



# **Mark scheme (Results)**

June 2017

Pearson Edexcel International  
Advanced Level in History (WHI04)

Paper 4: International Study with  
Historical 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](http://www.edexcel.com), [www.btec.co.uk](http://www.btec.co.uk) or [www.lcci.org.uk](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk)

June 2017

Publication Code WHI04\_1B\_1706\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

## 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

**Target: 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
	<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 judgment 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>

5	21–25	<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>

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	21–25	<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 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 war in Europe in 1914 was a result of the alliance system developed by the great powers.</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>• Until 1914 the alliance system had systematically worked to maintain the peace but in 1914 it led to war.</li><li>• In 1914 the crisis over Serbia threatened the balance of power between the two alliances so much that it created irreconcilable differences.</li><li>• Once set in motion, the workings of the alliance system meant that a local war turned into a general war.</li><li>• By 1914 the alliances were so closely linked to military planning that the use of diplomacy was limited.</li></ul> <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The alliance system was not inflexible and it did not inevitably lead to war.</li><li>• All wars are preventable until the fighting starts.</li><li>• The alliance system in 1914 was in a fragile state.</li><li>• Italy was undermining the Triple Alliance and the relationship between the Entente powers was under threat.</li><li>• Relations between France, Great Britain, Russia and Germany were in flux.</li></ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the outbreak of war in Europe in 1914 was a result of the alliance system developed by the great powers. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Between 1879 and 1914 the great European powers developed an alliance system – the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente – which appeared to maintain a balance of power in Europe</li><li>• The assassination of the Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo ( June 1914) led to the Serbian crisis and Entente fears that Alliance powers were threatening peace in the Balkans</li><li>• German support for Austria's stance towards Serbia set in motion a chain reaction which brought Russia, France and Great Britain into the diplomatic and military fray</li><li>• An arms race had developed and military planning was based around the diplomatic agreements of the alliances; in 1914 both alliances were better prepared for war than at any other point.</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 the outbreak of war in Europe in 1914 was a result of the alliance system developed by the great powers. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Previous local crises, including several in the Balkan region, had proven the flexibility of the alliance system and had not resulted in war</li><li>• The agreements made between the great powers within the alliance system did not automatically mean that all would be drawn into a general war; Italy as an Alliance power chose to remain neutral in 1914.</li><li>• The rigidity of military planning eventually drew Great Britain into the European war; Britain invoked a Belgian neutrality treaty (1839) in response to the German invasion of Belgium as part of the Schlieffen Plan</li><li>• Other reasons such as, German aggression, economic rivalry, imperial rivalry, the general European situation in 1914.</li></ul>

## 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 suggestion that that the peace treaties of the Versailles Settlement (1919-23) produced a period of peaceful international relations in the years 1923-1933.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the peace treaties of the Versailles Settlement (1919-23) produced a period of peaceful international relations in the years 1923-33 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• There were no major conflicts between the world powers in the years 1923-33</li><li>• All of the treaties included the covenant to establish the League of Nations as an international peace-keeping organisation</li><li>• The League of Nations was able to deal effectively with minor international tensions e.g. the dispute between Greece and Bulgaria</li><li>• Relative stability was ensured by the harsh terms of the treaties enforced on the losing nations; Germany, in particular, was in no position to challenge the new international order</li><li>• The meetings at the Versailles Conference encouraged the use of diplomacy to ensure peaceful international relations throughout the 1920s e.g. the Kellogg-Briand Pact (1928)</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the peace treaties of the Versailles Settlement (1919-23) did not produce a period of peaceful international relations in the years 1923-33 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Neither the peace treaties nor the League of Nations were ratified by the United States Congress, so creating international uncertainty with regard to ambitions of the most powerful nation in the world</li><li>• The reparation payments enforced on the losing powers by the peace treaties created international instability e.g. the Ruhr Crisis (1923-25)</li><li>• Many of the territorial agreements made in the treaties resulted in tension and conflict across Europe, such as between Greece and Turkey, on the western and eastern borders of Germany, over the Polish Corridor</li><li>• Human consequences of the peace treaties, such as the hardship caused by the reparations payment in Germany and the refugee crisis created by displaced nationalities, presented a threat to European stability</li><li>• Long-term resentment towards elements of the peace treaties, from both losers and winners, contributed to the growth of aggressive nationalist foreign policies in the late 1920s and early 1930s and a growing threat to international peace.</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 the suggestion that the British and American contribution was more significant than the Russian contribution to the defeat of Germany in the Second World War.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the British and American contribution was more significant than the Russian contribution to the defeat of Germany in the Second World War should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The British, with the aid of Empire troops, were able to maintain an opposition to Germany continuously throughout the war from 1939-45</li> <li>• The sea and air warfare waged by the British and the Americans, including the bombing of Germany from 1943, was more costly economically to the Germans than the land war on the Eastern front</li> <li>• The scale of American economic wealth, industrial production and military might could not be matched by the Germans</li> <li>• The Russians relied on American aid, both economic and military, in order to be able continue their war effort in the East</li> <li>• The combined British and American forces were able to produce a two-front attack on the Germany from the south and from Normandy in the latter stages of the war.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that the British and American contribution was not more significant than the Russian contribution to the defeat of Germany in the Second World War should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Russian counter-offensive against Operation Barbarossa after 1941 was instrumental in turning the tide against Germany; in particular, the scale of the loss of German soldiers in land fighting</li> <li>• The determination of the Russian people to continue to fight, despite apparently overwhelming odds, and the scale of the manpower available to Russian commanders were important factors in the defeat of Germany</li> <li>• The Eastern front was vital in ensuring the success of the Allies after D-Day; German resistance in western Europe might have been successful without the need to fight Russian advances as well</li> <li>• It was the Russian advance on, and capture of Berlin (April 1945), which led to the German surrender and ultimate defeat</li> <li>• The British and American contribution and the Russian contribution were equally significant; it required the combined effort of all three nations to finally defeat Germany in 1945.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>