GradeMax



Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2019

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level In History (WHI04) Paper 1B

Paper 4: International Study with Historical Interpretations

Option 1B: The World in Crisis, 1789–1945

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 2019
Publications Code: WHI04_1B_1901_MS
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

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.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
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.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
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 Anglo-German rivalry was a major underlying cause of the tensions 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 • German economic success led to a desire for overseas expansion, which threatened British imperial power • The rise of German naval power led to a naval arms race that further encouraged popular nationalism • Although Germany was the more aggressive power in the 20 years before the war, the British were willing to stand up for themselves if threatened • Britain abandoned its isolationism to strengthen ties with France and Russia in the early 1900s, which led to further tension with Germany. Extract 2 • Despite there being clear economic rivalry between Britain and Germany, there is clear evidence that both sides were too dependent on each other commercially to countenance war • The Moroccan crises may have demonstrated Anglo-German colonial rivalry but in 1914 there is little evidence to suggest that colonial issues were a significant factor in causing international tension • After 1912, the dominance of the British navy meant that Anglo-German naval rivalry was no longer an area of ongoing tension • Anglo-German naval rivalry may have contributed to strong popular hostility to Germany in 1914 but was not a significant cause of tension. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that Anglo-German rivalry was a major underlying cause of the tensions in Europe in 1914. Relevant points may include: • German imperial policy resulted in fractious relations with Britain, which potentially undermined European peace, e.g. the Kruger Telegram, the second Moroccan crisis (1911) • Anglo-German naval rivalry was indicative of an increase in militarism across Europe where conscription, increased army sizes and military plans had resulted in a 'war-like' atmosphere

Question	Indicative content
	• The creation of the Triple Entente (Britain, France, Russia) appeared to the Germans to be a direct challenge to the Triple Alliance (Germany, Austria-Hungary, Italy); Germany feared encirclement • Britain's willingness to abandon compromise in the face of threat was evidenced ultimately by its decision to declare war in August 1914 in response to the German invasion of Belgium as part of the Schlieffen Plan. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that Anglo-German rivalry was a major underlying cause of the tensions in Europe in 1914. Relevant points may include: • British and German companies were involved in each other's arms manufacture before the war, e.g. British firms licensed German companies to make machine guns, and invested in each other's industries • There was Anglo-German co-operation to settle the two Balkan Wars in 1912 and 1913 • By 1912, the British had maintained the two-power naval standard and relations began to improve, e.g. British navy ships visited Kiel in June 1914 with a reciprocal visit only abandoned due to the war itself • Other European rivalries were more significant, e.g. long-term Franco-German rivalry, Austro-Russian rivalry in the Balkans was particularly significant in 1914 • Other underlying factors were more significant, e.g. the creation of the alliance system, military planning, nationalism in the Balkans.

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, in the years 1920–33, the League of Nations was both a respected and successful organisation. Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1920–33, the League of Nations was a respected and/or successful organisation should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Over time, the majority of independent nations joined the League of Nations, including Germany; smaller and newly-independent nations, in particular, appeared to have faith in its objectives • In the years 1926–33, the British, French and German foreign ministers regularly used the Council as a forum in which to discuss international problems • Associated organisations and committees were both respected and successful, e.g. the ILO and the Health Organisation, the attendance of both the USA and USSR at the world economic conferences (1927/1933) • The League carried out successful mediation in international disputes, e.g. Aaland Islands, Upper Silesia, Memel, Greco-Bulgarian conflict • The League showed it was capable of mediating in complex international disputes, e.g. the agreement over Mosul involved Britain, Turkey and Kurdish minorities. Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1920–33, the League of Nations was unsuccessful and/or not respected as an organisation should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • In its early years the reputation of the League of Nations suffered from its direct link to the Versailles Settlement, e.g. the exclusion of Germany, the resentment of the 'losing powers', responsibility for mandates • The ability of the League of Nations to solve international disputes, and the respect in which it was held, was severely undermined particularly by the absence of the US, USSR and Germany (until 1926) • Major League powers often treated it with contempt, e.g. Italy over Corfu, France over the Ruhr, Japan over Manchuria or negotiated outside of League machinery, e.g. the use of the Conference of Ambassadors • Major financial and economic disputes resulting from the Versailles Settlement were dealt with outside the League, e.g. the Dawes and Young Plans, due to the absence of the US and its own Charter regulations • International peace initiatives were often undertaken outside the League (Kellogg-Briand Pact) while League attempts at disarmament were slow and unsuccessful, e.g. collapse of the World Disarmament Conference. 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 the significance, in the years 1939–45, of the role of the USA in the course of the war in Europe. Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1939–45, of the role of the USA in the course of the war in Europe was significant should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Lend-Lease Agreements (March 1941) were particularly valuable in keeping Britain in the war and in Britain being able to send supplies to Russia over the winter of 1941–42 • The signing of the Atlantic Charter (August 1941) gave symbolic and psychological support to the British in continuing to prosecute the war • After the US entry into the war in December 1941, the Allies determined to prosecute the war in Europe as a priority • From 1941–44 US involvement in the Allied bombing raids on Germany, in supplying Russia with domestic and military goods and in the invasion of Italy advanced the Allied attack on Nazi-occupied territories in Europe • The US led the Allied D-Day invasion of Europe and the subsequent invasion of Germany from the west. Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1939–45, the role of the USA in the course of the war in Europe was not significant/of limited significance should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The decision of the US to remain neutral in 1939 meant that it had limited impact on the course of the war from the invasion of Poland until the attack on Pearl Harbour • The Atlantic Charter could only be implemented if Germany was defeated in Europe and in August 1941 the US was still a non-belligerent state • The impact of Lend-Lease was limited; Britain had had to survive for nearly a year after the fall of France before agreements were signed and the Soviets disputed the impact of US supplies after 1941 • The final defeat of Germany in 1944–45 came as the result of a combined effort on behalf of the US, Britain and the Soviet Union attacking on three fronts • The role of other countries in the war was more significant, e.g. the resilience of the British, the failures and miscalculations of the Germans, the determination of the Soviets on the Eastern Front. Other relevant material must be credited.