



Pearson

Examiners' Report Principal Examiner Feedback

January 2020

Pearson Edexcel International A Level
In History (WHI03) Paper 1D

edexcel 

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 2020

Publications Code WHI03_1D_2001_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2020

Principal Examiner Report WHI03 D

WHI03 1D 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 student 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. However, this was not the case with all and it would be advisable for candidates to spend a short time 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 and ill focused answers. 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. Moreover there were a significant number of answers that did refer to the weight of the evidence but with little or no support to back up the point being made. Evaluation needs to be supported with reference to the source. Those that were more successful drew inferences, with support from the sources, and interrogated the evidence with support from relevant contextual knowledge that was applied to illuminate the points being made.

Section B responses generally scored higher marks as there was much greater development and engagement with the stated issues in the questions and a clear awareness of the conceptual focus of them. Many responses showed good knowledge of the periods studied and were able to develop arguments which crossed and linked the key topics being considered. However there were still some answers which only dealt with one of the time periods being questioned 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, used them together and were able to draw out inferences from them which related to Obama gaining the Democratic nomination for the presidency. Both sources were full of possibilities to draw inferences and to link these to the utility of them, for the historian, in the context of the enquiry (e.g. Harnden implied that Obama appeared as a beacon of hope for many young people). 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 (e.g. Obama's campaigning quickly adjusted to the possibilities brought about by the growth in the internet and social media). 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 the answer submitted 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. 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 a valid criterion for judgement. Candidates are asked to evaluate what is there rather than what is not.

However, 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. Moreover in a number of cases knowledge displayed didn't relate to the sources but explored the presidential campaign itself rather than that for the nomination. Knowledge that is deployed by the candidates needs to be something that could possibly have been known or understood by the author of the source, and so applied to the source, rather than something that had not yet taken place. In other instances, where utility was addressed through the provenance it was often based on either stereotypical judgements or questionable assumptions. This often took the form of

comments such as Fox News is conservative and therefore biased or untrustworthy (Source 1) or Harnden was British and so wouldn't know anything about American politics (Source 2).

Question 2

This was the most popular of the two questions. The question considered whether the impact of Andrew Johnson's presidency on the lives of black Americans was greater than the impact of Lyndon Johnson's presidency. Stronger responses clearly addressed the developments over both periods and weighed up the relative importance of both of them. Key areas such as the period of the Reconstruction years under Andrew Johnson were explored and discussed using valid criteria to judge the extent of impact. Counterarguments relating to the legislative achievements of Lyndon Johnson were considered and the relative importance of one president over the other were often discussed well. 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 also found it harder to outline clearly the actual decisions that both Presidents made and so struggled to make supported judgements relevant to the question. Occasional responses only engaged with one of the two periods given in the question and so limited severely their ability to score highly.

Question 3

This question was less popular and asked candidates to look at whether the role of civil rights campaigners was always of lesser importance than other factors in bringing about change for black Americans in the years 1883-1968. Strong answers successfully looked at the role of civil rights campaigners and their relative importance. These included their importance in successfully challenging Plessy v Ferguson and other restrictions on black Americans as well as their evolving methods of protest. The best answers then considered and weighed up the relative importance of other factors in advancing the cause of black Americans. Popular amongst these were the influence of certain presidents such as John F Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson as well as the rulings of the Supreme Court.

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 harder to bring in supporting examples from across the whole period and this made it harder to make supported judgements relevant to the question. Occasional responses showed little understanding of what civil rights campaigners actually did and so 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 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 and support their comments with direct reference to the sources or provenance.
- 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 at the time it was produced.
- 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 should be 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 such criteria 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.