



Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2022

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

Paper 4: 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](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)

June 2022

Publication Code: WHI04\_1B\_2206\_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

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

Question	Indicative content
<b>1</b>	<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 a general European war broke out in August 1914 because Austria-Hungary and Germany were determined to go to war.</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>• The Austro-Hungarian government deliberately chose to view the assassination in Sarajevo as being part of a Serbian conspiracy</li><li>• The Austro-Hungarian government was determined to punish Serbia despite having been warned by the Russians that any attempt might lead to general European war</li><li>• The ultimatum presented to the Serbians was deliberately provocative and provided only a small amount of time in which to respond</li><li>• The German government were aware of what the Austro-Hungarians were doing and did nothing to deter Austria, as they believed that this was a good opportunity to prosecute a war that was already inevitable.</li></ul> <p>Extract 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• By the end of July 1914, the German Kaiser was beginning to question the desire to put the peace of Europe at risk; diplomatic attempts to stop a war were undertaken with the Tsar in Russia and the British</li><li>• Despite attempts to avert a general war, the mobilisation plans of the major powers drove the impetus towards war</li><li>• Once Russia's mobilisation decision was put into effect, the Russians were unwilling to put a halt to events</li><li>• Last minute attempts to limit the war to eastern Europe were thwarted because German military plans were not flexible enough to prevent the deployment of the bulk of the German Army in the west.</li></ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that a general European war broke out in August 1914 because Austria-Hungary and Germany were determined to go to war. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The assassinations in Sarajevo took place on 28 June, several weeks before the Ultimatum was sent. When it was sent the Austro-Hungarians knew that Serbia was not directly culpable but went ahead anyway</li><li>• The Austro-Hungarians were determined to prevent the spread of independence movements; its actions were influenced by the Bosnian Crisis (1908-9) and the Balkan Wars (1912-13)</li><li>• In 1914, the military were becoming more influential in both Austria-Hungary and Germany. There was a growing belief of the necessity to act before French and Russian conscription policies could have an impact</li></ul>



Question	Indicative content
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The German decision to support the Austro-Hungarians effectively provided them with a 'blank cheque' on which they could act. Without this support their bombardment of Belgrade would not have been possible.</li> </ul> <p>Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that a general European war broke out in August 1914 because Austria-Hungary and Germany were determined to go to war. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The major European powers had all formulated complex military plans, which were predicated on the potential that the Alliance and Entente powers would act in concert in the event of war</li> <li>• The German Schlieffen Plan required precise timing related to transportation scheduled and envisaged a pre-emptive strike on France before turning to the east to confront Russia</li> <li>• In 1914, the European power alliances seemed to be less set in stone than previously, e.g. easing of British-German naval tensions; there was no specific reason for Germany, particularly, to provoke a general war</li> <li>• It was the Russian decision to support Serbia unconditionally and the Russian decision to mobilise on 30 July that meant that there was no likelihood of turning back.</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 whether international diplomacy was successful in achieving and maintaining peace in the years 1919-33.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that international diplomacy was successful in achieving and maintaining peace in the years 1919-33 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Versailles Settlement brought international peace after four years of devastating war</li><li>• The League of Nations was created in order to maintain international peace and was relatively successful in dealing with disputes between member nations, e.g. Aaland Islands, and in its humanitarian work</li><li>• International military agreements, e.g. Washington Naval Conferences, and the Geneva Disarmament Conference showed that there was a willingness to consider arms reduction and limitation</li><li>• The US-sponsored Dawes Plan (1924) and Young Plan (1929) were successful in using diplomacy to overcome tensions created by the First World War reparations agreements</li><li>• The Locarno Pact (1925) saw international agreement in Europe as to the western borders of Germany in the wake of the First World War and a general agreement amongst European countries to respect the peace</li><li>• The Kellogg-Briand Pact (1928), initiated by France and the US, heralded a new commitment to peace and diplomatic resolution to international disputes a decade after the end of the First World War.</li></ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that international diplomacy was not successful in achieving and maintaining peace in the years 1919-33 should be analysed and evaluated.</p> <p>Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• The Versailles Settlement left much uncertainty as to the borders of eastern Europe and created resentment, particularly in Germany</li><li>• The League of Nations was unable effectively to resolve certain international disputes, e.g. Russo-Polish War, Memel, Corfu Incident</li><li>• The Greek-Turkish War (1920-22) resulted in the Treaty of Sèvres being overturned in favour of the Treaty of Lausanne (1923); this gave Turkey, a defeated First World War power, more favourable conditions</li><li>• Reparations led to potential conflict and created a flashpoint with the Franco-Belgian invasion, and occupation, of the Ruhr (1923)</li><li>• Potential areas of dispute remained despite agreements and treaties, e.g. Locarno did not solve the problem of Germany's eastern border, the Geneva Disarmament Conference dissolved into confusion</li><li>• By the end of 1933, there was less certainty that international diplomacy would be sufficient to combat the impact of the Depression and growing militarism, as evidenced by the Japanese invasion of Manchuria.</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 accuracy of the statement that the aggressive nationalism of Hitler's Germany was more significant than British and French policies in explaining the outbreak of war in Europe in 1939.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that the aggressive nationalism of Hitler's Germany was significant in explaining the outbreak of war in Europe in 1939 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hitler had long-term objectives to overthrow the Versailles territorial settlement and create <i>Lebensraum</i> by expanding German sovereignty; in 1939, Hitler felt confident enough to attempt to complete his ambitions</li> <li>• <i>Anschluss</i> with Austria and the occupation of the Sudetenland put Europe on a war footing; such aggressive actions against sovereign states meant that many came to believe that a European war was inevitable</li> <li>• In 1939, Hitler's military agreement with Italy, in the Pact of Steel, appeared to create a united fascist alliance in Europe with expansionist ambitions</li> <li>• In 1939, Germany's invasion of Czechoslovakia, in breach of the 1938 Munich Agreement, and the signing of the Nazi-Soviet Pact, pushed Europe towards war</li> <li>• The invasion of Poland by Germany in September forced the British and French to declare war.</li> </ul> <p>Arguments and evidence that that British and French policies were significant in explaining the outbreak of war in Europe in 1939 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• British and French failure to deter challenges to the Versailles Treaty and their neutrality in the Spanish Civil War helped to create the impression of weakness that gave Hitler confidence in his actions in 1939</li> <li>• British and French failure to stand up to German aggression in the mid-1930s helped to create a belief in Europe that war would be the inevitable outcome, as a result, preparations for war were well underway by 1939</li> <li>• British and French appeasement in the summer of 1938, leading to the compromise made over the Sudetenland at Munich, convinced Hitler that German expansion eastwards was unlikely to be challenged</li> <li>• British and French appeasement policies in 1938 provided Nazi Germany with the opportunity to continue its policies of preparing for a future war of conquest against Poland</li> <li>• British and French failure to honour their guarantee to Czechoslovakia (March 1939) meant that Hitler had no reason to believe that the invasion of Poland (September 1939) would lead to war.</li> </ul> <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Pearson Education Limited. Registered company number 872828  
with its registered office at 80 Strand, London, WC2R 0RL, United Kingdom