



**Pearson  
Edexcel**

## Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2019

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level  
In History (WHI03) Paper 1B

Paper 3: Thematic Study With Source Evaluation

Option 1B: The British Experience of Warfare,  
1803–1945

## **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)

January 2019

Publications Code: WHI03\_1B\_1901\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

## General Marking Guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the first candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the last.
- Mark schemes should be applied positively. Candidates must be rewarded for what they have shown they can do rather than penalised for omissions.
- Examiners should mark according to the mark scheme not according to their perception of where the grade boundaries may lie.
- There is no ceiling on achievement. All marks on the mark scheme should be used appropriately.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved, i.e. if the answer matches the mark scheme. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- Where some judgement is required, mark schemes will provide the principles by which marks will be awarded and exemplification may be limited.
- When examiners are in doubt regarding the application of the mark scheme to a candidate's response, the team leader must be consulted.
- Crossed out work should be marked UNLESS the candidate has replaced it with an alternative response.

## Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 3

### Section A

**Target: AO2 (25 marks):** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases.</li><li>• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.</li><li>• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material, but mainly to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences.</li><li>• Detailed knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria with some justification.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two sources may be uneven.</li><li>• Deploys well-selected knowledge of the historical context, but mainly to illuminate or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material. Displays some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li><li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may not be fully substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.</li></ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion.</li> <li>• Deploys knowledge of the historical context with precision to illuminate and discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn.</li> <li>• Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.</li> </ul>

## Section B

**Target: AO1 (25 marks):** Demonstrate, organise and communicate knowledge and understanding to analyse and evaluate the key features related to the periods studied, making substantiated judgements and exploring concepts, as relevant, of cause, consequence, change, continuity, similarity, difference and significance.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li><li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li><li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li><li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is some analysis of some key features of the period relevant to the question, but descriptive passages are included that are not clearly shown to relate to the focus of the question.</li><li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth and has only implicit links to the demands and conceptual focus of the question.</li><li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li><li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There is some analysis of, and attempt to explain links between, the relevant key features of the period and the question, although some mainly descriptive passages may be included.</li><li>• Mostly accurate and relevant knowledge is included to demonstrate some understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, but material lacks range or depth.</li><li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li><li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li><li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li><li>• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied in the process of coming to a judgement. Although some of the evaluations may be only partly substantiated, the overall judgement is supported.</li><li>• The answer is generally well organised. The argument is logical and is communicated with clarity, although in a few places it may lack coherence or precision.</li></ul>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="435 219 1458 277">• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis and discussion of the relationships between key features of the period.</li><li data-bbox="435 300 1458 389">• Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question, and to respond fully to its demands.</li><li data-bbox="435 412 1458 501">• Valid criteria by which the question can be judged are established and applied and their relative significance evaluated in the process of reaching and substantiating the overall judgement.</li><li data-bbox="435 524 1458 582">• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.</li></ul>

## Section A: Indicative content

### Option 1B: The British Experience of Warfare, 1803–1945

Question	Indicative content
1	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme.</p> <p>The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to investigate the quality of Lord Raglan's leadership in the Crimean War.</p> <p><b>Source 1</b></p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Being personal letters, he might be expected to reveal his true thoughts on Raglan's leadership</li><li>• He experienced first-hand the events he is describing and witnessed some of the results of Lord Raglan's military decisions</li><li>• The tone and language of the letters are very hostile to Lord Raglan.</li></ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the quality of Lord Raglan's leadership in the Crimean War.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It claims that Lord Raglan is disliked or even hated by his men ('hatred growing up rapidly in the Army against Lord Raglan')</li><li>• It suggests that opposition to Raglan's leadership is growing in the media at home</li><li>• It implies that he is disdainful of his men ('In fact he sees nothing, he ought to see').</li></ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The siege of Sevastopol was a protracted affair beginning in September 1854 and the length of it brought criticism of Raglan's leadership</li><li>• The Charge of the Light Brigade, 25 October 1854, had called into question the competency of Raglan's leadership</li><li>• W H Russell's reports in <i>The Times</i> newspaper were questioning the efficiency of the management of the war.</li></ul>

