GradeMax

Pearson

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2018

Pearson International Advanced Level
In History

WHI04: International Study with Interpretations
Option 1A: The Making of Modern Europe, 1805-71

edexcel

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 2018
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

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

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 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, in the campaigns of 1813-14, the contribution of Russia was the main factor in the success of the coalition against Napoleon. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: Extract 1 • Tsar Alexander's leadership and commitment to the defeat of Napoleon were critical to the success of the Alliance. • Tsar Alexander viewed the campaign as a crusade; he was determined to pursue Napoleon westwards across Europe in order to inflict total defeat. • The Russian contribution was strengthened by the support of Prussian mobilisation. • The British financial contribution was helpful but not as important as that of Russia. Extract 2 • Russia was just one of a number of powers, including Prussia, Austria and Britain, that joined together to undermine the Napoleonic Empire. • Rulers and states that had once supported Napoleon began to desert him. • The British contributed financially, militarily and diplomatically to the success of the Coalition. • Napoleon's refusal to accept offers of peace on several occasions strengthened the determination of the alliance to win outright. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that, in the campaigns of 1813-14, the contribution of Russia was the main factor in the success of the Coalition against Napoleon. Relevant points may include: • Tsar Alexander's relationship with Napoleon had begun to break down before 1812, and Napoleon's invasion and its impact on Russia made the Tsar determined to destroy the Napoleonic Empire • The Russians' relentless pursuit of the Grand Armée led to the tremendous loss of French soldiers, horses and weaponry and encouraged Napoleon's allies, such as Prussia, to desert him and join with Russia in coalition • The Russian military command and army played a fundamental role in major campaign victories, e.g. the capture of Berlin, regaining the

Question	Indicative content
	Coalition initiative after the defeat of Schwarzenberg at Dresden • Russia was the one constant presence in the defeat of Napoleon in Germany and France, and Tsar Alexander led the victory parade in Paris. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that, in the campaigns of 1813-14, the contribution of Russia was the main factor in the success of the Coalition against Napoleon. Relevant points may include: • Prussians and Austrian military reforms, after 1806, enabled them to make a major contribution to the Coalition; the Prussian General, Blücher, was particularly successful and led the invasion of France • Britain took pressure off the Russians by providing monies for their campaign, and maintaining a second front in Spain; it was Castlereagh's personal diplomacy at Chaumont that led to the final push towards Paris • Napoleon's intransigent refusal to accept peace terms kept the Coalition together despite the alliance being fragile; the major powers constantly redefined their relationships even while the campaigns were going on • The Napoleonic Empire and alliance system broke down completely in 1813-14; all of the allies that provided troops for the 1812 invasion of Russia either switched sides or maintained neutrality in 1813-14.

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 how far the peace settlement of 1815 ensured European stability in the years to 1833. Arguments and evidence that the peace settlement of 1815 ensured European stability in the years to 1833 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Co-operation between the major powers continued through the Quadruple Alliance and the 'Congress System', so maintaining the balance of power and preventing a general European war • The potential threat of France was limited by the establishment of a constitutional monarchy, reparations and the creation of a barrier of buffer states • The potential threat of Russia was limited by the creation of the German Bund, the expansion of Prussia, the strengthening of Austria in the east and continued co-operation • Reaction to the revolutionary ideas of the French Revolution and Napoleonic Era was maintained through the Metternich System and the actions of the Holy Alliance • The restoration of hereditary rulers supportive of Austria, particularly in Italy and Spain, maintained the balance of power and limited the spread of revolutionary ideas. Arguments and evidence that the peace settlement of 1815 did not ensure European stability in the years to 1833 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Revolutionary ideas based on nationalism and liberalism continued to spread across Europe, particularly creating a challenge to the role of Austria and the Metternich System • From the later 1820s, independence movements in Belgium and Greece began to challenge the settlement with regard to the threats from France and Russia • Revolutions in Italy (1820-21, 1831) and France (1830) threatened the restored order • The creation of the German Bund encouraged the growth of German nationalism • By the later 1820s, the Quadruple Alliance was less stable and divisions had grown over the purpose of the 'Congress System', e.g. a shift in British priorities under Canning. 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 statement that Bismarck was wholly responsible for Prussian domination of the process of German unification in the years 1862-71. Arguments and evidence that Bismarck was wholly responsible for Prussian domination of the process of German unification in the years 1862-71 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Bismarck's appointment as Minister President (1862), made Prussia more diplomatically effective both in Germany and Europe, e.g. support for Russia (1863-4), the isolation of Austria (1865), Treaty of Prague (1866) • Bismarck engineered the three major wars which shaped German unification – the Danish War (1864), the Austro-Prussian War (1866), the Franco-Prussian War (1870-1) • Bismarck's willingness to support the collection of illegal taxes funded the army reforms which provided the basis for Prussian military victories in 1864, 1866 and 1870-71 • Bismarck purposefully followed policies in relation to Austria which furthered his aims for a *Kleindeutschland*, e.g. Confederation reform (1863), the *Zollparlament* (1867) • Bismarck skilfully manipulated unforeseen events to the advantage of Prussia, e.g. events in Schleswig-Holstein (1863), the Hohenzollern Candidature and the Ems Telegram (1869-70). Arguments and evidence that Bismarck was not wholly responsible for Prussian domination of the process of German unification in the years 1862-1871 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The German unification process was the culmination of the long-term development of Prussia as a political and economic power • The long-term decline of Austrian power in Germany, economically, politically and militarily, enabled Prussia to dominate the process of unification in the 1860s • The Zollverein provided an economic model from which a Prussian-dominated, *Kleindeutschland* was developed • Other individuals were involved in the Prussian domination of the process of unification, e.g. Wilhelm I, von Moltke • It was the army reforms, along with the use of new military technology, which provided the foundation of the Prussian military victories in 1864, 1866 and 1870-71 • The favourable diplomatic situation in Europe, e.g. a lack of British willingness to intervene produced few obstacles to Prussian expansion of power. Other relevant material must be credited.