



# **Examiners' Report June 2022**

**GCSE History 1HIA P4**

## 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 [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).



### 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 [www.edexcel.com/resultsplus](http://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: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2022

Publications Code 1HIA\_P4\_2206\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

## Introduction

The Period Study focuses on a time span of at least 50 years and requires students to understand the unfolding narrative of substantial developments and issues associated with the period. All three questions target AO1 (Knowledge and Understanding) and AO2 (Analysis of Second Order Concepts). Progression in AO1 is shown by a student's increasing ability to select information precisely and to show wide-ranging knowledge and understanding. Progression in AO2 is shown by a student's response moving from simple or generalised comments to analytical explanations which show a line of reasoning that is coherent, logical, and sustained. The two AOs are equally weighted on all the three question types.

Q01 focuses on consequence, requiring students to explain two valid consequences. (2 x 4 marks)

Q02 focuses on analytical narrative and the concepts causation, consequence, and change. The question includes two stimulus points and focuses on a specific time period containing events or ideas that can be analysed as a sequence of events. (8 marks)

Q03 focuses on the importance of an event/person/development in relation to situations and/or unfolding developments. Students answer two questions from a choice of three. (2 x 8 marks)

Centres are reminded that the indicative content in the mark scheme does not imply what students must include in responses nor does it give any expectation as to how students are expected to structure their responses.

## Question 1

At Level 2, many students showed good understanding supported with specific information on the impact of Gorbachev's 'new thinking' on both the USSR's domestic and foreign affairs. Most students were able to access at least Level 1 but there were a significant number of responses which scored 0 due to either unrewardable material or a blank response.

At Level 2, students explained consequences resulting from Gorbachev's 'new thinking' such as the thawing in Superpower relations, the loosening of the USSR's power over Eastern Europe and domestic changes. These consequences were supported with specific information on summit meetings with Reagan, the ending of the Brezhnev Doctrine, the impact of the Sinatra Doctrine, reactions in the satellite states and the influence of the new political ideals of *Glasnost* and *Perestroika* on the lives of people in the Soviet Union. A number of students commented on domestic opposition to Gorbachev from hard-line communists. Some students wrote about the 'Gang of Eight', the actions of Yeltsin and Gorbachev's removal from power but most responses on consequences within the USSR lacked the supporting information necessary for top Level 2.

Surprisingly, few students commented on the need for reductions in arms spending and the consequent withdrawal of Soviet forces from Afghanistan.

Level 1 responses were simple comments such as 'people had more freedom', 'the USSR got on better with the USA' or 'some people opposed Gorbachev'. Other typical Level 1 responses stated that Gorbachev was linked with a specific event or development but without explanation such as 'his ideas led to the fall of the Berlin Wall'. There were occasional unrewardable responses where Gorbachev was confused with previous Soviet leaders with descriptions of his intervention in Hungary or his actions during the Cuban Missile Crisis.

1 Explain **two** consequences of Gorbachev's 'new thinking'.

Consequence 1

~~de-stalinisation~~ . afghan war ended  
glasnost and perestroika

One consequence of Gorbachev's new thinking was the ~~then~~ end of the ~~was~~ soviet war in Afghanistan in 1988. Due to Gorbachev's wish to make communism better accepted and less aggressive Gorbachev chose to withdraw all soldiers from Afghanistan nine years after the initial invasion. There is a clear connection between "new thinking" and the end of aggressive conflicts between the soviets and others like the end of the Soviet - Afghan war.

Consequence 2

The main ideas from Gorbachev's new thinking of glasnost and perestroika (meaning openness and restructuring) lead to the ~~to~~ freedom of press being increased. As well as western media including film and music being allowed in the soviet union. This was to make soviet citizens happier and to make the USSR more open to the rest of the world. This directly connects to glasnost and

perestroika .



Both consequences were awarded high Level 2.

Consequence 1 reached AO2 Level 2 with comments in the second paragraph on 'a clear connection between 'new thinking' and the end of aggressive conflicts.' For AO1 Level 2 specific information is shown with the end of the war in Afghanistan in 1988 and withdrawal of soldiers 'nine years after.'

