knowledge about German recovery in the 1920s, with many candidates able to offer knowledge on successes abroad, economic issues, industrial growth and the importance of Stresemann within the Weimar political system. In (cii) knowledge about censorship and the police state tended to be generalised and coverage of 1933-39 was thin. It was noticeable in both questions that many students who had in depth knowledge struggled when coming to a judgement and tended to state that something was more important or significant without applying and explaining criteria. Candidates who did support their judgement 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 détente by 1972 by inferring that it was 'extensive', 'broadly happening'. 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 knowledge regarding the policy of peaceful co-existence, but it was those who applied it to the effects on the development of the Cold War in the 1950s, that ensured they moved into the higher levels of the mark scheme. Some candidates focused on outcomes such as, reduced threat of war, willingness of Khrushchev to engage in meetings outside the USSR, and increasing USSR/USA competition in other areas, e.g. space and nuclear technology.

In question (c) (cii) was marginally more popular than (ci). In (ci) candidates were well versed in the ideological differences between the USA and USSR but did not always apply that to the focus of the question and in (cii) candidates were very knowledgeable in relation to the crisis over Cuba. It was noticeable in both questions that many students had 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 support their judgement 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 reasonably well.

In question (a) many candidates were able to identify the impression given by the author about the impact of the Alger Hiss case and inferred 'it caused trouble', 'it affected the government'. 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 knowledge about the key cases regarding civil rights in the 1950s but did not consider the impact of Supreme Court decisions. The decisions were often generalised as 'therefore civil rights were granted'. Description of only the cases did not allowed candidates to access AO2 and, therefore, restricted their marks within the mark scheme.

In question (c) (ci) proved to be more popular than (cii). Awareness of the significance of Martin Luther King was very evident, with many candidates able to analyse his impact on the progress of civil right rather than just narrate the events. Candidates also considered the work of President John (though some confused this with the work of President Eisenhower) and other civil rights leaders. In (cii) many had knowledge of NOW, however, other aspects of development in the women's movement were generalised. It was noticeable in both questions that many students who had in depth knowledge struggled when coming to a judgement and tended to state that something was more important or significant without applying and explaining criteria. Candidates who did support their judgement secured marks in level 4.

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom