



Pearson

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2018

Pearson International Advanced Level
In History

WHI03: 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 or 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.

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

January 2018

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

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
	0	No rewardable material
1	1–4	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.• Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, but presented as information rather than applied to the source material.• 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.
2	5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question.• Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material, but mainly to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.• 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.
3	9–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.• Detailed knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail.• 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.
4	15–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.• 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.• 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.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="411 253 1394 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 data-bbox="411 398 1394 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 data-bbox="411 577 1410 741">• 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.

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">• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.
2	5–8	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.• 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.• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.
3	9–14	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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.• 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.• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.
4	15–20	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.• 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.• 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.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	21–25	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by a sustained analysis and discussion of the relationships between key features of the period.• 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.• 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.• The answer is well organised. The argument is logical and coherent throughout and is communicated with clarity and precision.

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 consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate Nelson's qualities as a naval commander in the years 1804-05.</p> <p>Source 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">• The despatch is from Nelson himself and is likely to reflect a desire to portray his qualities positively• It is to his military superiors and might look to give an honest appraisal of the naval situation• The tone of the source is one of self-aggrandisement in the face of neglect from his superiors. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about Nelson's qualities as a naval commander in the years 1804-05:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It suggests that he has empathy with and implies concern for the welfare of his seamen• It states that his task as commander is 'arduous' but implies he is more than up to it• He implies that he has been innovative and ingenious in maintaining the morale of his men. <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">• During the Napoleonic Wars squadrons of British ships were at sea for months, patrolling, defending against invasion and protecting commerce• Nelson had great experience of blockading during the French Wars• In 1804 Spain joined the war as France's ally, adding their ships to the French forces.

Question	Indicative content
	<p data-bbox="373 232 507 266">Source 2</p> <p data-bbox="373 282 1449 387">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 data-bbox="424 405 1465 685" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="424 405 1465 477">• Keats was a close admirer and subordinate of Nelson and so might incline towards a positive attitude towards him <li data-bbox="424 495 1366 566">• He is recalling a conversation held decades before in the full knowledge of Nelson's victory at Trafalgar <li data-bbox="424 584 1465 685">• It was reporting on Nelson's planning in the month before the Battle of Trafalgar and suggests he had a clear plan in advance of engaging with the enemy fleets. <p data-bbox="373 741 1487 846">2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about Nelson's qualities as a naval commander 1804-5:</p> <ul data-bbox="424 864 1477 1070" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="424 864 1477 936">• It suggests that what Nelson is planning, for the prospective battle, is both innovative and confusing to the enemy <li data-bbox="424 954 1254 987">• It suggests that Nelson has great faith in his officers <li data-bbox="424 1005 1477 1070">• It provides evidence that Nelson has a close rapport and willingness to divulge tactics with his officers. <p data-bbox="373 1126 1469 1263">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 data-bbox="424 1281 1430 1525" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="424 1281 1430 1352">• The Battle of Trafalgar was a victory for the British and ended French hope of challenging British supremacy at sea <li data-bbox="424 1370 1374 1442">• The splitting of his forces, as indicated in the memorandum, mirrors the actual tactics used at Trafalgar <li data-bbox="424 1460 1430 1525">• Nelson himself showed conspicuous bravery during the Battle of Trafalgar. <p data-bbox="373 1592 624 1626">Sources 1 and 2</p> <p data-bbox="373 1644 1422 1677">The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul data-bbox="424 1695 1461 1939" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="424 1695 1461 1767">• Both imply that Nelson enjoyed good relations with his seamen no matter of what rank <li data-bbox="424 1785 1445 1856">• Both create the impression of someone who was innovative in his tactical planning and attitudes to his seamen <li data-bbox="424 1874 1402 1939">• While Source 1 was written contemporaneously, Source 2 was produced many years after the events.

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 determined enemy resistance was mostly responsible for the difficulties experienced by the British army in fighting the Crimean War 1854-6 and the second Boer War 1899-1902.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that support the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The extensive fortification of Sevastopol by the Russians, and especially the work of General Totleben, ensured a protracted siege, which created great difficulties of supply for the British army • Russian defence at Balaclava and attack at Inkerman inflicted serious casualties on the British • In besieging Mafeking, Ladysmith and Kimberley, the Boers showed themselves capable of engaging in conventional artillery led warfare as well as their mastery of ground and accurate rifle fire • Black Week, December 1899, witnessed Boer victories including at Colenso and Spion Kop • The use of mobile commandos engaged in guerrilla warfare was effective in disrupting British military activity in the latter years of the Boer war. <p>Arguments and evidence that might challenge or modify the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Military blunders such as the Charge of the Light Brigade and the difficulties experienced by Lord Raglan were indicative of incompetent military leadership • The McNeill-Tulloch Report 1855 provided evidence of military negligence in the supplying and distribution of supplies and equipment to front line troops in the Crimean War • The British neither provided significant numbers of troops initially to fight the Crimean War nor rectified this when the need became more obvious • Early military leadership in the second Boer War was deficient but

<p>3</p>	<p>Roberts and Kitchener overturned many of the early losses to the Boers, including relieving Mafeking and Ladysmith by May 1900</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organised supply and recruitment chains were inadequate at the start of the second Boer War • Growing popular opposition at home made it more difficult to legitimise the war against the Boers. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p> <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 whether there were more similarities than differences in the organisation of the war effort in the years 1914-18 and 1939-45.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that point to similarities should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emergency powers were granted by Parliament through DORA 1914 and the Emergency Powers Act 1939. These both gave the state extensive powers to organise the war effort • Substantial Income Tax rises were fundamental to financing the war effort in both wars • In both wars women were utilised in the workforce in a way that was central to the organisation of the war effort • In both wars the generally held belief that Britain was a liberal, free trading economy was suspended as centralisation became prevalent • Munitions crises were evident in both wars. <p>Arguments and evidence that point to differences should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conscription was introduced later in the First World War than in the Second World War • Women in the Second World War were conscripted into war work at the start. This was not the case in 1914 • Rationing was not introduced until the end of the First World War but was there from the early stages of the Second World War • Dealing with the bombing of the British civilian population was a much more logistical difficulty for government in the years 1939-45 as the aerial threat was both greater and more damaging
----------	--

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Propaganda was organised through a Ministry of Information throughout the Second World War but only belatedly from 1917 in the First World War. |
|--|---|

Other relevant material must be credited