GradeMax



Mark scheme

January 2020

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level in History (WHI04/1A)

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

January 2020
Publication Code: WHI04_1A_2001_MS
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2020

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

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.
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 the downfall of the Napoleonic Empire in 1814 was due to the collapse of support for Napoleon within France. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: Extract 1 • The economic and social impact of Napoleon's military campaigns increasingly led to discontent and a break down in civil order • There was open defiance of Napoleon's attempt to conscript reinforcements for the 1813–14 military campaigns • Napoleon lost the support of the component parts of the Napoleonic political system despite showing his continued ability as a military leader • Napoleon lost the loyalty and support of influential groups. Extract 2 • It was the combined military forces of Napoleon's enemies, and specifically their capture of Paris in April 1814, rather than political issues, that resulted in Napoleon's downfall • Despite the availability of massive military resources, Napoleon had used up his resources fighting his enemies in Russia, Germany and Spain • Physical losses of military hardware and supplies, particularly from 1813, made it increasingly difficult for Napoleon to fight effectively • Napoleon may have suffered political setbacks in France but he maintained popular political support, particularly from the peasantry, until Paris fell. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the downfall of the Napoleonic Empire in 1814 was due to the collapse of support for Napoleon within France. Relevant points may include: • The adverse economic impact of the Continental System and a steep hike in taxation resulting from the loss of the Napoleonic Empire in 1813–14 affected Napoleon's political popularity and his ability to raise a new army • From 1812, Napoleon's political leadership was always vulnerable to military setback, e.g. the attempted coup in the aftermath of the Russian campaign, the political intrigue of Talleyrand in 1814 • In March 1814, the military decision of the Coalition to take Paris rather than engage Napoleon was influenced by Napoleon's loss of political control in France • Napoleonic government was replaced and Napoleon forced to abdicate by representatives of the French political elite not through direct military defeat and surrender.

Question	Indicative content
	Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the downfall of the Napoleonic Empire in 1814 was due to the collapse of support for Napoleon within France. Relevant points may include: • The Sixth Coalition combined to defeat Napoleon militarily from the east and the south and steadfastly maintained a united front by refusing to accept overtures for peace once France had been invaded • Coalition forces consistently outnumbered the available Napoleonic forces in the 1813–14 campaigns both in central Europe and in the south • After 1812, the loss of military ordnance and the lack of horses and supplies meant that, even with additional men, Napoleon's military position was fundamentally weakened, e.g. Battle of the Nations • Napoleon's own military leadership and decision-making were responsible for his downfall, e.g. fighting a war on two fronts, his intransigence during negotiations, the consequences of his treatment of coalition allies.

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 statement that the most important reason for the failure of the 1848–49 revolutions in Italy was the intervention of Austria. Arguments and evidence that the most important reason for the failure of the 1848–49 revolutions in Italy was the intervention of Austria should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Austrians maintained control of the Quadrilateral fortresses throughout 1848–49, using them as a base from which to counter-attack • The Austrian General Radetzky refused to negotiate a peace with Piedmont over control of Lombardy and persuaded the Austrian government to support his attempts to regain control • The superior forces of General Radetzky defeated the Italian forces of the First War of Independence at Custoza (July 1848) and Novara (March 1849), bringing to an end nationalist aspirations in northern Italy • After the counter-revolutionary successes against revolutionaries in Austria and Hungary in 1848, the Austrians used both their military and political might to regain control in Lombardy and Venetia • Austrian resurgence in northern Italy gave confidence to the deposed Italian leaders in central and southern Italy to regain control and brought the promise of support for the restoration of pre-revolutionary powers. Arguments and evidence that other reasons for the failure of the 1848–49 revolutions in Italy were more important should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The weaknesses of the revolutionaries, such as localism, a lack of unity and poor organisation, the diversity of underlying causes • The failure of the revolutionaries to maintain popular support, e.g. peasant support for the return of the monarchy in Naples • The failure of Charles Albert/Piedmont to lead 'Italy' to success in the First War of Independence • The role of France; the initial lack of support for the revolutionaries and the later intervention in the restoration of the Papacy to the Papal States • The role of the Pope; particularly, the impact of the Papal Allocution on the First 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 statement that, in the 1850s, Prussia greatly increased its influence within Germany. Arguments and evidence that, in the 1850s, Prussia greatly increased its influence within Germany should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Industrialisation, along with the growth of railways, enabled Prussia to become an economic powerhouse within Germany • As leader of the *Zollverein*, Prussia was able to strengthen its position as the leading German commercial state at the expense of Austria, e.g. the rejection of Austria's *Mitteleuropa* Customs Union • In 1854, Prussia advanced its diplomatic and political power in Germany by persuading the German Confederation Diet to reject the Austrian request for the mobilisation of troops to fight in the Crimean War • By the end of the 1850s, Prussia was viewed by many German nationalists as the state most likely to advance German unification, particularly the *Nationalverein* which advocated a *Kleindeutschland* policy • During the 1850s, Prussia began to re-establish some of its pre-Olmütz influence in northern Germany, giving Prussia the confidence to begin to present itself as a viable to challenge Austria. Arguments and evidence that, in the 1850s, Prussia did not greatly increase its influence within Germany should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • In 1850, the failure of the Prussian-inspired Erfurt Union, and the humiliation of Prussia at Olmütz, ensured that Austria retained and maintained its leadership of the German Confederation • Towards the end of the 1850s, Prussia was weakened by the lack of strong political leadership, when a regency was established due to the incapacity of Frederick William IV • The Prussian army was in need of serious reform; attempts to mobilise the army in 1859 had resulted in serious weaknesses being exposed • Austria's position as the pre-eminent state within Germany remained throughout the 1850s. Other relevant material must be credited.