



Pearson  
Edexcel

Examiners' Report  
Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2024

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level in  
History (WHI04) Paper 1D

## **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](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).

## **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)

Summer 2024

Publications Code WHI03\_1A\_2406

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

## Unit 4: International Study with Historical Interpretations

### Option 1D: The Cold War and Hot War in Asia, 1945–90

#### Introduction

#### General Comments

As with previous series, the candidates for the 2024 series were well-prepared and were able to deploy often extensive knowledge of the period and area of historical interpretation being studied. For detailed feedback on some of the general areas of strength and weakness, it is recommended that centres refer back to the Examiner reports for June 2023 and January 2024. Most of the comments made in these series still apply.

For WHI04 units, the assessment model in Section A asks candidates to evaluate a view in relation to two extracts provided from historians/authors of history and to reach a judgement as to how far they agree with the views presented in the extracts (AO3/AO1). AO3 skills focus on the extract content and the AO1 historical context should be used to validate or challenge the views in the extracts. For Section B, candidates are asked to choose one question from two alternatives and to use their AO1 knowledge and understanding to address the focus of the question in relation to the second-order concept(s) being assessed (causation, consequence, similarity, difference, change, continuity and significance). Both require candidates to write a controlled extended response with an organised argument.

Key areas of note for this series are:

- 1) There continues to be a clear increase in the number of candidates who understand how to approach the Section A Interpretation question. Almost all candidates now understand the requirement to discuss the extracts in relation to the view. However, there are some candidates who still use the extracts as evidence for a Section B style response and so fail to discuss the merits of the views in the extracts. The relative value of the AOs for this question are 20 marks for AO3 skills and 5 marks for AO1 skills.
- 2) It is clear that candidates who plan their answers are able to organise their argument and deploy knowledge that is more precisely selected to substantiate their argument. Candidates do not need to write a response for the whole hour available to them. Those that do, often end up producing very long, sometimes contradictory and less coherent answers than those who can select and deploy sufficient knowledge to further their argument and come to an evaluated judgement. There is no need for candidates to write about everything they know about the focus of the question but to select and deploy with precision. Level 5 for both Sections refers to '*sufficient knowledge... precisely selected*' and in Section B to the argument being '*logical and coherent throughout...communicated with clarity and precision*'.
- 3) As noted in the two previous series, there are fewer candidates who are using the indicative content as model scaffolds for answering questions. There are still some candidates, however, who are defining every word in the question and using phrases in the generic mark scheme rather than developing an argument from the outset. However, formulaic introductions to Section A are now few and far between and some excellent discussion of extracts for their own value is being seen.

4) Some responses still dismiss the given factor and write about all the other possible factors without evaluating them in relation to the given factor. It is often difficult with these responses to tell what the original question was and leads to conclusions that do not determine relative significance or come to a judgement about the actual wording of the question. Along the same lines, other responses identify an alternative given factor as being more important or more significant but do not develop valid criteria to explain why this is the case. These responses again often ignore the specific wording of the question in the conclusion and it is difficult to determine what the original question was.

5) Centres are to be commended for the amount content covered with candidates. Some of the best responses are detailed and interesting in the knowledge deployed. However, the deployment of knowledge often has weaknesses. Many candidates spend a great deal of time explaining the context of the period being assessed rather than directly analysing the key issues and features of the time being assessed. Some context is of course valuable but the questions are focused on the content in the specification. Also, there continues to be a significant number of responses that are chronologically and factually confused leading to arguments that lack logic, coherence and precision. Referring to point 2 above, this is often in responses where the candidate is attempting to write about 'everything they know'.

**Please note:** that it is recommended that centres look at a selection of Principal Examiner Reports from across the different options within WHI04 1A-1D and previous series to get an overall sense of examiner feedback, centre approaches and candidate achievement. It is also highly recommended that centres read the general Introduction and Section A and B introductions in the Principal Examiner Reports for June 2017. These generic introductions outline the assessment requirements for WHI04 and give an indication of the skills required.

Centres may wish to refer to the *Getting Started* guide that is to be found on the IAL History Pearson Edexcel website. It is also useful to take note of the indicative content in the mark schemes.

Further resources that may be of use are the *Applying Criteria* and *Developing Student's Understanding of Historical Interpretations* documents to be found on the Pearson Edexcel History GCE website along with the Principal Examiner Reports for Paper 1 of the Pearson Edexcel History GCE. The *Applying Criteria* document gives guidance with regard to the application of criteria for the different AOs tested at A level. The GCE Paper 1 Reports will be particularly useful for exemplification of AO3 interpretations skills (but please be aware that there are slight differences within the general Level descriptors and that AO1 is assessed for IAL). Exemplification documents are also available on the Pearson Edexcel History IAL website.

## Section A

See above for general comments but it was very pleasing to see some excellent Interpretation responses. For WHI04 1B, in particular, there are some very interesting responses appearing that it is a pleasure to read and reward.

It is worth reminding centres that although candidates are evaluating the extent to which the author's views in the Extracts are convincing, this is not a source evaluation exercise. There is no requirement in the specification for candidates to know any historiography surrounding the debate and candidates are not expected to know about the views of specific historians. In some responses, candidates evaluate the provenance of the Extracts. This is not required and can lead to time wasting in writing about the speculated origins of the books and the author's themselves, for example, making assumptions about nationality and bias. It is very helpful if centres clearly distinguish between AO2 source evaluation in Papers 2 and 3 and the AO3 evaluation of interpretations in Paper 4. One way to do this is to always refer to sources as Sources and interpretations as Extracts or referring to the names of the authors of the Extracts.

