GradeMax



Pearson
Edexcel

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2021

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

Paper 4: International Study with Historical Interpretations

Option 1A: The Making of Modern Europe, 1805–1871

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 2021
Publications Code WHI04_1A_msc_20210304
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2021

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, 1805–1871

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 Napoleon's commitment to enforcing the Continental System was the main reason for the 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 invaded both Portugal and Russia because of their unwillingness to participate in the Continental System • Napoleon was drawn into the Iberian Peninsula by his need to stop Portugal from trading with Britain and to prevent smuggling on the European continent undermining the System • Napoleon's decision to invade Russia in 1812 was as a result of his obsession with enforcing the Continental System and ruining British trade • Napoleon's preoccupation with the Continental System, despite evidence of it having already failed, resulted in Napoleon putting himself at a disadvantage militarily in 1812. Extract 2 • After 1807, the flaws in Napoleon's character began to show • Napoleon's increasing inability to analyse his situation objectively led to his failure in Russia in 1812 • Napoleon irrationality meant that he refused to accept several compromise settlements that may have left him in control of a French Empire • His refusal to delegate powers of command to his marshals undermined his own ability to command larger armies and a war spread over two major fronts. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that Napoleon's commitment to enforcing the Continental System was the main reason for the downfall of the Napoleonic Empire. Relevant points may include: • After Napoleon's aborted attempt to invade Britain and Nelson's victory at Trafalgar, Napoleon began commercial warfare against Britain through the Berlin (1806) and Milan decrees (1807) • Portugal was determined to maintain its sovereignty in the face of Napoleon's invasion of Spain and continued to trade with Britain, which was one of its oldest trading partners • As a result of Napoleon's incursion into the Iberian Peninsula, Britain decided to fight the Napoleonic Empire on land as well as at sea

Question	Indicative content
	• The Continental System resulted in economic hardships which created political resentment against him in France and encouraged the rise of nationalism against the Napoleonic Empire across Europe • The Tsar's refusal to implement the Continental System in Russia after 1810 resulted in Napoleon's catastrophic 1812 campaign against Russia and the retreat of Napoleon's Grand Army. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that Napoleon's commitment to enforcing the Continental System was the main reason for the downfall of the Napoleonic Empire. Relevant points may include: • After the treaties of Tilsit with Russia and Prussia in 1807, Napoleon began to act as if he was invincible. Talleyrand, his foreign minister, resigned believing that Napoleon was heading for a fall • Whereas previously Napoleon had meticulously planned his campaigns, in his determination to invade Russia Napoleon overstretched his resources and failed to appreciate the logistics involved • Napoleon's egotistical behaviour as both a military and political leader led to growing resentment in France, particularly from the notables who had been instrumental in legitimising his position • Napoleon rejected the Frankfurt Proposals offered by the Sixth Coalition in November 1813, which would have allowed him to retain control of a French Empire defined by France's 'natural boundaries' • Napoleon's failure to delegate military command had particular consequences in the Peninsular War, where he attempted to command the campaign from a distance and without accurate intelligence.

Section B: Indicative content

Option 1A: The Making of Modern Europe, 1805-1871

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 there was little change in the relationships between the great powers of Europe in the years 1815–48. Arguments and evidence that there was little change in the relationships between the great powers of Europe in the years 1815–48 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Throughout the period the 'Waterloo powers' (Russia, Austria, Prussia, Britain) remained cautious of French attempts to extend power within Europe and challenge the Vienna settlement • Throughout the period the Holy Alliance of Austria, Russia and Prussia maintained and consolidated a conservative, anti-revolutionary front, e.g. the Troppau Protocol and Münchengratz agreement • France did little to openly challenge the Vienna settlement or the position of the other great powers in Europe • In the German sphere, Prussia remained subordinate to Austria throughout the period • Throughout the period, although less so after the decline of the 'Congress System' in the 1820s, the great powers remained willing to settle tensions and disagreements through diplomacy. Arguments and evidence that counter and/or modify the statement that there was little change in the relationships between the great powers of Europe in the years 1815–48 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The alliance between the 'Waterloo powers' was barely maintained during the Vienna Congress and did not formally continue post-settlement • Attempts at a collective response to challenges to European security (the 'Congress System') only lasted until 1822 when the Congress of Verona broke down over the response to the revolution in Spain • In the 1830s, the European diplomatic climate was essentially re-oriented along ideological lines as Britain and France appeared to fashion a 'liberal alliance' against the reactionary alliance of Austria, Russia and France • Relationships between the great powers were often fluid, e.g. Anglo-Russian tensions over 'liberal' revolutions in Europe but Anglo-Russian co-operation in the Near East • Metternich's influence over eastern European issues weakened in the 1840s with Russia beginning to dominate events; in 1848 Metternich was looking to establish closer relations with France as a counter-balance. 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 whether, in the years 1850–71, economic strength was more important than military strength in explaining Prussia's dominance over the process of German unification. Arguments and evidence that in the years 1850–71, economic strength was more important than military strength in explaining Prussia's dominance over the process of German unification should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Prussian economic development at the expense of Austria, particularly in the 1850s, was the foundation stone of Prussia's emergence as the dominant German state, e.g. Manteuffel's reforms, industrial advances • Prussian economic development created the economic security for Prussia that gave Bismarck the foundation from which to carry out the diplomacy which formed the basis of the unification process the years 1862-71 • Throughout the period the Zollverein bound other German states to Prussia politically as well as economically so creating a blueprint for a Prussian-dominated unification; this was particularly so after 1867 • Prussian involvement in the development of the railway network across Germany contributed to Prussia's geopolitical dominance in the process of German unification • Prussian state sponsorship of industry and promotion of technological education showed that Prussia's leaders recognised the importance of Prussia's economic strength in becoming the dominant power in Germany. Arguments and evidence that counter and/or modify the statement that, in the years 1850-71, economic strength was more important than military strength in explaining Prussia's dominance over the process of German unification should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • It was the physical victory in wars against Denmark (1864), Austria (1866) and France (1870–71), which enabled Bismarck to dominate in diplomacy and Prussia to dominate the territorial unification of Germany • It was the logistical expertise of the Prussian military command, and the tactical use of the military resources available to them, that was responsible for the Prussian victories that unified Germany • It was specifically the Prussian military defeat of Austria in 1866 which was the turning point in the unification of Germany, by bringing about a *Kleindeutschland* solution to the process • It was the reform of the Prussian military after 1862, carried out under von Roon, that enabled the Prussians to become the dominant force in the process of German unification • Economic and military strengths were equally as important, as suggested by Bismarck in his 'blood and iron' speech, e.g. the use of Prussian-sponsored railways to mobilise troops in the wars of 1866 and 1870–71. 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