Consequence 2 reached AO2 Level 2 with the USSR 'more open to the rest of the world' and for AO1 specific information was shown with the inclusion of 'glasnost', 'perestroika' and comments on increasing freedom for the media.



Students occasionally offer two responses with the same content for both consequences. Examiners can then only reward one of the responses. Students should therefore ensure their two responses for Q01 cover different content.

It is also important not to waste time writing more than required to gain full marks on Q01.

## Question 2

There were some impressive analytical narrative responses for this question showing good knowledge and understanding of events in the development of a Cold War crisis over Berlin during the period 1958-63. Some however added information about events outside of these years. This lost valuable time as well as often creating responses which lacked coherence or organisation; thereby preventing access to Level 3.

To secure high Level 3 students need to understand the narrative concept, with the sense of a beginning, development, and end, rather than produce three paragraphs which are not linked. On question two the stimulus points serve as useful reminders to students of the chronology of events in the stated period. The stimulus points do not have to be used but there is an expectation that there will be some depth of knowledge in the narrative covered.

Level 3 responses showed a clear sequence of events with linkage between them, of events during the crisis over Berlin in the years 1958-63. Most responses used a narrative which included the problems for East Germany of the 'brain-drain' to West Germany, Khrushchev's increasing frustration over West Berlin's existence and the issuing of the Berlin Ultimatum, the series of talks between the USA and the USSR from 1959-61 to try and solve the 'Berlin problem', the shooting down of the American U-2 spy-plane during the Paris meeting, the building and impact of the Berlin Wall and Kennedy's visit to West Berlin in 1963. These narratives were frequently supported with accurate and relevant information such as the numbers of refugees from East Germany, specific meetings held such as Camp David and Vienna, details of the spy plane incident, specific features of the Berlin Wall and Kennedy's 'Ich bin ein Berliner' speech.

Impressive responses explained in depth how one event caused the next with analytical links made between events such as 'the loss of people from East Berlin infuriated Khrushchev so he decided to take action to correct this', 'Eisenhower's refusal to apologise led to Paris summit being abandoned and issues left unsolved', 'the USSR had to respond to the increasing pressures facing East Germany.' Only a few students included details on Ulbricht's role in persuading Khrushchev to close East-West Berlin border and ordering East German soldiers to build the wall.

At Level 2 responses wrote about events but with only some analysis of the links between them or gave a narrative which was in part incoherent such as the refugee crisis as a consequence of the Berlin Wall's construction. Level 2 responses often included material outside of the time frame (such as discussions over Berlin at the Potsdam Conference, the Berlin Blockade and Airlift and even the falling of the Wall in 1989) or wrote on other events during the period 1958-63 such as Castro's rise to power and thereby largely ignoring the question's focus on Berlin.

Level 1 responses tended to be descriptions of the Berlin Wall but without it being placed within any narrative. The occasional student wrote in the first person as an eyewitness of events. This style of answer has been commented on in previous Principal Examiner reports and should be avoided. Writing in the first person will invariably fail to meet the requirements of AO2 Level 2 as it is unlikely to produce an analytical response.



2 Write a narrative account analysing the key developments of the Cold War crisis over Berlin in the years 1958–63.

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- Khrushchev's Berlin ultimatum (1958)
- construction of the Berlin Wall (1961)

You **must** also use information of your own.

(8)  
All allied soldiers,  
workers leave Berlin.  
Separated East and West  
Overnight, barbed wire  
2-3 weeks, concrete 12 feet  
tall.

~~Khrushchev~~ The key developments of the Cold War crisis over Berlin in the years 1958-63. One development is the Khrushchev's Berlin Ultimatum. This was when Khrushchev announced to the whole of Berlin, that all allied soldiers, workers, believers of the Triuma (UK, USA and France). This caused pressure on the allied group as they didn't know what to do. This event also shows that the USSR are stronger than the USA as they are in charge of the situation.