Also, candidates do have time to read the Extracts carefully and all the way through. Sometimes candidates only read partial phrases or statements and in doing so infer/suggest views that are actually contradictory to the overall view being presented. As mentioned above, it is not necessary to write for the whole hour available for this Section. Careful reading and planning can lead to a more focused and well organised response.

**Q1. Question 1** required candidates to analyse and evaluate the two Extracts provided while deploying knowledge related to the issues raised in the Extracts to determine how far they agreed with the view that the USA was to blame for the stalemate in Korean peace negotiations in the years 1951-53. The author of Extract 1, T J McCormick, put forward the view that it was the Truman administration that was responsible for the stalemate due to domestic pressures and international goals. The author of Extract 2, R Whelan, suggested that the responsibility should be shared between the Communist participants and the USA, as both sides had reasons not to bring the war to an end in the short term.

It was clear that most candidates had been well prepared for the Key Topic controversy and there was some excellent knowledge of the role of the circumstances in which negotiations took place. However, there was some confusion amongst candidates as to the timeline of events and many candidates blamed General MacArthur for interfering in events that occurred after he was dismissed.

For Extract 1, most candidates were able to discuss the impact of the US decision not to accept the Soviet proposals for armistice in June 1951, the domestic pressures on Truman and the link to wider US foreign policy. There was some excellent contextual knowledge shown in regards to the domestic pressures facing Truman from McCarthyism and his relationship with Congress. For Extract 2, there was clear evaluation of the alternative view that, essentially, both the USA and the USSR were to blame, as both had domestic and international agendas that impacted on decisions made about the war in Korea. Here, there was some excellent contextual knowledge deployed of Stalin's attitude and involvement in influencing events in Korea, and also the issues that caused the stalemate to continue, such as the use of chemical weapons and the return of prisoners-of-war. Most candidates were able to select material from both Extract 1 and 2 to suggest that the USA had a particularly strong role in prolonging the negotiations. Some high Level responses

suggested that although Extract 2 indicated that there was some blame on both sides, overall both Extracts indicated that the USA was ultimately more to blame.

## Section B

Question 2 was more popular than Question 3.

**Q2.** Candidates were required to determine the extent to which the nature of US involvement in Vietnam changed in the years 1954-68. Most candidates tended to take a narrative analytical approach to this question. This is relevant as long as the analysis is sustained and descriptive explanation of events does not become the dominant approach. This approach also means that good planning is required to ensure balanced coverage across the whole period. Referring back to remarks in the General Comments, those candidates who wrote long contextual introductions going back to the 19<sup>th</sup> century and/or continued the narrative after 1968 wasted time when they could have been more focused on the time period of the question. Light touch relevant introductory context is relevant but it does need to serve a purpose in furthering the argument. Some candidates indicated in their introduction or conclusion that there was great change around 1965 but barely reached 1964 in their narrative. Some of the best responses dealt thematically with the concept of the nature of US involvement dealing with key issues such as economic aid, military aid, support for the South Vietnamese regimes, direct intervention and types of weaponry etc. In this way, the candidates were able to analyse the nature of change. A worrying number of responses failed to directly refer to the change in direct intervention in 1965. The move to 'boots on the ground' was often implied rather than directly stated and it is the most obvious clear change. As in previous questions focusing on Vietnam, candidates need to be secure in the order of the US administrations, South Vietnamese governments and the key timeline of US involvement. More than a few responses located Kennedy in the 1950s and Nixon in the early 1960s. Most responses were secure in their knowledge of the Johnson years. However, there is often confusion around the timeline of the events of, and following, the Gulf of Tonkin crisis.

**Q3.** Only a small number of candidates answered this question but those that did were very well prepared, with good knowledge of the potential causes for the success of Pol Pot (Saloth Sar) and the Khmer Rouge in gaining control over Cambodia. Candidates were aware of the support of Communist China and explored this in relation to other factors such as the strength of support in Cambodia for the Khmer Rouge, the complicated influence of Prince Sihanouk, the role of North Vietnam and the impact of US intervention as a consequence of the Vietnam conflict. Better responses compared the factors in relation to each other and often suggested that the US created the foundations of disruption and discontent that Pol Pot (Saloth Sar) was able to take advantage of.

## Paper Summary

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

### Section A (AO3/AO1)

- Candidates should aim to interpret both extracts by analysing the issues raised and showing an understanding of the arguments presented by both authors. It is important to show awareness that it is historian's points of view that are the basis

of a discussion; referring to the author by name helps this understanding (where there is more than one author, candidates can write the first name with et al after it.)

- Interpretations do not need to be evaluated in the same way as Sources. It is the views in the Extracts themselves that create the basis of the discussion. All the Extracts are 'secondary sources' and this does not need to be explained.
- Candidates should use their own knowledge of the specification content to validate and discuss the interpretations being presented.
- Candidates should come to an overall judgement with regard to the view stated in the question; it is not sufficient just to summarise the views presented in the extracts.

### **Section B (AO1)**

- Candidates should provide more precise contextual knowledge as supporting evidence. Use knowledge to provide evidence to support a sustained evaluation in relation to the conceptual focus of the question. Secure chronological knowledge enables candidates to produce a logical and coherent answer.
- Read the wording of the questions carefully, particularly if the time period of the question is stated; responses that refer to the wrong time period deploy irrelevant and inaccurate knowledge that does not directly address or only implicitly addresses the question.
- Introductions do not need to reflect a large amount of contextual detail; use introductions to establish the foundations of the argument you are about to present and to show that you understand the focus of the question.
- Use conclusions to state the judgement reached clearly and to show the relative significance of or the inter-relationship between key issues discussed in the main body of the essay; leave the examiner in no doubt as to what your judgement is and why.

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