



Pearson

# **Mark scheme**

January 2020

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

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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

January 2020

Publication Code: WHI04\_1B\_2001\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2020

## 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.

## 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: A01 (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.

**A03 (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
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material.
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates only limited comprehension of the extracts, selecting some material relevant to the debate.</li><li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included and presented as information, rather than being linked with the extracts.</li><li>• Judgement on the view is assertive, with little supporting evidence.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates some understanding and attempts analysis of the extracts by describing some points within them that are relevant to the debate.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• A judgement on the view is given with limited support, but the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding and some analysis of the extracts by selecting and explaining some key points of interpretation they contain and indicating differences.</li><li>• Knowledge of some issues related to the debate is included to link to, or expand, some views given in the extracts.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Demonstrates understanding of the extracts, analysing the issues of interpretation raised within them and by a comparison of them.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>

<b>5</b>	<b>21-25</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Interprets the extracts with confidence and discrimination, analysing the issues raised and demonstrating understanding of the basis of arguments offered by both authors.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>
----------	--------------	---

## 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
	<b>0</b>	No rewardable material
<b>1</b>	<b>1–4</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Simple or generalised statements are made about the topic.</li><li>• Some accurate and relevant knowledge is included, but it lacks range and depth and does not directly address the question.</li><li>• The overall judgement is missing or asserted.</li><li>• There is little, if any, evidence of attempts to structure the answer, and the answer overall lacks coherence and precision.</li></ul>
<b>2</b>	<b>5–8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• An overall judgement is given but with limited support and the criteria for judgement are left implicit.</li><li>• The answer shows some attempts at organisation, but most of the answer is lacking in coherence, clarity and precision.</li></ul>
<b>3</b>	<b>9–14</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• Attempts are made to establish criteria for judgement and to relate the overall judgement to them, although with weak substantiation.</li><li>• The answer shows some organisation. The general trend of the argument is clear, but parts of it lack logic, coherence or precision.</li></ul>
<b>4</b>	<b>15–20</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Key issues relevant to the question are explored by an analysis of the relationships between key features of the period.</li><li>• Sufficient knowledge is deployed to demonstrate understanding of the demands and conceptual focus of the question and to meet most of its demands.</li><li>• 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.</li><li>• 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.</li></ul>

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

## Section A: Indicative content

### Option 1A: The Making of Modern Europe, 1805–71

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 in 1914, before the events in June, the likelihood of a major confrontation between the European Great Power alliances was small.</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"><li>• Major confrontation between the two main alliances appeared unlikely as relationships between allies, particularly the British and Russian entente, came under strain or were questioned</li><li>• There were signs of détente between Britain and Germany and between Austria and Serbia</li><li>• All the major European powers were concerned about the consequences that an attack on a rival power might bring</li><li>• Discussions might have taken place about pre-emptive actions against rivals, particularly amongst the Alliance powers, but there was no agreed plan to carry out such actions.</li></ul> <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In 1914, Germany was fearful of encirclement by the Entente powers and was wary of the actions of its rivals</li><li>• In 1914, Russia was expanding its military capacity, exhibiting expansionist intentions and attempting to strengthen its relationship with Britain</li><li>• The German and Austrian military leadership were contemplating a pre-emptive strike against Russia and France in response to their rearmament programmes</li><li>• The military leadership in Germany and Austria appeared to have gained supremacy over civil government leaders in relation to foreign policy planning.</li></ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that in 1914, before the events in June, the likelihood of a major confrontation between the European Great Power alliances was small. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• In 1914, the Entente was under threat, e.g. the Anglo-Russian 'great game' rivalry in the Near East and Central Asia; domestic pressures in Britain and France</li><li>• Anglo-German naval rivalry appeared to be on the wane, e.g. German cuts in the naval budget, the visit of the British navy to Kiel in 1914</li><li>• After the Moroccan crisis (1911), Germany had moved away from a policy of <i>Weltpolitik</i>, which had lessened the possibility of tensions with France and Britain</li><li>• The alliance system created by the Great Powers of Europe, in the years 1879–1914, was defensive in nature and designed to prevent war between the powers, by providing security, rather than provoking war.</li></ul>



