Mark Scheme (Results)

June 2024

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

June 2024
Question Paper Log Number P75803A
Publication Code: WHI04_1B_2406_MS
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 general war broke out in Europe in 1914 because the decision-makers of the Great Powers were 'rushed into action by the nature of war plans'. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: Extract 1 • The civilian and military decision-makers of Europe made hasty decisions based on the requirements of putting war plans into action as soon as possible • There was a concern amongst the European military and political leaders of each country that if they did not mobilise their troops first then they might lose control of events • The use of military offensive action in the German and French war plans meant that each country was committed to quick mobilisation • The German military command persuaded the German Kaiser that there was no other alternative than to put the Schlieffen Plan into action. Extract 2 • The fast-moving nature of the July Crisis in 1914 meant that decisions were being made without full knowledge of what was actually happening • Britain was unable to influence events in July 1914 as it wished to do so because it's decision-makers did not have sufficient time to react • French decision-makers were not present in Paris, or in communication with officials, during most of the July Crisis • France was particularly affected by events outpacing the decision-making processes. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that general war broke out in Europe in 1914 because the decision-makers of the Great Powers were 'rushed into action by the nature of war plans'. Relevant points may include: • Most European powers had been planning for the possibility of some form of a war in Europe since the 1890s. Almost all the plans included the rapid mobilisation of troops, e.g. Plan XVII (France), Schlieffen Plan (Germany) • The timings of plans had the potential to escalate events quickly, e.g. reaction times to enemy mobilisation, the transportation of troops. Russia mobilised on 30 July, setting the plans of other countries in motion • The establishment of the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente, by 1914, meant that the war plans of individual nations were potentially connected

Question	Indicative content
	to the war plans of their allies, e.g. France and Russia • The Schlieffen Plan was based on fears of German encirclement from France in the west and Russia in the east and required mobilisation of troops on two fronts. The Plan required a pre-emptive attack on France. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that general war broke out in Europe in 1914 because the decision-makers of the Great Powers were 'rushed into action by the nature of war plans'. Relevant points may include: • In the aftermath of the assassination, there appeared to be no immediate threat to general peace in Europe. Many political leaders were taking summer breaks away from the capital cities and government offices • Previous incidents in the Balkans had resulted in Great Power tensions but not general war; diplomacy had ultimately prevented escalation and there was little indication until the end of July that this would not happen again • The inflexible nature of the Austro-Hungarian ultimatum to Serbia began a chain of events that meant that, once Germany had given assurances of support, events were increasingly difficult for politicians to control • In July 1914, Poincaré, the French President, did not automatically look to use Plan XVII in response to events and the German Kaiser and Russian Tsar attempted personal diplomacy to prevent general 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 a failure to achieve disarmament in the years 1921-34 was the main reason for the increasing international tensions in the years 1934-39. Arguments and evidence that a failure to achieve disarmament in the years 1921-34 was the main reason for the increasing international tensions in the years 1934-39 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • In the 1920s, a failure to convert the enforced disarmament of the 'guilty powers' at Versailles (1919) into a global commitment resulted in the lingering resentments that underwrote Germany's rearmament policy • Lingering Japanese resentment of demilitarisation negotiations in the 1920s, e.g. British and US unwillingness to accept Japanese equity, added to tensions in the years 1934-39 • In 1933-34, as the newly-appointed German Chancellor, Hitler's actions, and complete rejection of disarmament, at the Geneva Disarmament Conference created a climate of insecurity and tension in Europe • The failure of the Geneva Disarmament Conference exacerbated global security tensions and encouraged military expansion • The failure of Geneva Disarmament Conference undermined the credibility of the League of Nations and its future ability to mediate in international disputes, e.g. the Abyssinian crisis. Arguments and evidence that challenge the statement that a failure to achieve disarmament in the years 1921-33 and/or that other reasons led to the increasing international tensions in the years 1934-39 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • There was notable success in moving towards disarmament, e.g. the 'losing' countries of the First World War remained demilitarised, US willingness to consider some demilitarisation, naval agreements • The extent of demilitarisation in Britain in the 1920s limited Britain's capacity to deal with rising tensions in the years 1934-39 effectively • The rise of aggressive nationalism, particularly in Japan, Italy and Germany • The impact of the world depression on international co-operation • Hitler's aim to challenge the terms of the Versailles Treaty (1919) • The failure of the League of Nations to deal effectively with international disagreements, e.g. Manchuria, Abyssinia • Foreign policy decisions made by Britain and France in the 1930s. 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 Allied invasion of Italy made the most significant contribution to the defeat of Nazi Germany in the years 1941-45. Arguments and evidence that the Allied invasion of Italy made the most significant contribution to the defeat of Nazi Germany in the years 1941-45 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The invasion of Italy opened up a British and American mainland front against the European Axis powers and so stretched German resources in the continuing fight on the eastern front against Russia • Hitler was forced to abandon previously-planned military action on the Eastern Front at short notice, e.g. a major offensive at Kursk was abandoned in light of the allied invasion of Sicily • The political consequences resulted in the dismissal of Mussolini and surrender of Italy, resulting in the loss of Hitler's main ally in Europe and the diversion of resources to prop up Mussolini's new state in the north • Large numbers of German troops had to be redeployed to Italy, and to a lesser extent to the Balkans, to prevent Allied success in opening up a southern gateway to an invasion of Germany • The invasion partially diverted German attention away from the D-Day invasion of France being planned by the Allies and gave them invaluable insights into the challenges of establishing a new mainland front. Arguments and evidence that counter the view that the Allied invasion of Italy made the most significant contribution to the defeat of Nazi Germany in the years 1941-45 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The invasion of Italy was met with fierce resistance from German forces and the difficulties of fighting on Italian terrain meant that the Germans could not be defeated just by the opening up of a southern front • The war on the Eastern Front with Russia was central to the German defeat; Russian resistance was steadfast throughout the period, draining Germany of men, resources and morale and ending in German retreat • The volume and intensity of Allied aerial bombing campaigns inflicted severe damage on the German military and economy and impacted civilian lives, all of which undermined Germany's ability to fight effectively • The D-Day campaign (June 1944), opened up the mainland front that was to be the gateway for the American and British defeat of Germany in western Europe within a year • German tactical errors and military mistakes, particularly as Hitler began to take more command decisions, undermined Germany's ability to fight the war effectively. 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