Another development was that most of the East Berliners (USSR side) would get jealous of the West Berliners (USA side) because they had a better life. More modern, more freedom and better standards of life. This would tend persuade many East Berliners to travel to the West Berlin or no one could stop them. This would lead to

the population of East Berliners would decrease as the population of West Berliners would increase. This would have a negative impact on USSR as it was embarrassing that they couldn't keep people happy and that they had to move.

The USSR would then create a wall around West Berlin to counter the embarrassment of East Berliners travelling to the West. They built a standard barbed wire wall overnight and it was heavily guarded with armed police. They would shoot anyone that tried to travel between the wall. The wall would continuously get improved throughout the next couple of weeks. It turned into a 12 foot tall concrete wall, that would be impossible to travel from East to West.

This time period would show the World how ~~and~~ bad and embarrassing Berlin was in the year 1959-63.



This is an example of a Level 2 response.

Comments such as 'this caused pressure on the allied group,' 'this would persuade many East Berliners to travel' and 'the USSR would then create a wall' display the qualities of AO2 at Level 2 as there is a sequence of events. There is however no real analysis of the linkage between the events required for Level 3. The response is more a series of separate events. AO1 meets the requirements for Level 2 with accurate and relevant information added such as 'East Berlin (USSR side)', 'West Berlin (USA side)', the mention of living standards, a 'barbed wire wall overnight' which was 'heavily guarded' and later a 'twelve-foot wall.'



Students should focus on the time frame given in the question and that links are made in their narrative account rather than writing a series of events with no linkage.

For AO2 Level 2 and above the explicit and frequent use of language such as 'as a result of' or 'this led to' helps students produce suitably analytical responses.

## Question 3

Each of the question 3 options produced a different pattern of responses.

The first option on the Marshall Plan was answered by most students and overall responses showed analysis of importance as well as accurate and relevant knowledge.

The question 3 arms race question led to answers at all levels which were frequently stronger for AO2 and more limited for AO1. At Levels 1 and 2 many responses included unrewardable material on events and developments outside the 1949-58 time frame in the question.

The question 3 option on the Carter Doctrine had the fewest responses but with a very high proportion gaining Level 3.

### Q03-1

This question 3 option was answered by most students and nearly all accessed Levels 2 and 3 for both AOs.

Level 3 responses frequently analytically explained the importance of the Marshall Plan in widening the division in Europe, as integral to Truman's containment policy and its contribution to the intensification of hostility between the Superpowers. For AO1 most students included details such as the Plan's linkage to the Truman Doctrine, the financial sums involved with the figure of \$13 billion frequently used, the USSR's condemnation of 'dollar imperialism' and its response with the setting up of Cominform and Comecon. Some students included the Plan's role in hastening the division of Germany and in increasing propaganda campaigns by East and West.

Level 2 responses tended to have secure AO1 but with a more limited attempt at analysis of the Marshall Plan's importance for relations between East and West.

Some very weak or non-rewardable responses stated that the Plan was used to help countries in Eastern Europe, to improve East-West relations or to help communist countries. A number of responses had a confused chronological understanding of the complex early years of the Cold War by stating that the Marshall Plan led to Churchill making his 'Iron Curtain' and increasing the tension that resulted in the Long and Novikov telegrams.

### Q03-2

Overall responses for the arms race question were stronger for AO2 and showed more limited AO1 in terms of referring to actual developments.

Level 3 responses invariably kept to the time frame in the question and used the USSR's development of the A-bomb in 1949, the consequent production of the hydrogen bomb and the heightened Superpower tensions with new ICBMs to give an analysis of the development of the Cold War. However, many Level 3 responses also explained that there were some developments towards a slowing down of the arms race with Khrushchev's efforts to promote 'peaceful co-existence' supported with specific AO1 knowledge such as the 1955 Geneva meeting between Khrushchev and Eisenhower. Some responses commented effectively on how the Cold War intensified but also restrained the likelihood of a nuclear conflict. There were some references to 'Sputnik' with explanations on how it raised US concerns about falling behind in the arms race and the consequent increases in defence spending.