Question	Indicative content
	<p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that in 1914, before the events in June, the likelihood of a major confrontation between the European Great Power alliances was small. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li data-bbox="347 320 1385 409">• Germany's relations with the other Great European powers were determined by its strategical position in central Europe; it was vulnerable to attack from east and west and had a substantial coastline to defend</li><li data-bbox="347 416 1406 506">• In 1914, the Russian government was attempting to deflect domestic discontent by harnessing popular support through militarist and nationalist policies</li><li data-bbox="347 512 1398 602">• The German Schlieffen Plan had envisaged that a war with Russia would require action against France since 1906; the Austro-German military discussions in May 1914 were a serious contemplation of pre-emptive war</li><li data-bbox="347 609 1406 698">• In 1914, Moltke increasingly had the ear of the Kaiser and, Conrad, after a period in the wilderness, due to perceived poor performance over the Balkans, was regaining policy influence; both favoured aggressive policies.</li></ul>

## Section B: Indicative content

### Option 1A: The Making of Modern Europe, 1805–71

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 the rise in international aggression in the 1930s was mainly due to the weakness of the League of Nations.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the weakness of the League of Nations was responsible for the rise in international aggression in the 1930s should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The absence of major nations from the League, particularly the USA, weakened the ability of the League to implement its aim of collective security</li><li>• The perceived weakness of the League in dealing with international incidents may have encouraged nations to pursue more aggressive foreign policies</li><li>• The League's response to the Manchurian Crisis (1931–33) failed to discourage Japanese expansionist aspirations</li><li>• The abject failure of the League organised World Disarmament Conference (1932–34) encouraged countries to pursue aggressive foreign policies, e.g. Germany began to challenge the Versailles territorial settlement</li><li>• The League's response to the Abyssinian Crisis (1935–36) encouraged Mussolini to pursue his expansionist policy and to ally Italy to other countries with aggressive foreign policies, i.e. Germany and Japan.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the weakness of the League of Nations was not responsible for the rise in international aggression in the 1930s should be analysed and evaluated.</p> <p>Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The presence of the USA at the World Disarmament Conference did not prevent its failure</li><li>• Disillusion with the Versailles Settlement (1919–23) encouraged some nations to challenge the international order</li><li>• The world economic crisis of the early 1930s encouraged nationalist and expansionist foreign policies, particularly in Germany, Italy and Japan</li><li>• Ideological developments were responsible, e.g. the growth of nationalism, the bitter ideological rivalry between fascism and communism, perceived failure of post-First World War liberal democracy</li><li>• From mid-1930s the appeasement policies of Britain and France encouraged Italian and German expansionism.</li></ul> <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 how significant the impact of bombing was in bringing about the defeat of Germany and Japan in the years 1942–45.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the impact of bombing was significant in bringing about the defeat of Germany and Japan in the years 1942–45 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The bombing offensive against Germany by the British and Americans from 1942 created massive dislocation in civilian and industrial areas, which negatively affected Germany's ability to fight the war</li> <li>• The need to counter the Allied bombing campaigns in Europe diverted German resources from the ground war, particularly on the Eastern Front</li> <li>• Allied bombing campaigns massively reduced the effectiveness of the German air force, which made possible the successful invasion of Normandy in June 1944</li> <li>• Conventional bombing of Japan by the US destroyed many of the major cities and industrial centres, which undermined the Japanese ability to fight and may have convinced the Emperor to start ceasefire negotiations</li> <li>• The US decision to use atomic weapons against Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945 was responsible for the unconditional surrender of the Japanese and bringing the world war to an end.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the impact of bombing in bringing about the defeat of Germany and Japan in the years 1942–45 was not significant/had limited significance should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The bombing offensive against Germany was part of a wider air, sea and land assault, which combined together to achieve victory</li> <li>• Civilian morale initially was not significantly affected by conventional bombing, and indeed appears to have led to greater resolve, in both Germany and Japan, until the final months of the war</li> <li>• It was the slow wearing-down of Japan by the US in the war in the Pacific, at sea and on the Pacific islands, that underpinned the defeat of Japan; bombing would not have been possible without the territorial victories</li> <li>• It was only in 1944–45 that the US had the technical and strategic means to carry out both the conventional bombing (B-29 bombers and bases on the Chinese mainland) and nuclear bombing (atomic bomb) of Japan</li> <li>• Other factors were more significant, e.g. the opening up of two major fronts by the Allies, the mistakes of the German military leadership, Hitler's decisions, the overwhelming Allied economic superiority.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>