GradeMax



Mark scheme (Results)

June 2017

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level in History (WHI04)

Paper 4: International Study with Interpretations

Option 1A: The Making of Modern Europe, 1805-71

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 2017
Publication Code WHI04_1A_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
	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 judgment 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.

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 1A: The Making of Modern Europe, 1805-71

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 downfall of Napoleon in 1814 was due to the catastrophic failure of the Russian campaign in 1812. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: Extract 1 • The scale of the defeat in the Moscow Campaign and his hasty return to Paris undermined Napoleon's prestige as a military leader. • The campaign in Russia highlighted Napoleon's waning health and vitality and the consequent effect on his ability to lead. • Napoleon had begun to depend more on his marshals who themselves were not as competent as they had been in the past • The failure in Russia had jeopardised the Napoleonic Empire as a whole by encouraging other European powers to challenge Napoleonic power and by diverting French troops from the Peninsular War in Spain. Extract 2 • The defeat in the Peninsular War in Spain was more catastrophic than the failure in Russia. • Far from losing his leadership abilities and energy as a result of the Russian campaign, Napoleon was able to recover and revitalise. • Although the Russian campaign was a setback, he was able to recover quickly and continue to defend his Empire. • His decision to to leave his defeated army in Russia and return to France as quickly as possible was a positive move which allowed him to regroup. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the downfall of Napoleon in 1814 was due to the catastrophic failure of the Russian campaign in 1812. Relevant points may include: • The French army was devastated by the Russian campaign with estimated losses of over 500 000 men, including most of the Imperial Guard, and 200 000 horses • During the Russian campaign Napoleon's Prussian allies had begun to lose confidence in him and by February 1813 had signed an alliance with Russia • In 1813 Wellington took advantage of French weaknesses caused by the Russian campaign to secure a victory in the Peninsular War followed by an invasion of France itself

Question	Indicative content
	• The major European powers formed the Sixth Coalition in 1813 as a direct response to Napoleon's defeat in Russia culminating in Napoleon's defeat at the Battle of 'the Nations' in October • The army of over 300,000 men Napoleon put together in 1813 lacked experience, was short of horses and marshals such as Ney and Oudinot proved to be ineffective. Napoleon's command was affected by ill health. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the downfall of Napoleon in 1814 was due to the catastrophic failure of the Russian campaign in 1812. Relevant points may include: • On his return to Paris Napoleon began a propaganda campaign to bolster his support domestically (holding parties to celebrate the Russian campaign) and to recruit a new French army • Napoleon was able to raise an army of over 300 000 men in 1813 and to win a series of victories against the forces of the Sixth Coalition including the Battle of Dresden (May-June) • The Peninsular War which had begun well before the invasion of Russia in 1812 had drained French resources continuously while the victory of Wellington in 1813 resulted in the invasion of France from the south • Other factors, for example, the failure of the Continental system, the wider role of Britain including the impact of British subsidies to its allies, the impact of the reforms to the armies of Prussia and Austria.

Section B: Indicative content

Option 1A: The Making of Modern Europe, 1805-71

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 the suggestion that Metternich was the main obstacle to the growth of German and Italian nationalism in the years 1815-48. Arguments and evidence that Metternich was the main obstacle to the growth of German and Italian nationalism in the years 1815-48 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Metternich was an arch-conservative who was dismissive of nationalism, particularly in Italy ('a geographical expression'), and who worked actively as Austrian Chancellor to undermine nationalist influences • At the Congress of Vienna (1815) Metternich purposefully engineered the restoration of conservative rulers in Germany and Italy partly to counter the growth of nationalism during the Napoleonic era • The Metternich System was used by conservative rulers in Germany and Italy to act in concert against the growth of nationalism • Metternich was willing to use Austrian military force to put down revolutionary activity, such as the attempt to declare an independent Kingdom of Italy during the revolution in of Piedmont-Sardinia (1821) • Metternich undermined the growth of nationalism through his use of a surveillance network across Europe which allowed him to infiltrate and spy on the activities of nationalist groups. Arguments and evidence that Metternich was not the main obstacle to the growth of German and Italian nationalism in the years 1815-48 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Nationalist groups in both Germany and Italy were small and radical and had little support from the masses meaning that their impact was limited • Nationalism was often undermined by regionalism, localism and/or religious loyalties e.g. the antipathy between Naples and Sicily in the Italian south, the conservative influence of the Catholic Church • Nationalist groups did not have unified aims or objectives, creating internal weaknesses and a lack of co-operation e.g. the divisions in the Frankfurt Assembly (1848), the differing theories of Italian nationalism • The forces of conservatism were the main obstacle; despite Metternich's absence, in 1848 the ruling class undermined the Frankfurt Assembly in Germany and traditional rulers regained control in both Germany and Italy • Nationalism grew as a result of Metternich's reactionary stance e.g. the reinforcement of Austrian troops in Italy in 1847 increased support for Italian nationalism and encouraged talk of a war of independence. 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 suggestion that Garibaldi made a greater contribution to Italian unification in the years 1858-61 than Cavour. Arguments and evidence that Garibaldi made a greater contribution to Italian unification in the years 1858-61 than Cavour should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Garibaldi's support for, and willingness to fight in, along with his subsequent victories during, the war against Austria in 1859 legitimised nationalist support for Piedmont's policies in northern Italy • In apparent defiance of Cavour, Garibaldi launched a successful invasion of Sicily and Naples taking control of the south in the name of Victor Emmanuel II and gaining popular acclaim throughout Italy • Cavour was not openly supportive of the geographic unification of the Italian peninsula; he was only interested in the unification of the north under Piedmontese control and had a disparaging view of southern Italy • Cavour was forced to expand Piedmontese territory further south in 1860 not by choice but by Garibaldi's decision to march on Rome from the south • It was Garibaldi who initiated the creation of the Kingdom of Italy (1861) by his decision to hand over his southern conquests to Victor Emmanuel II at Teano (October 1860). Arguments and evidence that counter the suggestion that Garibaldi made a greater contribution to Italian unification in the years 1858-61 than Cavour should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Cavour used his political skills to bring about the unification of the majority of the Italian states e.g. the support he gained from Piedmontese expansionists, Mazzinian nationalists and Napoleon III • Cavour kick-started the process of unification; his negotiations at Plombières (1858) led to war with Austria, its subsequent withdrawal from Lombardy and the decline of Austrian influence over the peninsula • Cavour contributed to greater unity in northern Italy by organising the plebiscites which resulted in the Piedmontese annexation of Emilia and Tuscany (1860) • Cavour's decision to prevent Garibaldi's troops from reaching Rome (1860) saved Italy from military intervention by major Catholic powers to protect the Pope and directly led to the meeting at Teano • Cavour and Garibaldi contributions were equally significant; without Cavour's actions in the north and Garibaldi's in the south it is unlikely that the Kingdom of Italy would have been created in 1861. Other relevant material must be credited.