



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2022

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level
In History(WHIO3) Paper 1B

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 2022

Publications Code WHI03_1B_2206

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

Principal Examiner Report WHI03 B

WHI03 1B is divided into two sections. Section A comprises a compulsory source based question and assesses source analysis and evaluation skills(AO2). Section B consists of two essay questions of which the candidate is expected to answer one of them. They will assess the knowledge and understanding of the period in breadth (AO1). Questions, in this section, will be set so that they connect two or more of the key topics in the specification and will target a range of concepts which might include cause,consequence,significance,similarity/difference and change/continuity.

The time available for the paper did allow candidates the opportunity to plan their work and many took advantage of this as evidenced by the plans included. Also this helped to keep the candidates focused more clearly on the task in hand. Most plans were of a reasonable length and detail so as to outline the overall argument but occasionally they became so lengthy that they constricted the time available to actually write the response.However, it would be advisable for candidates to spend a short while getting their thoughts in order before writing their answers. This would be relevant to both sections of the paper.

In general, it was section A that seemed to present the greater challenge to the candidates as they had to consider two primary sources and their use to the historian in investigating an historical issue. There was some evidence that greater familiarity with this type of question was resulting in less very weak, generalised and ill focused answers. Difficulties were encountered in moving beyond surface comprehension of the sources and evaluation which was little more than either stereotypical judgements or, at best, questionable assumptions drawn from the sources. This was particularly the case when dealing with the provenance of the sources where unsupported references to the bias in a source continue but with little reward. Those that were more successful drew inferences from the sources,supported them with appropriate quotations and interrogated the evidence with support from relevant contextual knowledge that was applied to illuminate the points being made. The question requires candidates to use the sources 'together' and it was pleasing to see that the majority of candidates continue to be aware of this requirement. It can be achieved using a variety of different approaches. However, a significant number treated the sources separately making it much more difficult to access the highest levels.

In section B centres do need to be aware that questions can address the same time periods from the specification and that there is no requirement to always cover all key topics in an individual paper. Section B responses generally scored higher marks as there was much greater focus and engagement with the stated issues in the questions. Many responses showed good knowledge of the periods studied and were able to develop arguments which crossed the key topics being considered. However, there were still some answers which only dealt with one of the time periods being

asked about, making it difficult for these to score highly. Although some essays remained predominantly narrative they were in a minority. The generic mark scheme clearly indicates the four bullet-points which are the focus for awarding marks and centres should note how these descriptors progress through the levels. Candidates do need to be aware of key dates, as identified in the specification, and ensure that they draw their evidence in responses from the appropriate time period.

Comments on Individual questions.

Question 1.

For question 1 stronger responses showed a clear understanding of both sources and were able to draw out inferences from them which related to Churchill's relationships with his military commanders. Both sources were full of possibilities to draw inferences and to link these to the utility of the sources to the historian in the context of the enquiry, e.g. It implies that Churchill's ill-considered meddling in military matters is damaging morale ('plans into confused tangles and hopeless muddles. It is all desperately depressing.'). Good contextual knowledge was deployed to discuss the strengths of the evidence and some consideration was given to interpreting the material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it was derived (e.g. Churchill distanced himself from Harris as concerns regarding civilian casualties, caused by area bombing, increased in the years straight after the war). The very best interrogated the evidence and made clear supported judgements which weighed up the strengths or otherwise of the material in relation to the enquiry under consideration. The latter point is important as the focus of responses needs to be directly on the area of enquiry asked in the question.

Weaker responses appeared in a number of different forms. There were those where paraphrasing of the sources dominated and very few, if any, inferences relevant to the stated issue were made. In these types of responses contextual knowledge was often limited and, if evident, used to simply expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail in the sources. On occasions the answers drifted away from the focus on Churchill's relationship with his military commanders and concentrated simply on his character. Direct focus on the specific issue in the question is essential. Moreover many responses focused too much attention on what the sources left out and used this as the basis for their evaluation. Unless candidates can show that omissions are deliberate, this line of argument carries little value. Source material cannot be expected to include everything, so observing that the source doesn't mention a specific point, unless being used for an example of deliberate omission is unlikely to be valid criteria for judgement. Candidates are asked to evaluate what is there rather than what is not. If the author of the source has omitted something intentionally in order to modify meaning or distort the message of the source, then it will be relevant to discuss that in reaching a conclusion. However, discussion of all the things that the sources might have contained but failed to do so is unlikely to contribute to developing the argument.

