



## Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2021

Pearson Edexcel International

Advanced Level in History (WHI03/1B)

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 2021

Publications Code WHI03\_1B\_msc\_20210304

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2021

## 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
	0	No rewardable material
1	1–4	<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>
2	5–8	<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>
3	9–14	<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>
4	15–20	<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 data-bbox="408 253 1390 383">• 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 data-bbox="408 398 1401 562">• 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 data-bbox="408 577 1409 734">• 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
	0	No rewardable material
1	1–4	<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>
2	5–8	<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>
3	9–14	<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>
4	15–20	<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.</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 difficulties facing the British army in the Crimean War.</p> <p>Sources 1</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 long-serving Commanding Officer of the Regiment he might be expected to have a clear attachment to, and duty of care for, his troops</li> <li>• Being a senior officer and experiencing first-hand the events he is describing he might be expected to be knowledgeable</li> <li>• The tone and language of the letter is rather forlorn and expresses helplessness to do anything about what he is describing.</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 difficulties facing the British army in the Crimean War.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It indicates that disease is a serious issue confronting the British army (<b>'fifteen more dying... cases of cholera.'</b>)</li> <li>• It implies that the British army has been badly let down by those in <b>authority</b> ('so badly resourced from the start that almost everything is lacking')</li> <li>• <b>It claims that the army are faced with impossible fighting conditions</b> ('The road to Balaclava is impassable as it is knee deep in mud for six miles.')</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 October 1854 and lasting until September 1855</li> <li>• Supply problems were later identified, by the McNeill –Tulloch report, as a serious problem hindering the efficiency of the army</li> <li>• The Great Storm of 1854 (also known as the Balaklava Storm) occurred in and around the Black Sea on 14 November 1854. It caused severe damage and caused major disruption to supplies for the armed forces.</li> </ul> <p>Sources 2</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>• The need to establish a Committee of Inquiry, whilst the war was ongoing, might indicate the seriousness of the issues</li> <li>• The date of publication of the report might indicate that the committee had had time to come to reasoned conclusions as to the supply issues</li> <li>• The language and tone used is rather damning of the government.</li> </ul>



Question	Indicative content
	<p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the difficulties facing the British army in the Crimean War.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It implies that the logistical challenges confronting the army had been poorly considered in advance ('many <b>miles from England...</b> besiege Sevastopol which, from lack of numbers, it could not capture.')</li> <li>• It claims that the supply issues were widely discussed ('Many complaints were made to the Committee about the way in which stores were sent to the East.')</li> <li>• It implies that government had been grossly negligent from the start ('What was planned and undertaken without sufficient information, was conducted without sufficient care or thought.')</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 severity of the challenges facing the British army were so politically toxic that it led directly to the fall of Lord <b>Aberdeen's government</b></li> <li>• <b>Lord Palmerston's government</b> took notice of the health difficulties faced by British troops and established a Sanitary Commission to help improve conditions both at Scutari hospital and in the Crimea</li> <li>• Measures were taken to improve supplies to the army through a special transport department being established and a railway built to Balaklava to improve the supply situation.</li> </ul> <p>Sources 1 and 2</p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both sources indicate that medical provision for the British army was inadequate</li> <li>• Both sources claim that the problems of supply were evident from the start and that little was done to address them</li> <li>• The timing of source 2, much later in the war, allows for reflection and hindsight in a manner that source 1 does not.</li> </ul>

## 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 the statement that the key features of the British experience of war, in the years 1803-15 and in the years 1939-45, were essentially similar.</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>• Both wars highlighted the importance of effective political leadership to mobilise support, help secure alliances and to organise the war effort, e.g. Pitt, Castlereagh and Churchill</li> <li>• Both wars highlighted the importance of effective military command to the outcome. Nelson and Wellington played decisive roles in achieving victory over Napoleon, as did Montgomery and Harris over Hitler</li> <li>• Both wars showed the necessity of taking bold fiscal measures to ensure the fighting efficiency of the nation</li> <li>• Both the war with Nazi Germany and the Napoleonic wars involved the deployment of British troops on a grand and global scale</li> <li>• <b>Anti-war groups existed in both. The 'Friends of Peace' movement was active in the Napoleonic Wars and the 'Peace Pledge Union' in the Second World War.</b></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>• The size of the fighting forces were significantly larger in the war of 1939-45. By 1945 the British Army numbered just under three million men. By contrast during the Napoleonic war the British army was under 250 000</li> <li>• New technologies played a greater role in 1939-45 with mechanisation, communications technology and air power featuring as key determinants of the outcome</li> <li>• Women played a much more direct and significant role in determining the outcome of the war 1939-45</li> <li>• The experience of civilians was different in 1939-45, as the war was seen as a <b>'total war', and there were significant casualties caused by enemy bombing.</b></li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<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 the statement that the Second Boer War (1899-1902) and Trench warfare on the Western Front (1914-18) showed that the British Army was a poor fighting force.</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>• The British Army in the second Boer War struggled as recruitment into the ranks was increasingly from the poorer and less physically fit elements of society, making it, as a fighting force, less efficient</li> <li>• Sir George White, after suffering some minor reverses, managed to get himself cut off in Ladysmith, together with a large British force in excess of 10,000 soldiers</li> <li>• <b>The three defeats of 'Black Week' demonstrated ineptitude on the part of the army's tactics in trying to</b> relieve Kimberley and Ladysmith</li> <li>• <b>Sir John French's poor control of the BEF in the long retreat from Mons to</b> the Marne and his failure at Loos, was sufficiently significant to lose him the support of government and army and led to his replacement by Haig</li> <li>• The failure of Haig to realise that the bombardment preceding the Battle of the Somme (1916) was inadequate, resulting in a disastrous infantry attack on 1st July</li> <li>• <b>Haig's</b> intransigence and insistence on continuing, until 1918, with big pushes, which were wasteful of life, rather than a series of coordinated attacks at different points.</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 British volunteers and troops from the Empire were efficiently shipped to the theatre of operations and integrated into the forces already there</li> <li>• On 28 February 1900, General Sir Redvers Buller relieved Ladysmith after a well-planned and methodical attack</li> <li>• The deployment of new tactics in the second Boer War showed military flexibility. In 1901, the scorched earth tactics employed by Kitchener eventually overcame the hitherto successful guerrilla tactics of the Boers</li> <li>• The British army 1914-18 was often hampered by issues out of its control. The shell shortage of 1915 left the British commanders with too few armaments</li> <li>• <b>Haig's</b> showed a willingness to utilise new technology such as the tank and aircraft which significantly enhanced the fighting capabilities of the British Army</li> <li>• The co-ordination and efficiency of the British Army in the summer offensive 1918 showed a massive improvement in its effectiveness.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

