



Pearson
Edexcel

Examiners' Report
Principal Examiner Feedback

January 2024

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level in
History (WHI01/1D)

Paper 1: Depth Study with Interpretations

Option 1D: Britain, 1964-90

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

January 2024

Publications Code WHI01_1D_2401_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

Principal Examiner Report
Jan 2024
WHI01 1D : Britain, 1964-90

The entry for this paper was very small. Candidates chose two questions from four.

Question 1

This was generally a well answered question by candidates who understood that the focus of the question was Britain's position as a world power and judgement was needed as to whether that was the case or not. Some candidates saw it as an opportunity to describe events happening within Britain in those years, which limited their answers and hence their mark. Some candidates considered issues such as the move away from Empire, the Commonwealth, nuclear power, role within the UN and the issues of EEC membership and judged what that meant about Britain's world position.

Question 2

This was answered in various ways. Some candidates either did not know about the Lib-Lab Pact or were not sure when it was. Some candidates suggested that it happened in the 1974-5 period as a response to the issue of EEC membership. Those who knew it was in relation to the Labour government staying in office and maintaining confidence had a clearer understanding and were able to consider it in relation to other issues, namely weakness in 1974, economic issues, the issue of EEC membership, the Social Contract and the winter of 'discontent'.

Question 3

This question was popular with candidates. Many candidates were well versed in the reasons for Conservative electoral victory in the 1980s and suggested the appeal of Thatcher, particular policies and the Falklands War. Not all candidates were clear about 'divided opposition' and treated it in a generalised way. Some were clearer and considered the impact of the 'Gang of Four', the SDP and the issues with the Labour Party.

Question 4

There were varied responses to this question. Some candidates saw it as an opportunity to write a general description of British society within the date range of the question and focused on the 1960s in relation to censorship and permissiveness, with little reference to education. Those that focused on education and considered the move away from the tripartite system to a comprehensive system, the emergence of the national curriculum and greater access and opportunity balanced against other changes scored in the higher levels.

Points to consider:

- This is a 'Depth study with Interpretations' which means that knowledge on its own is not enough. Knowledge needs to be applied to the interpretation that is raised by the question and judgements made.
- The time allowed for this examination is sufficient to allow a small amount of planning time for each answer.
- When judgments are made they need to be supported with criteria – it is not sufficient to state that a factor or consequence/effect/impact is the most 'important' or 'significant' without explaining the basis upon which that judgment has been made.

