GradeMax



Mark Scheme

Summer 2019

Pearson Edexcel
International Advanced Level
In History (WHI04)
Paper 4: International Study with Historical Interpretations

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

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

Summer 2019
Publications Code: WHI04_1A_1906_MS
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2019

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: **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 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 it was the 'Spanish ulcer' that was responsible for downfall of the Napoleonic Empire. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: Extract 1 • Napoleon underestimated the effort required to conquer Spain and was never willing to commit his own energies to achieving victory there • The war in Spain physically undermined Napoleon's military strength by tying up men and resources and had a psychological impact on military confidence • The war in Spain had a wider impact across the Napoleonic Empire by encouraging resistance and affecting Napoleon's other campaigns in the years 1812–14 • Napoleon's political support base in France was adversely affected by the lack of success in Spain. Extract 2 • Losses in Spain were not decisive enough alone to bring about Napoleon's downfall • It was the mistakes of the Russian campaign – inadequate planning, misreading the Russian response and underestimating the Tsar's capacity to survive – which were decisive in causing the Empire to break apart • The failure of the Russian campaign encouraged the German states to reject the Napoleonic Empire • The Russian campaign robbed Napoleon of the military resources and allies he required to maintain the Empire. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that it was the 'Spanish ulcer' that was responsible for downfall of the Napoleonic Empire. Relevant points may include: • At Baylen (July 1808) a combined force of Spanish troops and peasant *guerrilla* bands defeated a French force, so tying down 30,000 men • Spanish resistance to the Napoleonic system and the rule of Joseph Bonaparte acted as a example for unrest in other states, e.g. resistance to Jerome Bonaparte in Westphalia, the defection of Prussia in 1813 • British successes in Spain created the foundation for Wellesley's eventual invasion of France • Napoleon himself described events in Spain as an open wound that would not go away; it prevented adequate preparation for the 1812 campaign and the war in Spain influenced Talleyrand's internal coup of April 1814.

Question	Indicative content
	Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that it was the 'Spanish ulcer' that was responsible for downfall of the Napoleonic Empire. Relevant points may include: • In 1812 Napoleon was completely dominant in Europe apart from the peripheral Iberian Peninsula. It was the decision to invade Russia, with whom he had signed a truce at Tilsit in 1807, which was the turning point • The 1812 campaign highlighted Napoleon's weaknesses as a commander and, in particular, encouraged Prussia, Saxony, Bavaria, Sweden and eventually Austria to turn against him • Despite the war in Spain, Napoleon was able to raise sizeable armies and fight vigorous campaigns both in 1812 and 1813–14 • Other factors, including the contribution of Britain, the Fourth Coalition, failure of the Continental System, the French domestic situation, military reforms in Austria and Prussia.

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 extent to which the key features of nationalism in Italy and nationalism in Germany in the years 1815–48 were similar. Arguments and evidence that the key features of nationalism in Italy and nationalism in Germany in the years 1815–48 were similar should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Both were influenced by the legacy of the Napoleonic occupation and the reactionary nature of the peace settlement of 1815 • Both were influenced by resentment of Austrian political influence and the repressive policies of the Metternich System • Both looked to unite geographical areas that were divided into separate political states but with a common culture; in Italy the Risorgimento and in Germany Romanticism • Both were mainly organised and supported by small (often secret) groups of dedicated followers many of whom were also liberals and middle-class • Both looked to gain support by harnessing the social and economic tensions emerging in Italy and Germany in the 1830s and 1840s. Arguments and evidence that the key features of nationalism in Italy and nationalism in Germany in the years 1815–48 were different should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Italian nationalists were more divided in their objectives, e.g. Mazzinian republicanism, neo-Guelphism, unity under Sardinia-Piedmont; Sicilian independence from Naples • German nationalism was identified with a common language and social concept ('Volk') exemplified by the Watch on Rhine (1840); Italian nationalism with a geographical identity lacking in a common language • Economic and political organisations existed within Germany that provided a possible foundation for future unity, i.e. the Prussian-led *Zollverein* and the German Confederation • German nationalism was aided by growing economic integration across Germany, e.g. railway building, but Italian nationalism was hampered by stark economic contrasts between north and south • German nationalists came close to success in the 1848 revolution with the creation of the Frankfurt Assembly but the 1848 revolutions only highlighted the weaknesses and divisions within Italian nationalism. 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 how accurate it is to say that the Prussian victory over Austria in 1866 was the key turning point in the process of unification of Germany in the years 1850–71. Arguments and evidence that the Prussian victory over Austria in 1866 was the key turning point in the process of unification of Germany in the years 1850–71 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The victory led to a decisive weakening of Austrian political influence in Germany and Austrian exclusion from the process of unification; any future unification of Germany would be in the form of a *Kleindeutschland* • Prussia increased its territory by the annexation of many of Austria's main allies and Prussia became the dominant political force in the newly created North German Confederation • Despite fielding a larger army, Austrian military supremacy in Germany was completely destroyed by the superior tactics and military technology of the Prussians • Prussia's dominant economic position within Germany as leader of the *Zollverein* was now reinforced by its political and military strength • Bismarck's sympathetic treatment of Austria in the peace settlement (Treaty of Prague) ensured Austrian neutrality In the Franco-Prussian War. Arguments and evidence that the Prussian victory over Austria in 1866 was not the key turning point/another event was the key turning point in the process of unification of Germany in the years 1850–71 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The victory over Austria only excluded Austria from the process of unification; the southern German states were still independent, and it was not inevitable that Prussia would 'unify' Germany • Austrian exclusion from the *Zollverein* in 1865 was the beginning of Prussia's emergence as the dominant German state after the humiliation at Olmütz 1850 • The Crimean War was the point at which the Austrian relationship with Russia deteriorated leaving Austria weakened diplomatically, e.g. Russian unwillingness to support Austria in 1866 • The appointment of Bismarck as Minister-President in 1862 by Wilhelm I led to the series of events, including the wars with Denmark, Austria and France, which resulted in German unification under Prussia • The French declaration of war in 1870 brought the southern Germany states into a military alliance with Prussia, which led to the defeat of France and the creation of the German Empire (January 1871). 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