Students in Level 2 explained how each side was building up their own stock of weapons to be stronger than the opponent with the broad understanding that technology was developing with new hydrogen bombs and ICBMs. Low Level 2 responses often included the space race, the Non-Proliferation Treaty, the 'hotline', détente, SALT 1 and even 'Star Wars'.

In Level 1 most responses consisted of generalised statements about increasing tension, the dangers of nuclear weapons, and Superpower rivalry but then often gave descriptions of the USA's use of the atomic bomb against Japan in 1945.

### **Q03-3**

This question 3 option had the fewest responses but a very high proportion were awarded Level 3. These students analysed the role of the Carter Doctrine in ending détente and the consequent souring of US-Soviet relations. This analysis of importance was supported with accurate and relevant information on Carter's orders to delay SALT 2, the US-led boycott of the 1980 Moscow Olympics and Reagan's success in the 1980 presidential election with his strong anti-Communist message. The USA's support for the *mujahideen* was prominent in many responses as was US interests in the Gulf region with the implication that the Carter Doctrine increased the prospects of a 'Second Cold War' with the shift in US foreign policy towards more aggressive responses and the tougher approach under Reagan. Few responses commented on any economic impacts of the Carter Doctrine such as the reduction in US grain exports and the banning of US computer exports to the USSR.

Weak Level 1 responses stated the Carter Doctrine improved Superpower relations, made the USA weak or confused it with the Truman or Brezhnev Doctrines.

- ✗ The importance of the Marshall Plan (1947) for relations between East and West.
- ✗ The importance of the arms race in the years 1949–58 for the development of the Cold War.
- ✗ The importance of the Carter Doctrine (1980) for relations between the USA and the USSR.

In 1949, The Soviet Union developed their own atomic bomb, which is capable of destroying completely anything in it's path for miles. This meant that the USA had to make ~~so~~ a bomb ~~ever~~ that was even more lethal. The USA made the ~~big~~ first hydrogen bomb, putting them in the lead of the arms race. However, ~~The~~ ~~USF~~ the USSR made the first inter-continental ballistic missile (ICBM), which could travel thousands of miles to reach a desired target. The arms race was significant as it increased tensions during the Cold War, and showed ~~to~~ who the two superpower of the time were.

- ☒ The importance of the Marshall Plan (1947) for relations between East and West.
- ☒ The importance of the arms race in the years 1949–58 for the development of the Cold War.
  
- ☒ The importance of the Carter Doctrine (1980) for relations between the USA and the USSR.

The Marshall plan provided aid to countries in return for them to not join the satellite states. This made relations between the East and West weaker, as the West were attempting to prevent countries being on Russia's side, and the East did the same to the West during the Berlin crisis later on.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

The first response on the arms race is awarded high Level 2 as it covers the criteria for both AO2 and AO1 at Level 2. AO2 comments include 'even more lethal' and the explanation at the end on the significance of the arms race. AO1 material includes the Soviet Union developing the atomic bomb in 1949, the USA with the first hydrogen bomb and the development of ICBMs which could travel 'thousands of miles.'

The second response on the Marshall Plan is awarded low Level 2 as it reaches Level 2 for AO2 with a clear sense of its importance for relations between East and West. AO1 is limited with the first sentence rewardable at Level 1.



Students should ensure they keep to any time frame in the question and ensure that they focus their response on what difference the specified event/person/development etc made to how subsequent events unfolded.



## Paper Summary

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

1. For Q01, explain a link between the event and the consequence and do not simply describe an event or something that happened.
2. For Q02, focus on the date range specified in the question and ensure that events or developments in your narrative are linked to show a clear sequence of events.
3. For Q03, explain the impact the development/event/person had on the development/event/person given in the question
- 4, In this examination series, there was a noticeable increase in the number of responses with illegible handwriting. Students should be aware that examiners can only credit what they can read.

## **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>

