Mark scheme (Results)

January 2025

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced 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 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 2025
Question Paper P76216A
Publication Code: WHI04_1B_2501_MS
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

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 when level descriptions are used

1. 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 the guidance below and their professional judgement to decide which level is most appropriate.

For example, one stronger passage at L4 would not by itself merit a L4 mark, but it might be evidence to support a high L3 mark, unless there are substantial weaknesses in other areas. Similarly, an answer that fits best in L3 but which has some characteristics of L2 might be placed at the bottom of L3. An answer displaying some characteristics of L3 and some of L1 might be placed in L2.

2. Finding 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.

Levels containing two marks only

Start with the presumption that the work will be at the top of the level. Move down to the lower mark if the work only just meets the requirements of the level.

Levels containing three or more marks

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.

Indicative content

Examiners are reminded that indicative content is provided as an illustration to markers of some of the material that may be offered by students. It does not show required content and alternatives should be credited where valid.

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.
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.

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 the outbreak of general war between the Great Powers in 1914 was mainly as the result of the speeding up of the arms race across Europe in the years 1911-14. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: Extract 1 • From 1911, the arms race in Europe began to increase rapidly with governments funding developments in naval capacity, size of armies and infrastructure • Even relatively small increases in spending by one country could lead to a chain reaction of responses across the continent • Russia's decision to implement a strategic military programme in 1913 created panic in Germany, which resulted in the German generals' belief that German war-readiness should be deployed given the opportunity • There was a direct line between the German response to the assassination in Sarajevo in 1914 and the speeding up of the arms race in Europe from 1911. Extract 2 • The main rivalries in arms races across Europe – Germany and France, Germany and Britain – were not responsible for the war because they did not trigger the conflict • The war of 1914 was triggered by a conflict between two countries not actually engaged in an arms race between each other - Austria-Hungary and Russia • The real responsibility for the outbreak of war was not the build-up of military capacity but the military planning put in place for operational warfare • The German Schlieffen Plan was central to the outbreak of war, as once German mobilisation occurred the path to direct conflict was inevitable. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the outbreak of general war between the Great Powers in 1914 was mainly as the result of the speeding up of the arms race across Europe in the years 1911-14. Relevant points may include: • There was a significant increase in armaments – both in the quantity and quality (particularly new sorts of weaponry) across mainland Europe in 1912-14. Increases in Germany were swiftly responded to by France • The Russian development programme, formally announced in June 1914, intended that its standing army would increase by 45% in three years and that its weaponry, such as rapid-firing field guns, would outpace Germany

Question	Indicative content
	• Naval rivalry between Britain and Germany increased in 1911–12, with Britain building more advanced 'super Dreadnoughts' and the German Naval Law proposing to outnumber British ships in domestic waters • In the summer of 1914, the German High Command, faced with an increasingly credible threat from Russia, made it clear to the Kaiser that they were increasingly willing to take advantage of a new crisis in Europe • The 'blank cheque' offer to Austria by Germany in the summer crisis of 1914 was made in the context of a direct increase in French conscription and Russian future plans. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the outbreak of general war between the Great Powers in 1914 was mainly as the result of the speeding up of the arms race across Europe in the years 1911-14. Relevant points may include: • The general war in Europe grew out of the conflict between Austria-Hungary and Russia over Austria's treatment of Serbia in response to the assassination of the Austrian heir, Archduke Franz Ferdinand, in Sarajevo • By summer of 1914, the Anglo-German naval race had diminished greatly and there had been signs of rapprochement, including a prospective visit of British warships to Kiel • The Schlieffen Plan envisaged that, if Germany went to war with Russia, it was probable that the Franco-Russian alliance would be invoked. The Plan required a pre-emptive war against France to prevent war on two fronts • All the major Europeans had war plans, most of which envisaged rapid mobilisation whose effectiveness relied on a strict timetable of events. Any direct war between Great Power nations would be difficult to contain.

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 extent to which British and French foreign policy in relation to Germany changed in the years 1919-39. Arguments and evidence that British and French foreign policy in relation to Germany changed in the years 1919-39 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • From 1925, the French and British began to support policies that saw Germany included in, rather than excluded from, international diplomacy, e.g. Locarno, reparations plans, Kellogg-Briand • In 1926, the British and the French accepted the proposal that Germany should become a fully fledged member of the League of Nations • In 1935, Britain broke the miliary terms of the Versailles Treaty by signing the Anglo-German naval agreement. This also undermined the relatively united front with France against Germany that had previously existed • In 1938, Britain and France resorted to direct negotiation with Hitler in an attempt to avert German aggression in Czechoslovakia. Arguments and evidence that British and French foreign policy in relation to Germany did not change in the years 1919-39 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • In the early 1920s, both showed hostility towards Germany, e.g. War Guilt, although France more so than Britain, and throughout the period both pursued foreign policies based on suspicion of German intentions • The overriding aim of both the British and French throughout the period was to prevent future German aggression. All approaches, including punitive and conciliatory, were designed to achieve the same end • French foreign policy across the period was determined by the necessity to secure its own borders • Throughout the period, the French and British attempted to either build a relationship with Italy, e.g. Stresa Front, or to work with Italy e.g., Munich conferences 1938, to counter Germany • Ultimately, at the beginning of the period and at the end of the period, Britain and France saw Germany as a potential military threat. 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 whether the final collapse of Germany in the years 1944-45 was mainly due to the impact of the Allied bombing offensive (1942-45). Arguments and evidence that the final collapse of Germany in the years 1944-45 was mainly due to the impact of the Allied bombing offensive (1942-45) should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • By spring 1944, the relentless day and night bombing of Germany by the Americans and the British had a cumulative negative effect on the ability of the government and civilian population to respond to the war • The British 'area bombing' of German industrial centres, such as the Ruhr, required the massive diversion of resources away from front line operations, e.g. the rebuilding of infrastructure, the relocation of industry • The 'area bombing' of German cities was indiscriminate by its nature resulting in thousands of civilian deaths, massive civilian displacement and a major loss of housing stock, so lowering the morale of German civilians • The significant impact of the bombing campaigns on the effectiveness of the German air force enabled the successful invasion of Normandy in June 1944 and the subsequent push towards Germany. Arguments and evidence that the final collapse of Germany in the years 1944-45 was mainly due other factors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Allied bombing of industrial areas did not have a catastrophic impact on the German economy with industrial production continuing to rise well into 1944 • The impact of the bombing on German morale was not sufficient to lead to mass internal resistance to the Nazi regime and, in 1945, many ordinary Germans heeded the call to defend Germany from invasion at all costs • The invasion of Italy and the collapse of Mussolini's government in 1943 saw the loss of Germany's main ally in Europe and the unforeseen need to divert forces away from the war in the East • Soviet advances from the East had a massive physical and psychological impact on Germany's ability to fight the war • After the Normandy invasion in 1944, the opening up of a new major front in Europe meant that Germany was in effect surrounded and its capacity to fight the war was undermined • Military miscalculations, both in 1944-45 and earlier, led to German military defeats and the invasion of Germany, e.g. failure to carry out a Spring offensive in the East in 1942, the Ardennes Offensive • In 1944, Germany's government became increasingly chaotic, as Hitler's ability to make rational decisions was undermined by a growing sense of paranoia and unrealistic expectations of German capabilities. Other relevant material must be credited.

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