Pearson Edexcel

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2023

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level in History (WHI04/1B)

Paper 4: International Study with Interpretations

Option 1B: The World in Crisis, 1879-1945

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 2023
Publication Code: WHI04_1B_2301_MS
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

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 4

Section A

Targets: **AO1 (5 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.

AO3 (20 marks): Analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, different ways in which aspects of the past have been interpreted.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material
1	**1–4**	• Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate. • Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included and presented as information, rather than being linked with the extracts. • Judgement on the view is assertive, with little supporting evidence.
2	**5–8**	• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate. • Mostly accurate knowledge is included, but lacks range or depth. It is added to information from the extracts, but mainly to expand on matters of detail or to note some aspects which are not included. • A judgement on the view is given with limited support, but the criteria for judgement are left implicit.
3	**9–14**	• Demonstrates understanding and some analysis of the extracts by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences. • Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts. • Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and discussion of the extracts is attempted. A judgement is given, although with limited substantiation, and is related to some key points of view in the extracts.
4	**15–20**	• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by a comparison of them. • Sufficient knowledge is deployed to explore most of the relevant aspects of the debate, although treatment of some aspects may lack depth. Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge. • Valid criteria by which the view can be judged are established and applied and the evidence provided in the extracts discussed in the process of coming to a substantiated overall judgement, although treatment of the extracts may be uneven. Demonstrates understanding that the issues are matters of interpretation.

5	**21–25**	• Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors. • Sufficient knowledge is precisely selected and deployed to explore fully the matter under debate. Integrates issues raised by extracts with those from own knowledge when discussing the presented evidence and differing arguments. • A sustained evaluative argument is presented, applying valid criteria and reaching fully substantiated judgements on the views given in both extracts and demonstrating understanding of the nature of historical debate.

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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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**	• 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.

5	**21–25**	• 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 World in Crisis, 1879-1945

Question	Indicative content
1	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 which is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates are expected to use the extracts and their own knowledge to consider the views presented in the extracts. Reference to the works of named historians is not expected, but candidates may consider historians' viewpoints in framing their argument. Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that the impact of the Balkan crises (1908-13) on Austria was responsible for the outbreak of a general European war in 1914. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: Extract 1 • The Austrian reaction to the Sarajevo assassinations can only be understood in relation to the events in the Balkans (1908-13) • Despite some diplomatic successes Austria's relationship with Serbia had worsened; Austria felt that Serbia had not kept its promises and was unlikely to accept the borders negotiated in 1913 in the long-term • Austria believed that Serbia's friendly relationship with Russia was potentially a threat to the integrity of the Austrian Empire • Austria felt that, as long as it could gain the support of Germany, it should react to the murder of the Austrian heir apparent as if the assassination were sanctioned by Serbia and, as such, required an aggressive response. Extract 2 • It was the existence of the German Schlieffen Plan that drew the European powers into a general war in 1914 • The French and Russian knowledge of the Schlieffen Plan determined the nature of France and Russia's own military plans • Once the Schlieffen Plan was implemented it would have a spiralling effect in eastern Europe that would require the rapid mobilisation of Russian troops on one side and Austrian troops on the other • The requirement of the European military plans of the four major continental powers for rapid mobilisation had a direct effect on the acceleration of events in July 1914 leading to the outbreak of war. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the impact of the Balkan crises (1908-13) on Austria was responsible for the outbreak of a general European war in 1914. Relevant points

Question	Indicative content
	may include: • The Bosnian Crisis left a legacy of tension between Austria and Serbia; Austria retained control of annexed territory while Serbia had been forced to back down in the light of Russian inability to provide support • Austria had gained a diplomatic victory in the aftermath of the Balkan Wars by restricting Serbian territorial gains, particularly by ensuring Albanian independence and so cutting off Serbian access to the sea • Serbian nationalists belonging to the Black Hand group were responsible for the assassination in Sarajevo. Austria was convinced that there was a direct link to the Serbian security forces and so to the government • By 1914, Russia was strategically and militarily in a much better position to support Serbia in a confrontation with Austria and was keen to assuage its perceived weakness in being unable to come to Serbia's aid in 1909 • Unlike in 1908, the situation in 1914 led to general war, as this time the assassinations enabled Austria to secure the 'blank cheque' from Germany and the Austrian ultimatum secured Russian firm support for Serbia. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the impact of the Balkan crises (1908-13) on Austria was responsible for the outbreak of a general European war in 1914. Relevant points may include: • From 1905, the formulation of the German military plan meant that the likelihood of Europe being drawn into a general war increased significantly, due to its assumption of a two-front war with France and Russia • In 1910, France and Russia reaffirmed their military commitments from the Dual Alliance of 1894 and their strategic planning was based on a general awareness of German military strategy • Militarisation was a key feature of European power politics in the years 1912-1914, e.g. the French formulated Plan XVII, Russia invested in its western defences, conscription and standing armies increased • The Schlieffen Plan involved the breaking of Belgian neutrality, which had the potential to draw Britain into a war between Germany and France; on 4 August 1914 Britain entered the war overtly in defence of Belgium • The diplomatic decisions of June-July 1914, particularly those of Germany, Austria and Russia, were based on an understanding of the timetables of mobilisation plans, e.g. Russian shift to general mobilisation on 30 July.

