



Pearson

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2018

Pearson International Advanced Level
In History

WHI04: 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 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 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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. |

| Level | Mark | Descriptor |
|-------|-------|---|
| 4 | 15–20 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 | <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 World in Crisis, 1879–1945

| Question | Indicative content |
|----------|---|
| 1 | <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Candidates should use their understanding of issues of interpretation to reach a reasoned conclusion concerning the view that the outbreak of a general European war in August was unexpected.</p> <p>In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <p>Extract 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Europeans, and European governments, went about their lives in the summer of 1914 with little expectation of war.• There was an assumption that the Austrians would be able deal with the situation caused by the assassinations in Sarajevo without resorting to unnecessary force.• By mid-July newspapers were no longer covering the aftermath of the assassination and did not cover the crisis in the Balkans until very late.• It was believed that the situation in the Balkans would end without recourse to war, like every other crisis since 1905. <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The series of international crises that occurred after 1905, created a pattern of 'brinkmanship', which meant that 'Europe drifted uncontrollably' towards war.• From 1905, revolutions experienced by some international powers had made international tensions worse and confrontation more likely.• The Agadir crisis illustrated that any future disagreement could potentially lead to war between major powers.• The nature of the alliance system meant that, by 1914, a single incident in Europe, however unlikely it initially appeared, could lead to a major confrontation. <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the outbreak of a general European war in August 1914 was unexpected. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The international crises after 1905 had been resolved by an unwillingness to upset the balance of power created by the alliance system developed in the years after 1879• The First (1912) and Second (1913) Balkan Wars had not led to a general European war, and there was a general belief that diplomacy would solve |

| Question | Indicative content |
|----------|---|
| | <p data-bbox="395 188 730 219">the Balkan crisis of 1914</p> <ul data-bbox="347 241 1401 474" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="347 241 1401 353">• Although acknowledged as shocking, the assassinations in Sarajevo had received only minor coverage in much of the European press and in some cases did not make it onto the main news pages <li data-bbox="347 376 1401 474">• In 1914, the Anglo-German relationship had been showing signs of less suspicion; a Royal Naval fleet made an official visit to Germany during the week of the Sarajevo assassination. <p data-bbox="300 497 1375 600">Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the outbreak of a general European war in August 1914 was unexpected. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul data-bbox="347 622 1407 1025" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="347 622 1407 721">• The readiness of the major powers to threaten war, during the crises of 1905-11, created a general atmosphere of expectation in Europe that war was likely at some time in the near future <li data-bbox="347 743 1407 801">• By 1905, the major European powers were organised into defensive alliances centred on France and Germany, and were also militarising <li data-bbox="347 824 1407 913">• The Agadir Crisis occurred as a result of a dispute not directly related to events in Europe; it came about as a result of the German reaction to France's intention to declare Morocco a French protectorate <li data-bbox="347 936 1407 1025">• The German decision to support Austria in the Balkan crisis resulting from the Sarajevo assassination, led to the outbreak of general war; both the alliance system and the Schlieffen Plan were brought into play. |

Section B: Indicative Content

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

| Question | Indicative content |
|----------|---|
| 2 | <p>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.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that international attempts to achieve disarmament, in the years 1921–33, were a complete failure.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that international attempts to achieve disarmament, in the years 1921–33, were a complete failure should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Germany was the only major country to undergo significant disarmament as the result of international actions, and this was enforced through the Versailles Settlement rather than negotiated• The Treaty of Rapallo (1922) between Russia and Germany began to undermine the disarmament clauses of the Versailles Settlement• The international rejection of war, as articulated in the Kellogg-Briand Pact (1928), was only a general declaration of intent• It was not until 1930 that the Preparatory Commission on World Disarmament produced a final draft for an international convention and not until 1932 that it met• The World Disarmament Conference collapsed completely in 1933, as nationalism in the Far East and Europe threatened international security and Hitler withdrew Germany from the talks. <p>Arguments and evidence that international attempts to achieve disarmament, in the years 1921–33, were not a complete failure should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• War-weariness after 1918, and a 'never again' mentality, meant that the international climate was broadly in favour of disarmament throughout the period• A major element of the peacekeeping principle of the League of Nations was a commitment to disarmament; a Commission worked to organise a World Disarmament convention• The Washington Naval Convention (1922) saw five major naval powers agree to limit naval expansion for the next 14 years• The five-power Naval Convention (1930) extended the agreement of 1922 to a wider spectrum of naval vessels• By 1933, at least 65 countries had signed the Kellogg-Briand Pact (1928) rejecting the use of war as an instrument of international diplomacy. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p> |

| Question | Indicative content |
|----------|---|
| 3 | <p>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.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that most significant influence on Hitler's foreign policy in the years 1933–39 was a desire to overturn the Versailles Treaty.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the most significant influence on Hitler's foreign policy in the years 1933–39 was a desire to overturn the Versailles Treaty should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The promise to overthrow the terms of the Versailles Treaty was a foundation stone of Hitler's political support and popularity • Hitler's initial foreign policy actions in 1933 were designed to undermine the international alliances that had maintained Versailles, e.g. Four-Power Pact, withdrawal from the World Disarmament Conference • From 1933-35, Hitler followed a policy of rearmament in direct contravention of Versailles and, in 1936, German troops remilitarised the Rhineland • Anschluss with Austria, which had been forbidden by Versailles, was a key policy; an attempted Nazi coup took place in 1934 and a successful occupation in 1938 • By the invasion of Poland in 1939, all of the major elements of the Versailles Treaty had been overturned. <p>Arguments and evidence that in the years 1933–39, other influences on Hitler's foreign policy were significant/the significance of the desire to overturn the Versailles Treaty was limited should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Domestic priorities, such as consolidating Nazi power and dealing with the economic impact of the Depression, encouraged militarism and expansion • Hitler's belief in <i>Lebensraum</i> looked to extend German territory in Eastern Europe • Ideological influences, including anti-Slavic racial policy and anti-communism • Traditional German nationalist interest to curb the influence of France and Russia in Europe • The desire to make Germany the dominant world power • Hitler's <i>Mein Kampf</i> suggests that the overturning of the Versailles Treaty was a precondition of other more significant aims, e.g. <i>Lebensraum</i>. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p> |