Pearson Edexcel

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2024

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level in History (WHI04)

Paper 4: International Study with Historical 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 2024
Question Paper Log Number P75144A
Publications Code WHI04_1B_MS_2401
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

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 that German political and military aggression was mainly responsible for the outbreak of war in Europe in 1914. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: Extract 1 • It was Germany acting as a bully in its dealing with the major European powers in 1914, rather than the assassination in Sarajevo, that caused the outbreak of war • Germany's dominant position amongst the mainland European powers, and the dominance of the German military within Germany itself, gave the German government confidence to tell other countries how to behave • German military plans were inflexible, which meant that once put into action it was not possible to stop them • The war began because the Germans wanted to strike first. Extract 2 • There was no general desire for war in Europe in 1914 but the actions and decisions made after the assassination of Franz Ferdinand led to war • All of the European countries involved in the decision-making were in some way responsible for the outbreak of the war with each playing a specific role in the escalation of tensions • Germany did not want a war to break out in Europe and made an honest attempt to prevent war breaking out • It was the assassination at Sarajevo that brought together the hostilities that had been brewing in the alliance system and which triggered the chain of events that led to the war. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that German political and military aggression was mainly responsible for the outbreak of war in Europe in 1914. Relevant points may include: • In the decades before 1914, German pursued a policy of *Weltpolitik*; German rulers looked to expand German power by challenging the economic and international status of other major European states • The German military plan for war in Europe – the Schlieffen Plan – necessitated an attack on both France and Russia and relied on the precise mobilisation of troops using railway transportation • It was Germany's 'blank cheque' assurance of support for Austria-Hungary that gave Austria-Hungary the confidence to pursue its aggressive stance towards Serbia after the assassination at Sarajevo

Question	Indicative content
	• The German military had already been considering a preventative war in Europe and took advantage of the events of 1914. The German declaration of war against Russia on 1 August resulted in a European war. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that German political and military aggression was mainly responsible for the outbreak of war in Europe in 1914. Relevant points may include: • The creation of an 'alliance system' post-1879, meant that tensions between the 'Triple Alliance' and the 'Triple Entente' could rapidly develop into the potential for war, e.g. tension in the Balkans and North Africa • It was Austria-Hungary's decision to challenge Serbia, over what was essentially a matter of internal politics, that led to a chain reaction of decisions across Europe that in turn led to the outbreak of war • European militarism had led to an arms race throughout Europe and the general mobilisation plans of all the major continental European powers meant that once put into action it would be difficult to reverse • At the end of July 1914, there was a personal attempt by Kaiser Wilhelm of Germany, in communication with his cousin Tsar Alexander of Russia, to prevent war.

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 USA had only a limited influence on international diplomacy in the years 1919–39. Arguments and evidence that the USA had only a limited influence on international diplomacy in the years 1917–39 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The failure of the US Congress to ratify the Versailles Settlement meant that US had little influence over its implementation • The US rejected membership of the League of Nations and so was not directly involved in the attempts of the League to establish mechanisms to prevent future war • US absence from the League meant that the 'old imperial powers' - Britain and France - dominated international diplomacy; the US was unable to further the proposed principles of Wilsonian self-determination of 1918–19 • The continued isolationism of the USA in the 1930s meant that it had very little influence over international reactions to the expansionist policies of the aggressive nationalist powers - Germany, Japan and Italy. Arguments and evidence that the USA was influential in international diplomacy in the years 1917–39 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The US contribution to the defeat of Germany, Wilson's 'Fourteen Point' vision for a future world and Wilson's physical presence at Versailles meant that the US dominated the Versailles Peace Settlement (1919–20) • US President Woodrow Wilson was influential in creating the founding principles of the League of Nations • The USA was influential in dealing with problems arising from the Versailles reparations demands on Germany. The Dawes Plan (1924) and Young Plan (1929) were brokered commissions led by US businessmen • The US was one of the two sponsors of the Kellogg-Briand Pact (1928) that looked to foster peace. The US, France and 15 countries, including Germany, promised not to use conflict to resolve international disputes • The USA was influential in conferences (1921–35) held to attempt to limit naval expansion, particularly in the Asia-Pacific region. The 1921–22 conference was organised by the US and held in Washington • US isolationism itself impacted on European diplomacy in the 1930s by encouraging British and French appeasement policies. 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 Mussolini's foreign policy was more of a success than it was a failure in the years 1933–41. Arguments and evidence that Mussolini's foreign policy was a success in the years 1933–41 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • In the years 1933–35, Mussolini managed to maintain a working relationship with France and Britain, e.g. the Stresa Front • In the years 1933–34, Mussolini was active in attempts to contain Hitler's threats of expansionism, e.g. Four Power Pact (1933), confrontation with Germany over Austria (1934) • In the 1930s, the build-up of the Italian armed forces, particularly the navy and air force, enhanced Mussolini's diplomatic strength in Europe • Mussolini expanded Italian influence in the Mediterranean and in Africa, e.g. extended territory in Libya, invaded Abyssinia (1935), supported the Nationalists in Spain (1936), annexed Albania (1939) • From 1936–39, Mussolini established Italy as part of Hitler's axis of fascist powers, e.g. Rome-Berlin Axis (1936), anti-Comintern Pact (1937) and Pact of Steel (1939) • Mussolini fulfilled his ambition to act as a major European statesman by chairing the Munich Conference (1938). Arguments and evidence that Mussolini's foreign policy was a failure in the years 1933–41 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Mussolini's reputation in Europe as a statesman came under increasing scrutiny as the 1930s progressed, e.g. his move towards Germany, his treatment as 'junior' partner by Hitler, the failure of Munich (1938) • The Italian invasion of Abyssinia was difficult and challenging with the Italian army being met with heavy resistance and Italy being condemned for its use of chemical weapons • The Italian army suffered setbacks in the Spanish Civil War and was defeated at the Battle of Guadalajara (1937) • Despite having signed the Pact of Steel with Germany, Mussolini opted for neutrality at the outbreak of war in Europe in 1939 • Within months of declaring war in 1940, Britain inflicted a humiliating defeat on the Italian navy at Taranto • By 1941, Mussolini's ambition to create an Italian empire in Africa was crushed for good, as Britain made gains in North African and took control of Abyssinia. 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