Pearson Edexcel

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2024

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

January 2024
Question Paper Log Number P75143A
Publications Code WHI04_1A_MS_2401
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

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 the effective use of Britain's sea power 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 • British naval commanders were supported in using their initiative to deploy the most up-to-date naval fighting methods; Nelson was the most significant example of this • Nelson's victory at the Battle of Trafalgar (1805) increased Britain's overall maritime superiority in the War • The use of the British naval blockade was responsible for the failure of Napoleon's Continental System and for Napoleon's inability to establish full control over the Empire • The success of Britain's naval blockade contributed to the events that led Napoleon to declare war on Russia in 1812. Extract 2 • The defeat of Napoleon required the concerted effort of four major powers (Britain, Austria, Prussia and Russia) on sea and land not just sea power • In the years after 1805, despite the British having gained mastery of the seas at Trafalgar, Napoleon was victorious in continental Europe • It was fighting on land that was significant in Napoleon's defeat, for example, Wellington in the Peninsular War and in Russia • The work of the Royal Navy in protecting trade was important but only in enabling Britain to finance Russia, Austria and Prussia in their land-based war against Napoleon. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the effective use of Britain's sea power was the main reason for the downfall of the Napoleonic Empire. Relevant points may include: • Innovation in weaponry (such as gunnery), new tactical thinking about lines of attack and clear support from the British Admiralty meant that the Royal Navy became the most effective naval force in Europe • British victory over the French and Spanish navies at Trafalgar enabled Britain to challenge Napoleon from the sea virtually unopposed and forced Napoleon to change strategy to the disastrous Continental System • The failing Continental System resulted in overstretch, with Napoleon fighting a war on two fronts (Spain and Russia) in 1812, and the creation of resentment that would lead to the anti-French alliance of 1813–14 • British naval supremacy allowed Britain to intervene successfully in the Peninsular War by providing material support to Spain and allowing the flexible deployment of British troops in Portugal.

Question	Indicative content
	Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the effective use of Britain's sea power was the main reason for the downfall of the Napoleonic Empire. Relevant points may include: • Even with almost total naval mastery, Britain found it difficult to take full advantage of this against Napoleon's influence in the Baltic and Mediterranean and sea-based raids were not always successful • In December 1805, Napoleon brought the Third Coalition to an end with the Austrian defeat at Austerlitz, and over the next three years went on to control or influence almost the whole continental landmass of Europe • It was the failure of Napoleon's Russian campaign that saw the downfall of the Empire. Napoleon's failure to defeat Russia and the destruction of his Grand Army led to the breakdown of his central European alliances • Napoleon's empire collapsed in 1813–14, with the Russian, Austrian and Prussian drive towards France from the east, after the Battle of the Nations, and Wellington's drive from the south.

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 whether the Belgian revolt (1830–31) was a turning point in the pattern of European diplomacy in the years 1815–48. Arguments and evidence that the Belgian revolt (1830–31) was a turning point in the pattern of European diplomacy in the years 1815–48 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Belgian revolt opened up the possibility that the 'concert of diplomacy' between the major powers established by the Vienna Congress would be replaced by a pattern of 'liberal' v 'conservative' powers in Europe • The Belgian revolt was the first time that France had intervened in international matters against the wishes of the great powers of continental Europe since 1815 and saw France included as a major power in the final agreement • The three major 'anti-liberal' European powers (Austria, Russia, Prussia) chose not to invoke the Troppau Protocol agreement to crush revolutionary activity • The outcome of the revolt saw the first major political and geographical changes to the post-Napoleonic map of western Europe that had been established at Vienna in 1815. Arguments and evidence that the Belgian revolt (1830–31) was not a turning point in the pattern of European diplomacy in the years 1815–48 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Belgian revolt was an exceptional situation during which the major powers came to accept its independence as a necessary means to maintain the stability of the Vienna Settlement rather than to undermine it • The problem of the Belgian revolt was ultimately solved through the conference diplomacy that had been established at, and continued after, the Vienna Congress • Revolutionary activity was opposed - particularly by Austria, Russia and Prussia - throughout the period, and indeed the Troppau powers were involved in suppressing insurrection in 1830–31 in Italy and Poland • The relationship between Britain and France over Belgium did not develop into a 'fixed' pattern, e.g. the Near East crisis 1839–40, and French involvement in European affairs remained based on expediency • In 1821, several major European powers (Russia, Britain, France) had already worked together to aid the success of the Greek revolt for independence from the Ottoman Empire • Other turning points: the Congress of Troppau (1820), the Greek revolt (1821), the Quadruple Alliance (1834). 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 Bismarck was responsible for both the growing tensions in Franco-Prussian relations in the years 1867–70 and the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War (1870). Arguments and evidence that Bismarck was responsible for both the growing tensions in Franco-Prussian relations in the years 1867–70 and the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War (1870) should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Bismarck upset France with his diplomatic strategy after the Austro-Prussian War to increase Prussian power in central Europe by isolating France and by deliberately allowing the promise of 'Biarritz' to fall away • Bismarck deliberately manipulated the press in order to create the hostile environment that provoked the Luxembourg Crisis. • Bismarck blatantly amended the Ems Despatch to make it appear that Wilhelm I had snubbed the French over the Hohenzollern candidature. This was the immediate trigger for the outbreak of war in July • Bismarck's aim, in 1870, was to provoke France into declaring war; he believed that a French attack could result in German unification, as the south German states would come to the defence of the North. Arguments and evidence that Bismarck was not responsible for both the growing tensions in Franco-Prussian relations in the years 1867–70 and the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian War (1870) should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • It was a general Prussian belligerence towards France, including the ruling classes, the army and German nationalists, that created the hostile environment that eventually led to the outbreak of war in 1871 • A populist French reaction to the growing power of Prussia, in the wake of the Austro-Prussian War, caused Napoleon III to look to reassert French prestige, so souring Austro-French relations • It was Napoleon III's action in attempting to purchase the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg from the King of Holland that created hostility with Prussia • The French government were responsible for manipulating the controversy surrounding the Hohenzollern candidature, particularly the Empress Eugenie and French ministers loyal to her • The Ems Incident came about as a result of the actions of Napoleon III's newly-appointed, strongly anti-Prussian, Foreign Secretary, Gramont; Gramont instructed Benedetti to approach Wilhelm I at Ems. • It was France that declared war on Prussia on 19 July 1870. 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