GradeMax

Pearson Edexcel

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2022

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

Paper 4: International Study with 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 2022
Publication Code: WHI04_1A_2201_MS
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

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 Napoleon's failure in the campaign of 1813 was mainly due to the impact of Prussian and Austrian military reforms. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: Extract 1 • By 1813, both the Prussians and the Austrians had improved their ability to counter the French by introducing military reforms; the Prussians were more flexible, and the Austrians had imitated French systems of fighting • Although Napoleon was relatively successful early in 1813, the Prussians gave a good account of themselves • The military reforms meant that Napoleon could be outfought at Leipzig, and that his opponents were fighting on a more equal footing • Prussian and Austrian command systems, and individual commanders, were important factors in the failure of Napoleon at Leipzig. Extract 2 • The army Napoleon raised for the 1813 campaign was not as experienced or well-trained as in previous campaigns • The French army was not only weakened by the loss of men and horses in the Russian campaign but particularly by the difficulty in replacing them • Napoleon could no longer rely on the resources and support from allies and occupied areas in northern Germany • Napoleon's own shortcomings, such as his impatience and unwillingness to negotiate, contributed to his defeat at Leipzig. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that Napoleon's failure in the campaign of 1813 was mainly due to the impact of Prussian and Austrian military reforms. Relevant points may include: • After the defeats of 1806, Scharnhorst began a root and branch reform of the Prussian military, from command to ground troops, that enabled the Prussian army to fight the French more effectively in 1813 • The reforms used by Prussia to circumvent French restrictions on Prussian army recruitment after Tilsit, created an estimated 150 000 trained reservists who could be called up in 1813 to serve in a *Landwehr* militia • Both Prussia and Austria made reforms that reflected the lessons learned from their earlier defeats by Napoleon; in 1813, well-instructed and trained troops were used to employ the Trachenberg Plan • The Austrian commander Schwarzenberg and, particularly, the Prussian general, Blücher, made decisive contributions at the battle of Leipzig; Prussian troops defeated Marshal Marmont and stormed Leipzig itself.

Question	Indicative content
	Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that Napoleon's failure in the campaign of 1813 was mainly due to the impact of Prussian and Austrian military reforms. Relevant points may include: • It was the disastrous impact of the Russian campaign (1812) on the men, resources and horses available to Napoleon in 1813 that was fundamental to his failure; in defeat the French satellite states began to desert him • The Prussian and Austrian armed forces did not face Napoleon on their own. They were part of the Sixth Coalition, which relied heavily on the strength of the Russian army and was bankrolled by the British • The Prussians suffered defeat by Napoleon's forces at Lützen and Bautzen (May 1813) and, even after Austria joined the Coalition in August 1813, Napoleon was victorious at Dresden • Napoleon's own weaknesses led to failure, for example, in 1813, he was less willing to allow his commanders responsibility, and several times during the campaign undermined attempts to negotiate a peace.

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 collapse of the 1848-49 revolutions in Germany and Italy was mainly due to the weaknesses of nationalism. Arguments and evidence that the collapse of the 1848-49 revolutions in Germany and Italy was mainly due to the weaknesses of nationalism should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • In both Germany and Italy, the cause of nationalism was not able to gain sufficient popular support to mount a concerted and sustained attack on the restored European order of 1815 • Despite early successes in both Germany and Italy, nationalists were not organised enough to use the revolutions to achieve unification. This was particularly so in Italy. • In Germany, nationalists were fundamentally undermined by the lengthy debate in the Frankfurt Assembly as to whether a unified Germany should follow a *Grossdeustchland* or *Kleinsdeutschland* path • In Italy, the attempt by Charles Albert of Piedmont to launch a War of Independence (1849) was undermined by suspicion of Piedmontese self-interest and the failure to ignite sufficient Italian patriotic fervour • Mazzinian nationalism in Italy was undermined by Mazzini's failure to secure the Roman Republic as a possible base for a future united Italy. Arguments and evidence that the collapse of the 1848-49 revolutions in Germany and Italy was not mainly due to the weaknesses of nationalism/was due to other factors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Nationalists did make significant gains, particularly in Germany where a national assembly, meeting in Frankfurt, was elected and organised to represent the German states • In both Germany and Italy, it was the competing objectives of the rebels that made it difficult for revolutionaries to sustain early successes • In both Germany and Italy, it was the revival in power of the forces of conservatism that crushed the revolutions. In Germany mainly the Prussian army and in Italy mainly the Austrian Army • It was the concerted counter-revolutionary effort of the conservative great powers of Austria, Prussia and Russia that ensured the failure of the revolutions • In Italy, the revolutions were thwarted particularly by the response of the Pope, who after initially accepting the Roman Republic, used his power both within Italy and across Europe to undermine the revolutionaries. 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 significant developments outside Italy were in influencing the completion of Italian unification in the years 1861-70. Arguments and evidence that developments outside Italy were significant in influencing the completion of Italian unification in the years 1861-70 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • In 1861, Napoleon III's acquiescence to the unification of Italy under Piedmont, after having been previously obstructive at Villafranca, allowed the creation of the Kingdom of Italy without fear of French interference • Throughout the period, Britain's tacit support for Italian unification encouraged Italian nationalists and British neutrality, in both 1866 and 1870, smoothed the way for the annexation of Venetia and Rome • The increasing likelihood of war between Austria and Prussia led to a formal military agreement with Prussia in April 1866; Italy subsequently received Venetia as a reward for its role in the Austro-Prussian war • Italian military failures at Lissa and Custoza meant that it was only the defeat of Austria by Prussia at Sadowa in 1866 that allowed Italy to gain Venetia as a result of the Austro-Prussian war • In 1870, increased tension between France and Prussia opened up possibilities for the Italians to attempt to gain Rome in return for the request for support from Napoleon III • In 1870, the withdrawal of the French garrison from Rome and the French defeat at Sedan gave Italy the opportunity to take-over Rome. Arguments and evidence that developments outside Italy were not significant/other factors were more significant in influencing the completion of Italian unification in the years 1861-70 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • It required the Kingdom of Italy to take advantage of the opportunities offered by outside development, particularly pursuing all avenues to acquire Venetia and to enable Rome to become the 'true' Italian capital • King Victor Emmanuel was a driving force in ensuring that Italian foreign policy remained focused on completing Italian unification • The Italians did contribute in some way to the acquisition of Venetia; the Italian entry into the war of 1866 meant that Austria was weakened by having to fight a war in the south as well • Italian nationalists encouraged the completion of unification throughout the period, particularly putting pressure on the new Kingdom actively to pursue the establishment of Rome as the Italian capital • It was the Italian army that invaded and took control of Rome in 1870 and the people of Rome who voted by an overwhelming majority in the plebiscite of October 1870 to become part of the Italian kingdom. 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