



Pearson  
Edexcel

## Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2022

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 2022

Publication Code: WHI03\_1B\_2201\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

## 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>

<b>Level</b>	<b>Mark</b>	<b>Descriptor</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>21–25</b>	<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
<b>1</b>	<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 faced by the British army in fighting the Boers.</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>• The report comes from a newspaper report soon after the battle when the events would have been fresh in the minds of the reporters</li><li>• Being from a British newspaper it might be expected to overemphasise the capabilities of the Boer resistance to help explain the setback at Colenso</li><li>• The tone is respectful of the resilience of the Boers and the organisation of their defences.</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 faced by the British army in fighting the Boers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• It indicates that the assessment of the British officers as to the state of the Boer defences was incorrect ('our officers concluded that the Boers had realised that they could not hold their position and had retreated.')</li><li>• It claims that the Boers had utilised clever tactics to slow the British advance ('After the battle it was discovered that the Boers had built a dam across the river')</li><li>• It implies that the British underestimated the Boer military capabilities ('They had planned an exceedingly effective defence.')</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 battle of Colenso was the third of a series of defeats in Black Week which forced a reappraisal of British tactics</li><li>• Defeats during Black Week prompted frenzied debate in British newspapers as to the wisdom of military involvement against the Boers</li><li>• The defeats during Black Week made the British more aware that the Boers had adopted new military technologies such as smokeless powder.</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>• Having served in the Boer War and entitling the article 'South African Experience', he was a witness to the events he is describing</li> <li>• The article was presented to an audience in England unfamiliar with both the situation and the terrain he is describing</li> <li>• His experiences were those of a Private soldier caught up in the heat of battle and so might not be typical of experiences elsewhere on the battlefield.</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 faced by the British army in fighting the Boers.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It indicates that the British troops were not best prepared to launch an attack against the Boers ('heavily burdened, without sleep - exhausted after a twelve-mile march')</li> <li>• It claims that the Boers put up a determined resistance to the attack ('impossible to look up at the position the Boers held because raising one's head was the signal for a hundred bullets.')</li> <li>• It implies that ultimately Boer resistance and discipline crumbled rather easily ('wildly firing... Boers fled in all directions.').</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>• Following initial defeats, there were changes in military leadership, with the replacement of Sir Redvers Buller by Lord Roberts.</li> <li>• Lord Roberts instigated tactical changes to tackle the Boer threat</li> <li>• In May 1900, the British had a series of military successes including relieving the siege at Mafeking and capturing Johannesburg.</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 describe attacks on Boer positions but with different outcomes</li> <li>• Source 1 is recounting an attack from earlier in the war when Boer tactics were prevailing. By May 1900 (Source 2) the attack suggests Boer resistance is being overcome</li> <li>• Both sources agree that the Boers were capable of co-ordinating and sustaining murderous rifle fire on their attackers.</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 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 the role played by government was the most significant reason for the successful military outcome for the British in the Napoleonic Wars (1803-15) and the Crimean War (1854-56).</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>• Key members of the government such as Pitt, in the Napoleonic Wars, and Palmerston, in the Crimean War, played a significant role in co-ordinating the war effort</li> <li>• The British government encouraged the use of new technologies such as Congreve’s rockets in the Napoleonic wars, and railways to supply troops and the electrical telegraph for communications in the Crimea</li> <li>• The British government was assiduous in building alliances which were significant to the successful outcome in both wars</li> <li>• Financing the wars facilitated the fighting and was competently achieved by shrewd adjustments to Income Tax and borrowing levels without detriment to the wider British economy</li> <li>• Government played a significant role in organising recruitment, deploying troops and overcoming logistical problems of supply.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement and/or that other factors were more significant should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The work of government was often incompetent, e.g. the McNeill-Tulloch report 1855 provided evidence of negligence in the supplying of front-line troops in the Crimean War</li> <li>• Politicians such as Lord Aberdeen in 1855 were forced to resign when their competence for organising the war effort was called into question</li> <li>• Good military leadership of the British army was more significant to the outcome of the wars, e.g. Wellington as a commander in the Peninsular War and at Waterloo, and Raglan, at times, during the Crimean War</li> <li>• Good military leadership of the British navy was more significant to the outcome of the wars, e.g. Nelson at Trafalgar and the British navy being successfully deployed to cut off Russian supply lines in 1855</li> </ul>

- |  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The successful utilisation of new technologies had a significant impact in both wars, e. g. the exploitation of carronades in the Napoleonic War and the Minié ball in the Crimean War.</li></ul> |
|--|---|

Other relevant material must be credited

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 British success in the wars against Germany, in the years 1914–18 and 1939–45, was mainly due to good military leadership.</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>• Good and successful military leadership was displayed by Haig when he learned from earlier mistakes and fashioned the British army into a highly skilled and effective multi-armed fighting force, e.g. Amiens 1918</li> <li>• Good military leadership was displayed by Haig’s willingness to embrace new technology, for example the tank at the Somme, Cambrai and ultimately, alongside aircraft, in the decisive 1918 offensive</li> <li>• Montgomery’s decisive leadership at the battle of El Alamein 1942, culminating in the defeat of Rommel, was a decisive turning point in the military fortunes of the allies</li> <li>• Harris’ strategic bombing campaigns against Germany, although controversial, played a significant role in reducing Germany’s capacity to wage effective war</li> <li>• Montgomery’s effective leadership of the 21<sup>st</sup> Army group was instrumental in helping to spearhead the drive into Germany in 1945, which ultimately helped to bring the war to a conclusion.</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>• Military leadership was, at times, inadequate, e.g. Sir John French struggled to command the BEF and his timidity and inability to work well with his Corps commanders ultimately led to him being replaced</li> <li>• Technological developments played a key role in military success in both wars e.g. the development of the tank in 1914-18 war and radar 1939-45</li> <li>• Effective recruitment policies needed to mobilise mass armies was central to the success in both wars, e.g. the role of Kitchener 1914-16, Conscription 1916, National Service Act 1939</li> <li>• Mass mobilisation of the civilian population to work in munitions factories, feed the nation and produce aircraft was vital in enabling a successful prosecution of the wars</li> <li>• Emergency powers were granted by Parliament through DORA 1914 and the Emergency Powers Act 1939. Both these gave the state extensive powers to organise the war effort which was central to military success.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

