Mark scheme (Results)

January 2025

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 2025
Question Paper P76215A
Publication Code: WHI04_1A_2501_MS
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

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.

How to award marks when level descriptions are used

1. Finding the right level

The first stage is to decide which level the answer should be placed in. To do this, use a 'best-fit' approach, deciding which level most closely describes the quality of the answer. Answers can display characteristics from more than one level, and where this happens markers must use the guidance below and their professional judgement to decide which level is most appropriate.

For example, one stronger passage at L4 would not by itself merit a L4 mark, but it might be evidence to support a high L3 mark, unless there are substantial weaknesses in other areas. Similarly, an answer that fits best in L3 but which has some characteristics of L2 might be placed at the bottom of L3. An answer displaying some characteristics of L3 and some of L1 might be placed in L2.

2. Finding a mark within a level

After a level has been decided on, the next stage is to decide on the mark within the level. The instructions below tell you how to reward responses within a level. However, where a level has specific guidance about how to place an answer within a level, always follow that guidance.

Levels containing two marks only

Start with the presumption that the work will be at the top of the level. Move down to the lower mark if the work only just meets the requirements of the level.

Levels containing three or more marks

Markers should be prepared to use the full range of marks available in a level and not restrict marks to the middle. Markers should start at the middle of the level (or the upper-middle mark if there is an even number of marks) and then move the mark up or down to find the best mark. To do this, they should take into account how far the answer meets the requirements of the level:

- If it meets the requirements *fully*, markers should be prepared to award full marks within the level. The top mark in the level is used for answers that are as good as can realistically be expected within that level
- If it only *barely* meets the requirements of the level, markers should consider awarding marks at the bottom of the level. The bottom mark in the level is used for answers that are the weakest that can be expected within that level
- The middle marks of the level are used for answers that have a *reasonable* match to the descriptor. This might represent a balance between some characteristics of the level that are fully met and others that are only barely met.

Indicative content

Examiners are reminded that indicative content is provided as an illustration to markers of some of the material that may be offered by students. It does not show required content and alternatives should be credited where valid.

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 own actions were primarily responsible for the downfall of the Napoleonic Empire in the years 1813–14. In considering the extracts, the points made by the authors should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: Extract 1 • Napoleon's decisions were a key element to his overthrow and the ultimate loss of the whole Napoleonic Empire • Napoleon's refusal to compromise was central to both the territorial losses of 1813-14 and Napoleon's military failures, such as at Leipzig • Napoleon's intransigence over promises made when he became Emperor, and over his own beliefs, meant that he ended up losing control of the whole of the Empire, including France itself • Napoleon's unwillingness, and apparent inability, to take advice led ultimately to his final defeat. Extract 2 • In 1813, Napoleon found himself challenged by diplomatic isolation and military weaknesses • Napoleon's enemies in Europe joined forces militarily and financially to work against France • Circumstances came together to produce an alliance that was less likely to fracture than previously, and that was ultimately resolved to fight Napoleon until the bitter end • From 1813, Napoleon was at a military disadvantage, e.g. deficit in numbers, deficit in trained soldiers, that affected his ability to win battles, e.g. at Leipzig. Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to support the view that Napoleon's own actions were primarily responsible for the downfall of the Napoleonic Empire in the years 1813–14. Relevant points may include: • After the humiliating retreat from Moscow, Napoleon became obsessed with restoring his lost prestige • Throughout his campaigns, Napoleon had been reluctant to delegate command or military planning, and this became even more pronounced in 1813-14, eventually losing the trust of his generals, e.g. Ney • It was Napoleon's determination to continue fighting, both before and after Leipzig, that began to lose Napoleon support within France and ultimately led to his internal overthrow as French ruler in 1814.

Question	Indicative content
	Candidates should relate their own knowledge to the material in the extracts to counter or modify the view Napoleon's own actions were primarily responsible for the downfall of the Napoleonic Empire in the years 1813–14. Relevant points may include: • The failure of the 1812 campaign in Russia laid the groundwork for the creation of the 6th coalition against Napoleon. Russia and Prussia signed the Treaty of Kalisch in February 1813, and Britain looked to provide loans • Central northern Europe became lost to Napoleon, due to a combination of switching sides, e.g. Bernadotte, a reaction to conquest in the German states and the confidence of a newly-reformed Prussia army. • The 6th coalition worked effectively together to defeat Napoleon. British and Iberian forces followed the French retreat from Iberia and Russian, Prussian and Austrian forces invaded Northern and Eastern France • Napoleon's military effectiveness was severely compromised in 1813-14; many Frenchmen were reluctantly conscripted or deserted, 100,000 horses had been destroyed in Russia and his cavalry depleted.

