



Mark Scheme (Results)

June 2024

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

June 2024

Question Paper Log Number P75802A

Publication Code: WHI04_1A_2406_MS

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: A01 (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 mainly to Napoleon's failed campaigns in the Peninsular War. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: Extract 1 • Napoleon's intervention in the Iberian Peninsula was an utter failure with both the intervention and outcome being unnecessary • The failures of the Peninsular campaigns were due to Napoleon himself; his usual military prowess failed to materialise leading to failures in war and the undermining of Napoleon's air of invincibility • The war in Spain had a significant impact, both physically and psychologically, on the ability of France to continue to wage war • Napoleon's failure to win the Peninsular War before beginning his campaign against Russia fatally undermined his previously all-powerful position in Europe. Extract 2 • The Russian campaign of 1813 finished in both territorial losses and military defeat for Napoleon • Napoleon's defeat in Russia undermined the belief in Napoleon's invincibility once and for all • The Russian defeat, along with British naval superiority and French failure in the Peninsular War, gave confidence to those continental European people's under Napoleonic rule to organise resistance • The impact of the military losses in Russia, particularly the immense loss of horses, undermined Napoleon's ability to fight effectively against Russia and the German states.

Question	Indicative content
	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 mainly to Napoleon's failed campaigns in the Peninsular War. Relevant points may include: • It was Napoleon's decision to enforce the Continental System on Portugal in 1808 and then to turn on his Spanish ally when British support for Portugal resulted in French failure • Napoleon relied on personal control of his military campaigns for the effective prosecution of war but left much of the fighting in Iberia to his subordinates • Napoleon misjudged the response of the Spanish people to his decision to put his brother Joseph on the Spanish throne; the subsequent <i>guerrilla</i> war led to high casualties and questioned French military might • Napoleon's decision to embark on the Russian campaign of 1812, when still at war in the Iberian Peninsula, created military overstretch and meant that the British under Wellington could take advantage on land. 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 mainly to Napoleon's failed campaigns in the Peninsular War. Relevant points may include: • Russia's decision to continue to pursue the French beyond its borders resulted in the loss of conquered French territory and created a reaction across continental Europe that ultimately led to the Sixth Coalition • Napoleon made logistical and leadership mistakes in the Russian campaign, e.g. overstretched supply lines, the decision to take Moscow, that suggested his military prowess was on the wane • In 1813, Prussia made the decision to switch sides against Napoleon and was able to use its recent military reforms, some of which were modelled on Napoleonic practice, to fight effectively against Napoleon • The impact of the retreat from Russia meant that Napoleon was forced to recruit a new army of less experienced and less fit men and was unable to replace all of the horses needed to fight the campaigns of 1813-14.

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 how significant were the reforms of Pope Pius IX in causing the outbreak of revolution in Italy in 1848-49. Arguments and evidence that the reforms of Pope Pius IX were significant in causing the outbreak of revolution in Italy in 1848-49 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The reforms of Pope Pius XI influenced liberals across Italy to believe that there was a possibility of constitutional reform, so encouraging a desire for political change, e.g. the revolt of the Two Sicilies against Ferdinand II • Pius's call for an Italian customs union, and his rejection of Metternich's attempt to garrison troops on Papal lands in reaction to his reforms, made Pius into a nationalist 'hero', encouraging nationalists across Italy • As Pope, Pius's reforms suggested that he was giving 'divine blessing' to political reform across Italy so undermining the rulers of the restored states and encouraging Charles Albert's support for a war of independence • Metternich's introduction of reactionary measures in Lombardy and Venetia, in direct response to Pius's reforms, were responsible for the outbreak of revolution in Austrian-controlled Italy • Pius's failure to live up to the expectations of his reforms led to revolution in Rome itself and, subsequently, to the creation of the short-lived Roman Republic. Arguments and evidence that the reforms of Pope Pius IX were not significant/other factors were significant in causing the outbreak of revolution in Italy in 1848-49 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Pius was reluctant to harness the power of liberals and nationalists in Italy and did not intend for his reforms in the Papal States to lead to revolutionary activity against sovereign rulers • The outbreak of revolution in the Italian states in 1848-49 was largely as a result of the specific circumstances in specific Italian states, e.g. Sicilian resentment of Naples, taxation in Lombardy • The revolutions in Italy came at a time of economic and social hardship, e.g. poor harvest, economic downturn, across most of Italy • Revolutionary activity was a response to the conservative rule of the restored monarchs and their failure to respond to the changing political situation across Europe • The revolutions in much of northern and central Italy were the result of long-term resentment of the power of Austria over Italy, including Metternich's reactionary policies and the garrisoning of troops. 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 the leaders of Prussia were successful in strengthening Prussian power in the years 1861-64. Arguments and evidence that the leaders of Prussia were successful in strengthening Prussian power in the years 1861-64 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Wilhelm I's success in dealing with the immediate threat of constitutional crisis, both by maintaining the constitution and by his appointment of Bismarck, meant that by 1864 Prussia was seen as a growing power • Bismarck's appointment as Chancellor in 1862 brought greater stability to the executive government of Prussia, so enabling Prussia to strengthen its position in Germany after a period of relative instability • Bismarck's advice to Wilhelm I to boycott the Austrian-initiated 1863 convention of German states to consider reform of the German Confederation undermined Austrian power in Germany • Bismarck's foreign policy improved relations with Russia, in response to the Polish Revolt, and clearly indicated Prussia's growing power in Germany with the joint Austro-Prussian action over Denmark • Military reforms begun in 1862 by von Moltke resulted in the Prussian army being able to match Austria in terms of men and matériel, particularly with the introduction of the Dreyse 'needle gun' in 1864 • During this period, von Moltke and von Roon oversaw the culmination of a reorganisation and professionalisation of the Prussian army that enabled Prussia to show its growing strength in the war with Denmark in 1864. Arguments and evidence that the leaders of Prussia were not successful/there was limited success in strengthening Prussian power in the years 1861-64 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Prussia remained politically unstable, as Bismarck's actions in relation to the Prussian legislature resulted in ongoing dispute over the budget and the powers of the executive • Wilhelm I's actions in boycotting the 1863 convention of German states did not encourage other German rulers to do the same or to challenge Austrian power further • Bismarck's intervention in the Polish Revolt on the side of Russia could be seen to have exacerbated difficulties in overcoming the constitutional crisis and a potential accord with France • Success in the war with Denmark required Prussia to work with Austria in the events leading to, and the prosecution of, the war, as Bismarck knew that Prussia was not yet strong enough to act independently • Austria remained the dominant political power in Germany and retained the leadership of the German Confederation. Other relevant material must be credited.

