

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2026

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 2026

Question Paper Log Number P78992A

Publication Code WHI04_1A_2601_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd

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: A01 (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.

A03 (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 the impact of Napoleon's defeat in Russia in 1812 was 'catastrophic and lasting'. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: Extract 1 • Despite taking some time to develop, Napoleon's defeat had a devastating impact on both his allies and on France • The defeat in the Russian campaign had weakened Napoleon's reputation of being an invincible military commander and so encouraged Prussia to change sides against him and Russia to completely destroy him • Napoleon accepted the armistice in May 1813 because he feared that his newly created army was too inexperienced to achieve complete victory against his enemies • Napoleon failed to understand the strength of feeling against him in the wake of the Russian campaign to such an extent that he found himself in August 1813 at war with Austria, Prussia and Russia. Extract 2 • On his return to Paris from Russia, Napoleon was determined to continue to control his empire and organise a new army to counteract any invasion • The military situation was not as bad for France as the defeat suggested, as the brunt of the casualties and losses was borne by subjects and allies of the Napoleonic Empire rather than France itself • Napoleon was able to organise and supply a new army, including cavalry, of 300,000 men from both France and the Empire • By mid-April 1813, Napoleon had organised an army strong enough to be mobilised to fight against the Russian advance. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that the impact of Napoleon's defeat in Russia in 1812 was 'catastrophic and lasting'. Relevant points may include: • Napoleon lost the vast majority of his trained men in the Russian campaign and, in particular, never recovered from the vast loss of horses and cavalry expertise; this became clear in the 1813 campaign • Napoleon's command during the Russian campaign increasingly alienated his own military staff and the nature of the defeat affected his ability to maintain the confidence of his commanders in future campaigns

- Tsar Alexander, in spite of the advice of his military commanders and without support from many Russians, was determined to finish the job of destroying Napoleon after his flight from Russia in 1812
- Former allies rapidly switched sides in 1812-13, e.g. the Prussian commander Yorck defected to Russia, the Prussian king signed a secret treaty with Russia, Sweden was an initial member of the Sixth Coalition.

Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that the impact of Napoleon's defeat in Russia in 1812 was 'catastrophic and lasting'. Relevant points may include:

- Napoleon mobilised every source of manpower possible to replace the men and arms lost in the retreat from Moscow, e.g. the National Guard whose role it was to defend France were persuaded to join the regular army
- On his return to France, Napoleon found that he still had a relatively large degree of popular support and was able to stabilise his own position by dealing with the political fallout from the coup attempt of October 1812
- At the end of 1812, the Napoleonic Empire still covered most of Germany, the Netherlands and Italy while Austria was maintaining a neutral stance and Napoleon was married to the daughter of the Austrian Emperor
- At the outset of campaigning in May 1813, Napoleon's newly formed army won significant victories against the nascent Sixth Coalition at Lützen and Bautzen. Napoleon continued to fight on with varying success until 1814.

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 accurate it is to say that there was significant change in the relationships between the European great powers in the years 1815-48. Arguments and evidence that there was significant change in the relationships between the European great powers in the years 1815-48 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The breakdown of the Congress of Verona (1822) brought to an end any attempt by the European great powers to deal with perceived challenges to European security using a collective response (the 'Congress System') • Pragmatic diplomacy led to fluid relationships with significant changes in relation to events, e.g. Anglo-Russian tensions arose over reactions to European liberalism but there was co-operation in the Near East • The 1830s saw something of a re-orientation along ideological lines as Britain and France appeared to shape a 'liberal alliance' in comparison to the reactionary 'Holy Alliance' of Austria, Russia and Prussia • Austrian influence over eastern European issues weakened in the 1840s; in 1848, Metternich was looking to establish closer relations with France in the west as a counter-balance to growing Russian power in the east. Arguments and evidence that counters the statement that there was significant change in the relationships between the European great powers in the years 1815-48 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Throughout the period the European powers that had defeated Napoleon maintained a cautious distrust of France and a determination to maintain the Vienna settlement in relation to future French expansionism • Austria, Russia and Prussia maintained and consolidated a conservative, anti-revolutionary 'Holy Alliance', e.g. the Troppau Protocol and Münchengrätz agreement, across the period • The great powers remained willing to settle tensions and disagreements through diplomacy, e.g. the Treaty of London (1839) that guaranteed Belgian neutrality • From the Vienna Congress onwards, Britain made clear its reluctance to become entangled in events on the European mainland by following a policy of isolation • In the German states, Prussia remained subordinate to Austria throughout the period, with Austria dominating the German confederation • France did little to challenge seriously the Vienna settlement or the position of the other great powers in Europe. 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 failure of the 1848-49 revolutions in Germany and the Austrian Empire was mainly due to the weaknesses of the revolutionaries. Arguments and evidence that the failure of the 1848-49 revolutions in Germany and the Austrian Empire was mainly due to the weaknesses of the revolutionaries should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The spontaneity, and immediate success, of many of the revolutionary outbreaks meant that the revolutionaries had few agreed plans for future government • The diverse nature of the ideals, aims and objectives of the revolutionaries, e.g. liberal democracy, German nationalism, independence from Austrian rule, failed to create political stability • Liberal and nationalist revolutionaries were often urban middle-class and lacked widespread support from either the peasantry or the working-classes once constitutional governments began to be established • The Frankfurt Assembly was factional and unable to agree on a wide variety of issues and policies; it took months to debate and agree the basic rights, borders and leadership of a new united Germany • The new state governments and the Frankfurt Assembly had no organised military forces to either prosecute foreign policy or to defend themselves against external or counter-revolutionary forces • The revolutionaries gained little support from external states who might have been sympathetic to liberal causes, such as Britain. Despite revolution in France, Louis Napoleon did not give support in Germany. Arguments and evidence that the failure of the 1848-49 revolutions in Germany and the Austrian Empire was mainly due to other factors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The forces of conservatism in central Europe were more resilient than had at first appeared. Rulers withdrew from their capitals with their military mainly intact and were able to regroup • In Austria, the emergence of Schwarzenberg as a political force, the accession of a new Emperor and a reinvigorated military leadership led to a successful counter-revolution • In Prussia, the refusal of the King to accept the invitation from the Frankfurt Assembly to become the new ruler of a <i>Kleindeutschland</i> effectively brought to an end nationalist revolutionary ambitions • The collapse of the revolutions in Vienna and Berlin enabled the Austrian military to overcome the revolutions in the rest of the Empire and the Prussian military to intervene across the Germany states • Russian military forces successfully intervened in support of the Austrian Emperor against the nationalist revolution in Hungary. Other relevant material must be credited.