

Mark scheme

International Advanced Level  
in History (WHI03/1B)

Paper 3: Thematic Study with  
Source Evaluation

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

## Generic Level Descriptors for Paper 3

### Section A

**Target: A02 (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 data-bbox="443 253 1366 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="443 398 1366 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="443 577 1366 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: A01 (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 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 that 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 the Duke of Wellington as a commander during the Waterloo campaign of 1815.</p> <p><b>Source 1</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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>• This is the reported conversation of the Emperor Napoleon and no man had a better overall view of this his last campaign</li> <li>• The defeated Napoleon might be expected to minimise Wellington's entitlement to the glory given to him as the reputed victor. He clearly bore a grudge against Wellington</li> <li>• The writer was French and might be expected to have a partial view of the conduct and outcome of the Battle of Waterloo and the reported conversation took place several months after the battle and was not written up in book form until eight years later.</li> </ul> </li> <li>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about Wellington's conduct of the campaign <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It provides evidence that Wellington was completely taken by surprise</li> <li>• It claims that Wellington's troop dispositions before the battle were poor</li> <li>• It claims that Wellington was essentially very lucky.</li> </ul> </li> <li>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>• The confirmation by Wellington of his being surprised, for example 'Napoleon has humbugged me'</li> <li>• Knowledge of Wellington's troop dispositions both initially at Quatre Bras and then at Waterloo</li> <li>• Wellington's careful conduct of the battle.</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p><b>Source 2</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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>• The Duke of York was an experienced British soldier, particularly as an administrator and was devoted to the British Army</li> <li>• He was notoriously hostile to Wellington as the source indicates</li> <li>• This is a reported conversation from six years after the battle.</li> </ul> </li> </ol>

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 Wellington's conduct of the campaign:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It provides evidence of Wellington's military ability although in a grudging tone</li> <li>• It provides confirmatory evidence of the element of surprise inflicted on Wellington by Napoleon</li> <li>• It claims that the others deserve the credit for the successful outcome of the battle as much if not more than Wellington</li> <li>• It asserts that Wellington is defective in character, i.e. 'false and ungrateful'.</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>• Knowledge of the ways in which it might be said that Wellington got into 'a messy situation' during the campaign</li> <li>• Knowledge of Wellington's relations with his subordinates and the frequent charge that he was over-controlling and did not delegate sufficiently</li> <li>• Knowledge of his often troubled relations with 'Horseguards' headed by the Duke of York.</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>• They both agree that Wellington was surprised by Napoleon during the Waterloo campaign</li> <li>• Both sources are from hostile but well-informed sources although one French and one British</li> <li>• Both sources by focusing on the role Wellington during the campaign tacitly accept his perceived importance.</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 that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement 'The opposition in Britain to both the Crimean War and the Second Boer War was insignificant'.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement that 'The opposition in Britain to both the Crimean War and the Second Boer War was insignificant' should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public opinion of the Crimean War was overwhelmingly supportive of the war, including most radicals who were ideologically hostile to Tsarist Russia</li> <li>• The two leading parliamentary critics of the Crimean War, Richard Cobden and John Bright, both lost their seats in the election of 1857</li> <li>• The bulk of the press in both wars supported the war effort. Press criticism of the government in the Crimean War turned on the issue of the efficiency in prosecuting the war not the fundamental issue of fighting the war</li> <li>• Public opinion of the Boer War appears to have been largely in favour with the government winning a comfortable majority in the 1900 election and widespread public demonstration of support at other times</li> <li>• In neither war does opposition to the principle of fighting the war appear to have influenced government decision making.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement that 'The opposition in Britain to both the Crimean War and the Second Boer War was insignificant' should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was opposition to both wars from leading and eloquent politicians notably Cobden and Bright in the Crimean War and Lloyd George and Campbell Bannerman in the Boer War</li> <li>• There was considerably more public opposition to the Boer War than the Crimean War particularly after the victory over the Boers in the summer of 1900 failed to end the fighting and Kitchener had to develop unpopular methods to counter guerrilla tactics</li> <li>• The British press in the Boer War was more divided than in the Crimean War with some Liberal papers such as the Manchester Guardian and the Daily News (from early 1901) opposing the war</li> <li>• In both wars the press raised widespread concerns about the efficient conduct of the struggles, which influenced the conduct of the war. For example, the Daily Mail, which was a strong supporter of the Boer War, nevertheless expressed concerns about its conduct</li> <li>• The Boer War was opposed by two new parties that had not existed in the 1850s, namely The Irish Nationalist Party and the Labour Group (officially the Labour Party in 1906).</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>



Question	Indicative content
3	<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 that is indicated as relevant.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that 'The technology applied to warfare in the Second World War had largely been developed during the war of 1914–18.'</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that support the statement that 'The technology applied to warfare in the Second World War had largely been developed during the war of 1914–18', should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The tank that dominated the battlefields of 1939–45 had first made its appearance in battle in September 1916</li> <li>• Air power, so important in 1939–45, had developed after 1914 to play an increasingly important role in land warfare by 1918</li> <li>• Submarines had developed as an increasingly important weapon at sea during 1914–18 and played a vital role in naval warfare in 1939–45</li> <li>• The first aircraft carrier had been created by Britain by the end of the First World War and this was to be the dominant capital ship of the Second World War</li> <li>• Radio became increasingly important for communication purposes on the battlefield towards the end of the First World War and was the key method of communication in 1939–45</li> <li>• Most of the key infantry weapons of 1939–45, such as grenades, mortars and the light machine gun, had been developed in 1914–18.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that contradict the statement that 'The technology applied to warfare in the Second World War had largely been developed during the war of 1914–18.' should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nuclear weapons were developed during the Second World War</li> <li>• The rocket technology so threatening in 1944 was developed by Germany in 1939–45</li> <li>• The technology of secret communication,(Enigma), and its countering (Turing's early versions of the computer) were developed post-1918</li> <li>• Aircraft technology was massively developed and advanced both immediately before and during the Second World War</li> <li>• Radar for aircraft and submarine detection systems was developed post-1918</li> <li>• Most of the explosives and propellants of 1939–45 pre-dated 1914.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>