



Mark Scheme

International Advanced
Level in History (WHI04/1B)

Paper 4: International Study
With Interpretations

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

Edexcel, BTEC and LCCI qualifications

Edexcel, BTEC and LCCI qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body offering academic and vocational qualifications that are globally recognised and benchmarked. For further information, please visit our qualification websites at www.edexcel.com, www.btec.co.uk or www.lcci.org.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus

About Pearson

Pearson is the world's leading learning company, with 40,000 employees in more than 70 countries working to help people of all ages to make measurable progress in their lives through learning. We put the learner at the centre of everything we do, because wherever learning flourishes, so do people. Find out more about how we can help you and your learners at: www.pearson.com/uk

June 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 war broke out in Europe in August 1914 because of key decisions made during the June-July crisis.</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"> • It was the specific decisions made by key individuals in the response to the assassinations in Sarajevo that led to war breaking out. • Tensions existed between the major European powers but these were not inevitably going to lead to war. • The alliance system had existed since the 1890s and had not yet led to war; all significant disputes had been dealt with through diplomacy. • Decisions made in the summer of 1914 led to mistakes, failures and miscalculations all of which contributed to the outbreak of war. <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Britain and Germany had been engaged in a naval arms race in which each side attempted to outdo the other for over a decade. • Public opinion in Germany, Britain and France had been stirred up by the naval competition taking place. • Between 1912 and 1914 military preparations across Europe had begun to escalate. • The major European states did not seem to be in the mood for diplomacy in 1914. <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that war broke out in Europe in August 1914 because of key decisions made during the June-July crisis. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specific decisions made post-Sarajevo created a chain reaction, e.g. Austria's ultimatum to Serbia, the German 'blank cheque', Russia's mobilisation, the German invasion of Belgium and Britain's reaction • The key decision in Russia to mobilise in defence of Serbia meant that a diplomatic solution became unlikely • The German decision to implement the Schlieffen Plan assumed that war would be over before Britain had the opportunity to intervene • The naval race was on the wane in 1914; the German fleet was due to

Question	Indicative content
	<p>visit Britain on a goodwill mission in August 1914</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The 1st and 2nd Balkan Wars had been settled without recourse to general war when Britain and Germany worked together to restrain Russia and Austria • Disputes over Morocco (1905-6), Bosnia Herzegovina (1908-9) and Agadir (1911) had all been resolved diplomatically. <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that war broke out in Europe in August 1914 because of key decisions made during the June-July crisis. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Although created as defensive diplomatic alliances, the Dual Alliance and the Triple Alliance had mobilisation agreements and could be viewed as armed alliances • The British viewed the German naval escalation as a threat to its maritime power, e.g. a German presence in the North Sea, gunboat diplomacy as a feature of the Agadir Crisis (1911) • The German Schlieffen Plan was based on the threat posed by the Dual Alliance and envisaged a pre-emptive strike on France before engaging with Russia; the events of 1914 in Sarajevo set this in motion • The increase in army numbers, and the extension of conscription, by many of the major continental European powers was indicative of an atmosphere of 'war-readiness' that emerged after 1911.

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 whether Mussolini achieved his foreign policy aim of making Italy a great international power in the years 1933-39.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that Mussolini achieved his foreign policy aim of making Italy a great international power in the years 1933-39 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mussolini was lauded for Italy's role in deterring a possible German attempt at Anschluss (1934) and so preventing a possible war in Europe • In 1935, Italy joined in the Stresa Front with Britain and France in an attempt to maintain the peace settlements of the 1920s in the face increased challenge • Mussolini increased defence spending (12% of national income) and built up the Italian armed forces • Mussolini added to the Italian Empire with the invasion and conquest of Abyssinia (1935-36) and invasion of Albania (1939) • Post-1935 Mussolini looked to support, e.g. Spanish Civil War (1936-39), and to create alliances, e.g. Anti-Comintern Pact (1937), Pact of Steel (1939), with other right-wing powers • Mussolini's role as mediator in the Sudetenland crisis (summer 1938) overseeing the Munich Agreement brought international prestige to Italy. <p>Arguments and evidence that Mussolini did not achieve his foreign policy aim of making Italy a great international power in the years 1933-39 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Italian invasion of Abyssinia damaged Italy's reputation internationally, e.g. the use of gas, contempt for League of Nations and brought the Stresa Front to an end • Mussolini's desire for Italy to be seen as an 'equal' partner in its relations with Germany after 1936 was undermined by Hitler's disdainful attitude, e.g. the invasion of Poland ignored agreements in the Pact of Steel • The 80,000 Italian troops sent to fight in the Spanish Civil War were poorly equipped and suffered humiliating defeats on the Nationalist side • Mussolini's arrogant attitude and apparent partiality towards Germany undermined the trust placed in Italy by Britain and France during the Sudetenland negotiations in 1938 • At the outbreak of the Second World War Italy was not sufficiently prepared to fight a major war, being both militarily and economically weak, and declared itself a non-belligerent power as a result. <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 significance of the war in the Mediterranean, in the years 1941-45, to the Allied victory in the Second World War.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the war in the Mediterranean, in the years 1941-45, was significant to the Allied victory in the Second World War should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 1941, Italian difficulties in North Africa and, particularly, Greece, diverted Germany attention from Russian invasion and may have delayed Operation Barbarossa significantly enough to prevent overall success • Allied successes beginning at El Alamein (October 1942) and culminating in the German surrender in Tunisia (May 1943) were a massive setback to the German war effort • The invasion of Italy exposed the 'soft underbelly' of Germany in Europe; it was the first stage of the Axis collapse in the European theatre of war overseen by Britain and America • The surrender of Italy saw the defeat of a major Axis power, the addition of a new ally and provided air bases for the bombing of German occupied territory in Central Europe and the Balkans • From 1942-45 action in the Mediterranean diverted German resources from the war on Britain and Russia and successes strengthened the morale and determination of the Allies. <p>Arguments and evidence that the war in the Mediterranean, in the years 1941-45, was not significant/of limited significance to the Allied victory in the Second World War should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were other more important turning points in 1942 than El Alamein, e.g. the Battle of Midway in the Pacific War and the defence of Stalingrad on the Eastern Front • The length and scale of the war in Italy, after the invasion of the mainland 1943, prevented the envisaged swift conquest of German controlled territory from the South • In 1944, the D-Day landings and the invasion of France brought about the opening up of the Western Front and the subsequent Allied invasion of Germany from the west • The Russian campaigns on the Eastern Front (1943-45) led to subsequent Allied invasion of Germany from the East • The war in the Pacific resulted in the Allied defeat of Japan (1942-45) and the American use of the atomic bomb against Japan (August 1945) ultimately brought the war to an end. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>