Pearson Edexcel

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2023

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced 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 2023
Publication Code: WHI04_1A_2301_MS
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

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, 1815-71

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, in the campaigns of 1813-14, Castlereagh was the most significant factor in ensuring that the alliance against Napoleon was maintained. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: Extract 1 • Castlereagh's personal diplomacy was responsible for both keeping the allies united and the campaign against Napoleon going • Castlereagh feared that Britain's allies would prematurely sign a peace treaty with Napoleon and so travelled personally to meet the alliance leaders to ensure they carried on co-operating against Napoleon • Castlereagh's actions strengthened the allies' resolve to continue their campaign in spite of some military setbacks against Napoleon and some attempts by Napoleon to make peace • Castlereagh played an important role in drawing up the Treaty of Chaumont, which kept the allied powers together. Extract 2 • It was not just Castlereagh's ability to personally influence the European leaders that led to his success but other factors outside his control • Napoleon's actions undermined the possibility of negotiating a peace agreement so helping Castlereagh to maintain the alliance • Fear of a potential military resurgence by Napoleon forced Russia, Austria and Prussia to maintain the alliance against Napoleon, as Britain could provide financial and military resources • Metternich perceived Castlereagh as being useful in advancing Metternich's own diplomatic aim of keeping the Tsar in check rather than being influenced by Castlereagh himself. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that, in the campaigns of 1813-14, Castlereagh was the most significant factor in ensuring that the alliance against Napoleon was maintained.

Question	Indicative content
	Relevant points may include: • Castlereagh was personally determined to maintain the focus of the European powers on defeating Napoleon and left England in early 1814 with his own specific set of aims and objectives • Castlereagh's personality was suited to the personal diplomacy he carried out in 1814; his calmness, determination and relatively humble approach gained the respect of European leaders, such as Tsar Alexander I • Castlereagh arrived in Europe with an advantageous negotiating position; Britain had the financial strength to underwrite a decisive victory in the form of subsidies and Wellington's army was advancing in southern France • The Treaty of Chaumont (March 1814) provided £5,000,000 in British subsidies to the continental European allies and the allies agreed to continue the campaign against Napoleon until he was defeated decisively. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view that, in the campaigns of 1813-14, Castlereagh was the most significant factor in ensuring that the alliance against Napoleon was maintained. Relevant points may include: • In February 1814, Napoleon's forces in France won a series of victories (Six Days' Campaign), which frustrated the alliance and reinforced their determination to work together to defeat Napoleon • In early 1814, Napoleon tentatively looked to resurrect the Frankfurt peace proposals (November 1813) but categorically rejected the harsher terms offered by the allies so undermining a final peace negotiation • After the events of 1812, Tsar Alexander was determined to see the campaign against Napoleon through to its end and was particularly focused on reaching Paris • Metternich's decisions in early 1814 were fundamental to the maintenance of the alliance; he was willing to accept the harsher peace terms put to Napoleon and work with Castlereagh to counter-balance Russian aims.

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 successful the Vienna Settlement (1815) was in dealing with the threats to European stability in the years 1815-32. Arguments and evidence that the Vienna Settlement (1815) was successful in dealing with the threats to European stability in the years 1815-32 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The settlement created a 'concert' of Europe amongst powers determined to prevent future French aggression that was generally effective for several decades after • The settlement led to a strengthening of the Holy Alliance (Austria, Russia, Prussia) that was particularly committed to the suppression of the revolutionary ideals of nationalism and liberalism in continental Europe • The territorial settlement strengthened Prussian power in the Rhineland and western Germany, so creating a physical and psychological barrier to French ambitions eastward • Austria's return to its leading position in the German Bund and emphasis on maintaining its power in the south and east of central Europe ensured that potential Russian ambitions were contained • The restoration of the Italian monarchies and the influence of Austria in Italy enabled the suppression of liberalism and nationalism and the failure of revolutionary activity in the 1820s and early 1830s. Arguments and evidence that the Vienna Settlement (1815) was not successful in dealing with the threats to European stability in the years 1815-32 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • In the 1820s, the Quadruple Alliance became less stable and divisions grew over the purpose of the 'Congress System', e.g. breakdown of Congress of Verona, a shift in British priorities under Canning • In the 1820s, independence movements in Belgium and Greece began to challenge the Settlement with regard to the threats from France and Russia • The restoration of the Italian monarchies and the creation of the German Bund only fuelled nationalism, e.g. Hambach Festival (1832), in these areas by providing a focus for discontent • The activities of several of the restored Italian sovereigns led to liberal

	revolutionary outbreaks in 1820-21, leading to a constitutional monarchy being established in Piedmont • A series of liberal revolutionary outbreaks occurred across Europe in 1820-21 and again in 1830-31. There was a constitutional crisis in Russia in 1825. 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 war was the most significant factor in shaping the process of German unification in the years 1850-71. Arguments and evidence that war was the most significant factor in shaping the process of German unification in the years 1850-71 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Crimean War saw a significant sea-change in Austria's subsequent ability to challenge Prussian power in Germany. Austria's unwillingness and inability to provide support to Russia lost Russia as a future ally • Austrian loss of territory as a result of war in Italy in 1859-60 symbolised the growing weakness of the Austrian Empire and Austrian involvement in Italy in 1866 weakened Austria's position in the Austro-Prussian War • War enabled Prussia to prove its growing military superiority – in arms and effectiveness - and establish itself as a formidable German state capable of leading Germany to a *Kleindeutschland* solution to unification • The successful Prussian-Austrian war against Denmark (1864) allowed Bismarck to lay the groundwork for the divisions which would result in the Austro-Prussian War and Austria's exclusion from a united Germany • The Austro-Prussian War (1866) resulted in the creation of the North German Confederation under Prussia and laid the foundations for the final phase of German unification in the years 1866-71 • The Franco-Prussian War (1870-71) resulted in the inclusion of the final four southern German states into a united *Kleindeutschland* and the creation of a German Empire under Prussia. Arguments and evidence that other factors were more significant in shaping the process of German unification in the years 1850-71 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Bismarck's vision and role in bringing about *Kleindeutschland* unification • The growth of the *Zollverein* after 1850 provided a blueprint and impetus

	for German unification • Prussia's growth as a wealthy modern industrial nation in relation to the decline of a conservative and divided Austrian Empire • Economic conditions, such as industrialisation, urbanisation, trade and commerce, railway building, the *Zollverein* • A favourable international situation, e.g. the Schleswig-Holstein dispute, Italian independence, British and Russian neutrality • The creation of an intellectual climate in the German states favourable to a *Kleindeutschland* solution and the influence of the National Liberals. 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