



Examiners' Report Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2023

Pearson Edexcel International
Advanced Level In History (WHI03)

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 2023

Publications Code WHI03_1B_2306_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

Principal Examiner Report WHI03 B

There was a small entry for this series for WHI03 1B. Most candidates were able to finish the paper and knowledge was generally focused appropriately. Paper 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 continued to be some evidence that greater familiarity with this type of question was resulting in less very weak, generalised and ill focused answers. However, difficulties were still 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 some candidates are aware of this requirement. It can be achieved using a variety of different approaches. However, a significant number continued to treat 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. 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 the difficulties faced by Wellington in the Peninsular War. 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 the British army was hampered by the civilian population at this time ('thousands of people ... hastily abandoning their homes and retreating with our army', 'crowds of desperate men'). Moreover, the best answers produced thoughtful observations concerning the provenance of the sources to help judge how far the historian could make use of them to consider the enquiry. 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. Therefore some candidates focused successfully on the difficulties faced by Wellington in the Peninsular War, e.g. Wellington's forces were significantly depleted by the loss of 5000 men at the Battle of Vitoria.

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 quite a number of occasions the answers drifted away from the focus on the difficulties Wellington faced and just concentrated on what happened. This was to the detriment of the overall mark as direct focus on the specific issue in the question is essential. Here the question invited a judgement on the difficulties encountered rather than just a description of events.

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 being written after the events he had

probably forgotten everything (Source 1) or Wellington would only be biased about things in his letter (Source 2).

Question 2

This was a popular question which focused on whether the most significant opposition to the Crimean War (1854-56) and the second Boer War (1899-1902) occurred within Parliament. Strong answers successfully considered the importance of opposition within Parliament and then weighed this up against other factors. The best answers focused on opposition such as from John Bright in the Crimean War and David Lloyd George in the second Boer War. Balanced against this were factors like the work of newspaper reporting in both wars as well as campaigns organised by people such as Emily Hobhouse in the second Boer War. The very best answers were discursive, wide-ranging in the evidence assembled and sustained in 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 also found it more difficult to bring in supporting examples from across the period and this made it harder to make supported judgements relevant to the question. Occasional responses showed little understanding of what was meant by Parliament and largely became a narrative of random events from the periods under consideration. This limited severely their ability to score highly.

Question 3

There were fewer responses to this question in which candidates had to consider whether Montgomery, in the years 1939-45, was a far more successful military commander than was Haig in the years 1914-18. Strong answers successfully compared the two military commanders across the periods under consideration and considered both their successes and failures. Some candidates displayed very good knowledge of Haig's difficulties as evidenced by the challenges of the Somme 1916 but also the successful prosecution of the 1918 offensive. Montgomery's success at El Alamein but difficulties over Operation Market Garden were also considered. Judgements made were clear, well supported and based on clearly established criteria.

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 period and this made it harder to make supported judgements relevant to the question. Occasional responses showed little understanding of the key individuals in the question and largely became a narrative of random events from the periods under consideration. This limited severely their ability to score highly.

Candidates 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 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.