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, in the years 1815-50, there was little real challenge to the provisions of the Vienna peace settlement (1815) relating to the German states. Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1815-50, there was little real challenge to the provisions of the Vienna peace settlement (1815) relating to the German states should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The political and territorial agreements made in 1815 were still essentially the same in 1850, with the German states remaining confederated as part of the German Bund and with the Austrian Emperor at its head • In the years 1815-48, under the auspices of the Metternich System, the restored order had maintained an apparent iron fist over the radical ideas of nationalism, liberalism and socialism emerging in the German states • There was no significant political revolt or attempted revolution in the German states until 1848. Riots with a social and economic origin, such as those in 1846-47, were swiftly put down by armed force if necessary • The radical political movements emerging in Germany in the period were generally poorly organised with a small social base, often student-led, and with no coherent set of political aims and objectives • The revolutions of 1848-49 had ended in divisions amongst the revolutionaries themselves, e.g. the Frankfurt Parliament, and being put down by the armed forces of the Troppau Protocol powers • Attempts by Prussia to take advantage of the events of 1848-49, with the creation of Erfurt Union, were comprehensively overcome by the humiliation of the Punctation of Olmütz (1850). Arguments and evidence that, in the years 1815-50, there was a real challenge to the provisions of the Vienna peace settlement (1815) relating to the German states should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The growth of German nationalism, particularly after the Hambach Festival (1832), and reflected in the Rhine crisis (1840), presented a real challenge to the nature and organisation of the German Bund • Economic developments, such as the Zollverein and the growth of the railways, provided the foundations for potential alternative political structures and political challenges from the emerging middle-classes • The intensity of the revolutionary activity of 1848-49 in the Austrian Empire, including the resignation of Metternich, fundamentally weakened the power of Austria in Germany for good, despite the counter-revolutions • 1848-49 saw substantive political revolution in the majority of the German states and the creation of a universal German parliament in Frankfurt, which created a constitution and agreed on a future *Kleindeutschland* • The provisions to strengthen Prussia in the west and Austria in the east and south, themselves began to challenge the nature of the German Bund, making a *Kleindeutschland* under Prussia more of a possibility. 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 Crimean War was the most significant factor in the rise of Piedmont as the leading Italian state in the years 1849-59. Arguments and evidence that the Crimean War was the most significant factor in the rise of Piedmont as the leading Italian state in the years 1849-59 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Encouragement from the 'great powers' of Britain and France for Piedmont to enter the Crimean War signified that Piedmont was seen as a significant state in international diplomacy • Piedmont's decision to intervene in the Crimean War, along with the successful actions of its army, indicated that Piedmont was growing in confidence as a state • Piedmont's successful intervention meant that Cavour attended the Congress of Paris (1856) and that, once peace had been negotiated, the delegates agreed to discuss the 'Italian Question' • Piedmont's role in the war brought increased sympathy from Britain and France, which enabled Piedmont to improve its credentials as the Italian state most likely to challenge Austrian influence in Italy • Cavour's meeting with Napoleon III in the aftermath of the war resulted in a diplomatic relationship that would lead to direct French support for, and intervention in, the Second Italian War of Independence • Austrian inaction in the Crimean War signalled a growing weakness in its international standing that Piedmont was able to take advantage of when prosecuting the Second Italian War of Independence (1859). Arguments and evidence that other factors were more significant in the rise of Piedmont as the leading Italian state in the years 1849-59 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Cavour had only reluctantly agreed that Piedmont enter the war, and its intervention had been minimal. At the Congress of Paris, Napoleon III had asked what he could do for Italy but Piedmont was essentially side-lined • Piedmont's intervention in the Crimean War did not lead to any immediate direct support from Britain and France for Piedmont's desire to challenge Austria in Italy; in fact, they became formal allies of Austria • The agreement of Victor Emmanuel II to maintain the *Statuto* established Piedmont as the most politically advanced Italian state after the 1848-49 revolutions • The appointment of Cavour as prime minister (1852) was the turning point in the development of Piedmont as a relatively stable and prosperous state, e.g. his use of the *connubio* and promotion of trade • Economic developments provided a foundation for the rise of Piedmont, e.g. government support for, and sponsorship of, trade treaties and infrastructure plans, industrial growth, particularly in textiles • The Second War of Independence sealed Piedmont's rise as the leading Italian state. Franco-Piedmont collaboration resulted in Austria being forced out of Lombardy and central Italy coming under Piedmont's control. 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