



Pearson

# **Mark scheme (Results)**

June 2017

Pearson Edexcel International  
Advanced Level in History (WHI03)

Paper 3: Thematic Study with  
Source Evaluation

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

### **Edexcel, BTEC and LCCI qualifications**

Edexcel, BTEC and LCCI qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body offering academic and vocational qualifications that are globally recognised and benchmarked. For further information, please visit our qualification websites at [www.edexcel.com](http://www.edexcel.com), [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk) or [www.lcci.org.uk](http://www.lcci.org.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)

### **About Pearson**

Pearson is the world's leading learning company, with 40,000 employees in more than 70 countries working to help people of all ages to make measurable progress in their lives through learning. We put the learner at the centre of everything we do, because wherever learning flourishes, so do people. Find out more about how we can help you and your learners at: [www.pearson.com/uk](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

June 2017

Publication Code WHI03\_1B\_1706\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

## General marking guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the last candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the first.
- 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.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- 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.

## How to award marks

### Finding the right level

The first stage is to decide which level the answer should be placed in. To do this, use a 'best-fit' approach, deciding which level most closely describes the quality of the answer. Answers can display characteristics from more than one level, and where this happens markers must use their professional judgement to decide which level is most appropriate.

### Placing a mark within a level

After a level has been decided on, the next stage is to decide on the mark within the level. The instructions below tell you how to reward responses within a level. However, where a level has specific guidance about how to place an answer within a level, always follow that guidance.

Markers should be prepared to use the full range of marks available in a level and not restrict marks to the middle. Markers should start at the middle of the level (or the upper-middle mark if there is an even number of marks) and then move the mark up or down to find the best mark. To do this, they should take into account how far the answer meets the requirements of the level:

- If it meets the requirements *fully*, markers should be prepared to award full marks within the level. The top mark in the level is used for answers that are as good as can realistically be expected within that level
- If it only *barely* meets the requirements of the level, markers should consider awarding marks at the bottom of the level. The bottom mark in the level is used for answers that are the weakest that can be expected within that level
- The middle marks of the level are used for answers that have a *reasonable* match to the descriptor. This might represent a balance between some characteristics of the level that are fully met and others that are only barely met.

## 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>• 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>• 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>• 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>• 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 their 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. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the abilities of Winston Churchill as a wartime political leader in the years 1940-45.</p> <p>Source 1</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>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:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>As a journalist/magazine editor he would be expected to have a significant number of informed sources of information</li><li>His left wing political views might make him critical of the more conservative Churchill</li><li>The autobiography was published in 1982 recalling views held in 1942.</li></ul></li><li>The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the abilities of Winston Churchill as a wartime political leader:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>It claims that opposition to Churchill's ability as a leader was growing and was widespread</li><li>It implies that he had first hand knowledge of meetings taking place that were critical of Churchill's leadership</li><li>It suggests that Churchill still retained the general support of the people as a wartime leader.</li></ul></li><li>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:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>He rallied the nation in defiance of Hitler. In the words of Labour politician Hugh Dalton, Churchill was 'the only man we have for this hour'</li><li>Public opinion polls show that between July 1940 and May 1945, never less than 78 per cent of those polled said they approved of Churchill as prime minister</li><li>The failure of the Conservatives to win the general election of July 1945 suggests that the political influence of Churchill was waning.</li></ul></li></ol>

Question	Indicative content
	<p data-bbox="300 159 432 192">Source 2</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="347 210 1382 309">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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="491 331 1353 430">• His position as Allied Supreme Commander in Europe meant he had direct and regular contact with Churchill from 1943</li> <li data-bbox="491 452 1326 517">• The tone has evident warmth and friendship towards Churchill</li> <li data-bbox="491 539 1358 638">• His autobiography was written very close to the events described and so reflects immediate opinion but with some hindsight.</li> </ul> </li>   <li data-bbox="347 768 1366 902">2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the abilities of Winston Churchill as a wartime political leader (1940-45): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="491 925 1134 958">• It claims he was an 'inspirational leader'</li> <li data-bbox="491 981 1214 1014">• It claims he was knowledgeable about events</li> <li data-bbox="491 1037 1350 1102">• It suggests that Churchill's ability to influence decision making was limited.</li> </ul> </li>   <li data-bbox="347 1240 1385 1375">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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="491 1397 1361 1503">• Churchill professed great confidence in Eisenhower and always defended him in the face of criticism from the British high command</li> <li data-bbox="491 1525 1326 1630">• Churchill blocked Eisenhower's attempts to extend a diplomatic black-out beyond the day of the 157,000-strong invasion of the European mainland</li> <li data-bbox="491 1653 1374 1718">• Churchill differed with Eisenhower about the importance of capturing Berlin ahead of the Russians.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p data-bbox="300 1783 539 1816">Sources 1 and 2</p> <p data-bbox="300 1832 1337 1865">The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="347 1888 1286 1953">• They both agree that Churchill was a central political figure: 'inspirational leader' 'only possible war leader'</li> <li data-bbox="347 1975 1337 2040">• Both sources agree that Churchill could be forthright and argue strongly for his convictions</li> <li data-bbox="347 2063 1350 2096">• Whilst source 2 is predominantly a flattering account source 1 is</li> </ul>