Section B: Indicative content

Option 1B: The World in Crisis, 1879-1945

Question	Indicative content
2	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 which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether the treaties of the Versailles settlement (1919-23) were very harsh and benefitted only the victorious powers. Arguments and evidence that the treaties of the Versailles settlement (1919-23) were very harsh and benefitted only the victorious powers should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Under Article 231, the Treaty of Versailles placed the blame for the outbreak of the First World War on Germany above all other nations • The Versailles Treaty, in particular, humiliated Germany by forcing it to pay reparations, decimating its military resources and manpower, reducing its borders and redistributing its colonies amongst the victors • The territorial agreements of the treaties were arbitrary in their treatment of many ethnic Germans and self-determination was often overridden in order to reward victors such as Romania, Serbia and Greece • Hungary was treated as separate defeated power in the treaty of Trianon, having to accept war guilt and pay reparations, despite emerging from the First World War as a truly independent nation for the first time • The initial treaty with Turkey was so controversial in its favouring of the major European powers and Greece, with regard to territorial and fiscal control, that it had to be revised in the Treaty of Lausanne in 1923 • The 'Big Four' all benefitted from the redistribution of German colonial territory as League of Nations mandates, and from the break-up of the Turkish Empire with its lucrative oil-bearing territories. Arguments and evidence that counter the proposition that the treaties of the Versailles settlement (1919-23) were very harsh and benefitted only the victorious powers should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Treaty of Versailles was intended to mitigate the impact of the German army's 'scorched-earth' policy, which had been designed to harm the infrastructure of the countries of western Europe in its retreat • The implementation of self-determination in eastern Europe attempted to create secure independent states strong enough to establish themselves in the confusion of the break-up of the Austria-Hungarian

	Empire • Millions of people in Europe were liberated, particularly the many in eastern Europe who had gained rights of citizenship in the newly created independent states, such as Czechoslovakia • In the 1920s, the League of Nations, as part of the terms of the treaties, prevented further international confrontation through diplomacy and benefited millions across the world through its humanitarian work • Several of the victorious powers themselves felt resentful of the Versailles settlement and felt that they had not benefitted, e.g. Italy and Japan. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	Indicative content
3	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 which is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether the most significant reason for Japan's aggressive foreign policy, in the years 1933-41, was the desire for national security. Arguments and evidence that the most significant reason for Japan's aggressive foreign policy, in the years 1933-41, was the desire for national security should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Japan had a traditional fear of the potential for Chinese, Russian and Korean expansionism and this became more so in the 1930s • Japan's lack of raw materials, resources and land weakened its security. The Japanese invasion of Manchuria, China and Indo-China all provided Japan with opportunities to solve these issues • Japan felt threatened by the rise in communism in Russia and China, e.g. Japan saw Manchuria as a potential buffer against Russian expansionism • The Washington Naval Conference severely limited the naval power of Japan, and the security of Japan as an island nation, so fuelling the desire for mainland territory to maintain security • Japan's attack on Indo-China in 1941 was partly influenced by fears that its ally Germany would take advantage of its advances in western Europe to take control of Dutch and French interests in the region • The increasing US physical and economic presence in the Pacific was a

	constant concern to Japan and played a role in the Japanese decision to attack Pearl Harbour (December 1941). Arguments and evidence that there were other reasons for Japan's aggressive foreign policy, in the years 1933-41, should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The growth of militarism in the 1930s. Japan's military took control of Japan in response to a civilian political and economic crisis and followed a policy of military intervention in Asia as a solution to Japan's problems • A resurgence of Japanese nationalism in the 1930s increased the desire to establish territorial control in mainland Asia as proof of national superiority • Japanese resentment of its post-First World War treatment despite being a victorious power, e.g. limited gains at Versailles, European attitudes during disarmament diplomacy, treatment by the League of Nations • Economic factors, e.g. the devastating effect of the Great Depression on the Japanese economy, the need to ensure a supply of material for Japanese industry • Japan's relationship with Germany, e.g. as part of the anti-Comintern pact, after 1939 in relation to potential German interest in South East Asia. Other relevant material must be credited.

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom