GradeMax



Mark Scheme

International Advanced Level in History (WHI04/1A)

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 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 the military effectiveness of the army and navy was Britain's most significant contribution to the downfall of Napoleon. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: Extract 1 • The British used the army and the navy successfully together to prosecute the wars against Napoleon. • The British were able to avoid the defeats inflicted upon other European powers and avoid invasion. • The naval successes of Nelson enabled the British army to take a leading role in the Peninsular War so thwarting Napoleon's ambitions. • Wellington's leadership qualities, and the fighting qualities of his troops, meant that his armies were not defeated in the campaign against Napoleon. Extract 2 • The British financial contribution was of great significance in the war against Napoleon. • The British military commitment, on its own, was too small to bring about the defeat of Napoleon. • British subsidies were used to bankroll alliances with continental European states who could provide the manpower to match Napoleon in the field. • The British financial contribution to the campaigns against Napoleon from 1813 onwards was particularly significant. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the military effectiveness of the army and navy was Britain's most significant contribution to the downfall of Napoleon. Relevant points may include: • Nelson's defeat of the Franco-Spanish fleet at Trafalgar (October 1805) protected Britain from invasion and would create an environment in which Britain could intervene in Portugal

Question	Indicative content
	• British naval supremacy prevented Napoleon from enforcing the Continental System effectively • Wellington was successful on the Iberian peninsula 1808-13, worsening the 'Spanish ulcer' and diverting Napoleonic troops from the Russian campaign of 1812 • Wellington invaded France from the south as part of the victorious Fourth Coalition. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the military effectiveness of the army and navy was Britain's most significant contribution to the downfall of Napoleon. Relevant points may include: • The British army was relatively small with 250 000 men in all theatres of war compared to 600 000 in the French army • The British navy had imperial commitments which weakened the ability to respond to the Napoleonic threat without allies • British subsidies were offered to European states throughout the period • Castlereagh's use of promised subsidies underwrote the creation of the Fourth Coalition (March 1814) and gave encouragement to central European states to resist the Napoleonic imperial 'system' • Other British contributions: Castlereagh's personal diplomacy etc.

Section B: Indicative Content

Option 1D: 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 statement that the outbreak of revolution in Germany and Italy in 1848 was caused mainly by economic and social distress. Arguments and evidence that the outbreak of revolution in Germany and Italy in 1848 was caused mainly by economic and social distress should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Harvest failures, due to disease and poor weather conditions, in the years 1845-48 led to widespread hunger and increased food prices so creating popular unrest • Overproduction in newly-established manufacturing industries created unrest amongst the unemployed working-classes and disquiet amongst the middle-classes as businesses failed • Artisans made unemployed by the growth of factory production in the 1840s organised protests and strikes • The inability of governments to ameliorate the 1845-7 agricultural and industrial crises led to criticism and political discontent from peasants, workers and the middle-classes • Urbanisation created poor, crowded living conditions in towns which were perfect breeding grounds for mass discontent and active protest • Specific examples of distress e.g. skilled workers in Cologne, peasantry in Naples and Sicily. Arguments and evidence that there were other reasons for the outbreak of revolution in Germany and Italy in 1848 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The main agricultural and industrial crises had subsided in 1848 and economies were beginning to recover • The growth of nationalism – in Germany political, economic and cultural nationalism was being discussed more openly; in Italy the ideas of Mazzini, Gioberti and Balbo influenced the Risorgimento • The growth of liberalism – across Germany the middle-classes were demanding more representation; in Italy, constitutionalism was growing e.g. Charles Albert in Piedmont • The revolutions were a response to a variety of matters of discontent triggered by the spontaneous reaction to revolution in France • Specific examples of non-economic and social discontent e.g. constitution in Baden, independence from Naples in Sicily. 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, in the years 1849-59, Piedmont developed the capability to challenge Austrian power in Italy fully. Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1849-59, Piedmont had developed sufficiently enough to be able to challenge Austrian power in Italy should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Economic growth and government investment in the economic infrastructure brought Piedmont prestige as an emerging industrial nation and the finances to build up its military capabilities • Piedmont generated international interest in the 'Italian Question' through its involvement in the Crimean War and the subsequent diplomatic negotiations • The appointment of Cavour as Prime Minister in 1852; Cavour was able to bring together the economic, political and diplomatic developments which allowed Piedmont to consider war with Austria • In March-April 1859, emboldened by a diplomatic alliance with France (Plombières 1858), Piedmont provoked a war with Austria which it believed it was capable of winning. Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1849-59, Piedmont had not developed sufficiently enough to be able to challenge Austrian power in Italy should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • In 1859, Piedmont was still developing as a 'modern' nineteenth century state with limits to its political and economic security • Piedmont had gained in international prestige but apart from the interest of France there was little likelihood of direct aid for war against Austria from elsewhere e.g. Britain • Piedmont's military capabilities were untried; Piedmont had played a very minor role in the Crimean War and its military strength was small relative to the might of the Austrian Empire • There was no apparent interest either in Austrian Italy or other Italian states in challenging Austrian power, apart from amongst National Society supporters • Piedmont was not in a position 'to help itself' fully, being reliant on the direct diplomatic and military support of the French in order to fight the war with Austria in April 1859. Other relevant material must be credited.