Question	Indicative content
	more negative and suggests there was growing opposition to Churchill's leadership.

## Section B: Indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
2	<p>Answers will be credited according to their 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 how accurate it is to say that politicians and the government machine were more successful in organising the war effort in the years 1803-15 than in the years 1854-56</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement that politicians and the government machine were more successful in organising the war effort in the years 1803-15 than in the years 1854-56 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The innovative introduction and then re-introduction of Income Tax in 1803 successfully helped finance the war effort</li><li>• The scale of the war effort in 1803-15 was significantly greater than that in the Crimea 1854-56</li><li>• Government subsidies to Britain's continental allies were essential in maintaining an anti- Napoleonic series of alliances which were crucial to victory</li><li>• Lord Castlereagh, as Foreign Secretary, was instrumental in negotiating the Quadruple Alliance in 1814 which was crucial in defeating France in 1815</li><li>• The McNeill- Tulloch report 1855 provided evidence of negligence in the supplying and distribution of supplies and equipment to front line troops in the Crimean War</li><li>• The adverse reporting of the Crimean War by <i>The Times'</i> William Howard Russell, which placed the blame for military setbacks partly on politicians, helped to bring down Lord Aberdeen's government in 1855.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement that politicians and the government machine were more successful in organising the war effort in the years 1803-15 than in the years 1854-56 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• By 1854 the British economy and currency was the strongest in the world and so could purchase supplies and enlist</li></ul>

mercenary recruits by paying efficiently in sterling

- Both the Napoleonic and the Crimean Wars saw the successful introduction of new military technologies
- The political machine addressed most of the concerns levelled against the War Office and the army in the early months of the Crimean War
- Neither war was conducted to the satisfaction of all and both wars witnessed opposition in Parliament to the conduct of them
- Gladstone's budgets of 1854-55 raised income tax from 7d to 1s 2d to finance the war and so avoided Britain having to take out expensive loans.

Other relevant material must be credited.

3

Answers will be credited according to their 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 the statement that the British public firmly supported the country's involvement in both the Second Boer War and the First World War.

Arguments and evidence supporting the statement that the British public firmly supported the country's involvement in both the Second Boer War and the First World War should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- The government won a clear victory in the Khaki election of 1900 implying widespread public support for the war
- Critics of the Second Boer war such as Beatrice Webb regularly commented in her diary of the 'strong patriotic sentiment' gripping the country
- The mass mobilisation of women and the broader commitment to the demands of total war in the First World War indicated widespread support for the war effort
- The increases in readership of pro-war newspapers such as the *Daily Mail* in both wars indicated widespread public support
- Although on different scales the mass mobilisation of the armed forces indicated firm support.

Arguments and evidence opposing the statement that that the British public firmly supported the country's involvement in both the Second Boer War and the First World War should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:

- Popular newspapers such as the *Daily News* after 1901 and the Manchester Guardian throughout opposed the Second Boer War
- Criticism of the tactics used to counter the Boers, such as the use of concentration camps, grew from 1901 and anti-war demonstrations were commonplace
- The continuing support for such anti-war parties as the Irish Nationalists in the Khaki election of 1900 suggests a lack of support for the war in some regions
- The dwindling of volunteers, the failure of the 'Derby Scheme' and the need to introduce conscription suggests a waning of public support for the First World War
- The inception of the No Conscription Fellowship and the growth in conscientious objectors indicates opposition rather than support for the First World War.

Other relevant material must be credited.