Furthermore, in some responses there was considerable knowledge displayed and focused on the specified enquiry but with almost no or exceptionally limited references to the sources. As this question is targeting AO2 (analysis and evaluation of source material) these kinds of responses cannot score highly. In other instances, where utility was addressed through the provenance it was often based on a mixture of stereotypical judgements or questionable assumptions such as Alanbroke (Source 1) in his diary would always tell the truth or Harris (Source 2) was writing in 1947 so knew nothing about the war.

Question 2

This was the more popular of the two questions. The question considered the extent to which the candidates agreed that the reporting of journalists was responsible for shaping the attitudes of the British public to wars in the years 1854-1918. Stronger responses clearly discussed the importance of the reporting of journalists across the whole period and established criteria such as their impact on morale or recruitment to judge success. Counterarguments considered other issues which helped shape attitudes such as military success or failure and government policies. The very best were wide-ranging in the evidence they assembled and sustained in their argument

Weaker responses tended towards either narrative or generalisation. If analysis was present, the support offered tended to be limited in both range and depth. Weaker responses often only considered the time periods with little depth and so made it difficult to address all the demands or to make supported judgements relevant to the question. Occasional responses only engaged with one side of an argument and so limited severely their ability to score highly.

Question 3

There were fewer responses to this question in which candidates had to consider whether it was the work of individual political leaders that was mostly responsible for the successful conduct of wars by the British in the years 1803-1902. Strong answers successfully considered individual political leadership across the whole period to make judgements about the significance of their contribution. The best answers considered the role of individual politicians such as Pitt, Palmerston and Chamberlain in successfully organising the war effort. Counterarguments considered the role of military leaders, the government machine and also the press in promoting the successful conduct of the wars. Judgements made were clear, well supported and based on clear criteria which often considered the changing context of warfare over the whole period in time.

Weaker responses tended towards either narrative or generalisation. If analysis was present, the support offered tended to be limited in both range and depth. Weaker responses also found it more difficult to bring in supporting examples from across the time period and this made it harder to make supported judgements relevant to the question.

Occasional responses showed little understanding of the meaning of political leadership and became a narrative of events. This limited severely their ability to score highly.

Students are offered the following advice for the future:

Section A

- Candidates need to draw from the sources inferences that are both supported and relevant to the enquiry in the question. These inferences should be developed through the use of contextual knowledge which is relevant to the enquiry in the question
- Candidates need to move beyond stereotypical judgements or assumptions that are questionable and unsupported when engaging with the provenance of the source. References to the biased nature of sources must be explained and supported in the context of the enquiry in the question
- Candidates need to consider the weight the evidence has in helping them reach judgements relevant to the enquiry. This needs to move beyond simply stating it carries weight to an explanation as to how
- Candidates should consider the stance or purpose of the author of the source and be aware how this might be affected by the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.
- Sources should be interrogated with distinctions being made between such things as claims and opinions. The sources should be used together at some point in the answer
- Candidates must avoid engaging with the enquiry simply from their knowledge. The answer needs to be focused on how the sources help the historian and knowledge used to discuss the inferences or points arising from the sources.

Section B

- Candidates need to read the question carefully so as to fully understand the time periods being considered and the full range of issues that they are being asked to consider
- Candidates would benefit from taking some time to plan their answers. As the examination is quite generous in its time allocation this would still allow plenty of time to write the answers.

- Candidates should consider what criteria might be used to shape or reinforce the judgements being made. For example in a continuity/change question criteria such as political, social or economic, if relevant, might help to provide a framework
- Candidates need to avoid description and develop analytical responses which make clear and supported judgements relevant to the question
- Candidates should try to establish links between the arguments being made and, if relevant, weigh up the relative importance of them.