Question	Indicative content
	<p><b>Source 2</b></p> <p>1. The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Being a senior British officer in the Crimean War, he was a witness to the events he describes</li> <li>• Being a senior officer, he might be expected to be more sympathetic to the difficulties experienced by Lord Raglan</li> <li>• The tone of the source reveals anger towards Lord Raglan's critics.</li> </ul> <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the quality of Lord Raglan's leadership in the Crimean War.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It claims that factors other than Lord Raglan were to blame for the failure of the siege ('from causes far different to what the press suggested')</li> <li>• It suggests that Lord Raglan has been harshly judged by the press ('most unjustifiable language')</li> <li>• It implies that his critics are hypocrites for shifting their position on Lord Raglan.</li> </ul> <p>3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many of the military problems experienced in the Crimea were the fault of the home authorities who failed to provide adequate logistical support</li> <li>• Lord Raglan had a distinguished military career prior to the Crimean War</li> <li>• Russell's reports from the Crimea need to be treated with some caution as he was absent from it for a substantial amount of time in the winter of 1854–55.</li> </ul> <p><b>Sources 1 and 2</b></p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both sources emphasise that the press and especially <i>The Times</i> newspaper played a key role in shaping perceptions about Raglan's leadership and the conduct of the war</li> <li>• Both sources acknowledge that insufficient resources for the British army were a key issue</li> <li>• Both sources acknowledge that there was growing anger towards Lord Raglan at this time.</li> </ul>

## Section B: Indicative content

### Option 1B: The British Experience of Warfare, 1803–1945

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that opposition to both the Napoleonic Wars 1803–15 and the Second Boer War 1899–1902 was limited.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Public support for the war effort in both wars was broadly secure. Criticisms of government often focused on the deficiencies in prosecuting the war rather than the fundamental issue of war itself</li><li>• Much of the press in both wars supported the war effort, e.g. <i>The Times</i> in the Napoleonic Wars and the <i>Daily Mail</i> in the Second Boer War</li><li>• Political support appears to have been largely in favour, e.g. mainly Tory dominated pro-war governments appointed 1803–15 and the Tory government winning a majority in the 1900 'Khaki' election</li><li>• Voluntary recruitment in both wars led to significant increases in the size of the British army, implying broad support for the war</li><li>• Concern over the threat of invasion by Napoleon and the defence of the Empire against the demands of the Boers helped to reinforce support for governments in both wars.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In both wars political support fluctuated. The Foxite Whigs were mostly critical in the Napoleonic Wars and there was continuing support for anti-war parties such as the Irish Nationalists in 1900</li><li>• Anti-war groups existed in both. The 'Friends of Peace' movement was active in the Napoleonic Wars and 'The League against Aggression and Militarism' in the Second Boer War</li><li>• There was a national peace campaign during 1807–08 led by MP Samuel Whitbread and the radical Sir Francis Burdett, who both believed the war was holding back political and economic reform</li><li>• Popular newspapers such as the <i>Daily News</i> after 1901 and the <i>Manchester Guardian</i> opposed the Second Boer War throughout</li><li>• Anti-war literature was evident in both wars, e.g. Anna Barbauld's poem 'Eighteen Hundred and Eleven' and Thomas Hardy's 'Drummer Hodge'.</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

3

Answers will be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and candidates are not required to include all the material which is indicated as relevant.

Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate it is to say that technological developments were the key factor in the outcome of both the war on the Western Front in the years 1914–18 and the struggle with Nazi Germany in the years 1939–45.

Arguments and evidence supporting the judgement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The tank played a key role in the defeat of Germany in both 1918 and 1945
- Aircraft had played a key role in the defeat of Germany in 1918. By 1945 their role had expanded considerably and they were central to the weakening of Germany through the bombing campaign
- Key developments in weapons technology such as grenades and light machine guns had been vital to military success in 1918 and continued to be so in the defeat of Nazi Germany
- Advances in communications technology, especially the radio, were central to coordinating allied campaigns in 1918 and 1945.

Arguments and evidence qualifying the statement and/or that other factors were more important should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- Technological developments played a greater role in the struggle against Nazi Germany, e.g. radar and the development of the cryptological Bombe used to help crack the vital 'Enigma' code
- Key German technological advantages such as advanced aircraft design in 1914–18 and rocket technology 1939–45 failed to produce overall victory for them
- The significance of the female contribution to the British war effort
- The ability of Britain and its population to engage in 'total war' was central to the war effort in both wars
- Strong political leadership of both Lloyd George and Churchill was central to strengthening the sinews of war.

Other relevant material must be credited.