Pearson Edexcel

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2019

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level In History (WHI03) Paper 1C

Paper 3: Thematic Study With Source Evaluation

Option 1C: Germany: United, Divided and Reunited, 1870–1990

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 2019
Publications Code: WHI03_1C_1901_MS

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 3

Section A

Target: **AO2 (25 marks):** Analyse and evaluate appropriate source material, primary and/or contemporary to the period, within its historical context.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
	0	No rewardable material.
1	**1–4**	• Demonstrates surface level comprehension of the source material without analysis, selecting some material relevant to the question, but in the form of direct quotations or paraphrases. • Some relevant contextual knowledge is included, but presented as information rather than applied to the source material. • Evaluation of the source material is assertive with little or no supporting evidence. Concepts of reliability or utility may be addressed, but by making stereotypical judgements.
2	**5–8**	• Demonstrates some understanding of the source material and attempts analysis by selecting and summarising information and making inferences relevant to the question. • Contextual knowledge is added to information from the source material, but mainly to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry but with limited support for judgement. Concepts of reliability or utility are addressed mainly by noting aspects of source provenance and some judgements may be based on questionable assumptions.
3	**9–14**	• Demonstrates understanding of the source material and shows some analysis by selecting key points relevant to the question, explaining their meaning and selecting material to support valid developed inferences. • Detailed knowledge of the historical context is deployed to explain or support inferences as well as to expand, confirm or challenge matters of detail. • Evaluation of the source material is related to the specified enquiry and explanation of utility takes into account relevant considerations such as nature or purpose of the source material or the position of the author. Judgements are based on valid criteria with some justification.
4	**15–20**	• Analyses the source material, interrogating the evidence to make reasoned inferences and to show a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion, although treatment of the two sources may be uneven. • Deploys well-selected knowledge of the historical context, but mainly to illuminate or discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material. Displays some understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and applied, although some of the evaluation may not be fully substantiated. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
5	**21–25**	• Interrogates the evidence of both sources with confidence and discrimination, making reasoned inferences and showing a range of ways the material can be used, for example by distinguishing between information and claim or opinion. • Deploys knowledge of the historical context with precision to illuminate and discuss the limitations of what can be gained from the content of the source material, displaying secure understanding of the need to interpret source material in the context of the values and concerns of the society from which it is drawn. • Evaluation of the source material uses valid criteria which are justified and fully applied. Evaluation takes into account the weight the evidence will bear as part of coming to a judgement and, where appropriate, distinguishes between the degree of certainty with which aspects of it can be used as the basis for claims.

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.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
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 1C: Germany: United, Divided and Reunited, 1870–1990

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 must analyse and evaluate the sources for an enquiry into the nature of opposition within the GDR in the late 1980s. **Source 1** 1.The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • Having been compiled by the state security service, it might be expected to emphasise the threat posed by the opposition • Dated 1989 it can be reflective of the growing opposition in the GDR throughout the period • As an official report, compiled for political consideration, the Stasi might want to embellish the situation to justify its own position. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the nature of opposition within the GDR in the late 1980s. • It claims that a significant amount of the threat to the GDR is external ('leading political forces in the NATO states are working, to develop and promote opposition parties') • It implies that the threat from opposition is existential and growing ('undermine, and politically destabilise the GDR to the point of changing its society') • It suggests that the opposition is increasingly organised and resilient and provides evidence that much of it is being organised by the Protestant churches. 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: • In January and March of 1989 demonstrations were organised in Leipzig. The city was one of the centres of protest against SED dictatorship • Monday night protests after church services were a regular occurrence in the GDR in 1989 • Partially free elections in Eastern Europe mostly supported the anti-Communist movement. This was a clear signal for the people in the GDR that communism was waning.

Question	Indicative content
	Source 2 1.The following points could be made about the origin and nature of the source and applied when evaluating the use of selected information and inferences: • As a journalist he is reporting on events in Berlin that he has witnessed • The date of the article would suggest that the events were fresh in his mind • Being an American journalist, he might take a more critical approach to the reactions of the authorities to opposition. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the nature of opposition within the GDR in the late 1980s. • It claims that the protests were the most serious in Berlin for ten years and that the GDR authorities had to be forceful in dealing with them ('wrestling them…beating them') • It suggests that the youthful nature of the opposition has made the GDR regime fear for its own survival • It implies that many of the reasons for opposition stem from the inflexibility of Honecker's government (' who has resisted Mikhail Gorbachev's appeals for greater openness'). 3. Knowledge of historical context should be deployed to support and develop inferences and to confirm the accuracy/usefulness of information or to note limitations or to challenge aspects of content. Relevant points may include: • Gorbachev's policies of *Perestroika* and *Glasnost* in the USSR encouraged opposition movements throughout Eastern Europe • Leading western music acts such as Genesis and David Bowie performed concerts right next to the Berlin Wall • Popular music was suppressed in the GDR and influential musicians, such as Wolf Biermann, had earlier been expatriated. **Sources 1 and 2** The following points could be made about the sources in combination: • Both sources indicate the importance of western influences in fomenting opposition in the GDR • Source 2 implies that events in the Soviet Union have played a central role in stirring up youth opposition in a way that Source 1 does not • Both sources imply that opposition is growing in strength in the late 1980s.

Section B: Indicative content

Option 1C: Germany: United, Divided and Reunited, 1870–1990

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 the statement that political challenges from the left and the right merely challenged Weimar democracy in the years 1919–24 but were responsible for its collapse in the years 1930–34. Arguments and evidence supporting the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Communist threats to Weimar democracy in both Berlin and Bavaria were crushed in 1919. By December 1924 electoral support for the KPD was declining • The attempted Nazi putsch in Munich 1923 was easily dealt with by the authorities and Hitler was imprisoned. By December 1924 Nazi electoral support was declining • Growing electoral support for the KPD 1930–32 threatened political stability and was partly responsible for growth in support for the Nazis who were committed to ending democracy • By blaming the Reichstag Fire on the Communists Hitler was able to secure the Decree for the Protection of People and State that fundamentally weakened democracy • Street violence perpetrated by the Communists and Nazis, especially in 1932, eroded faith in the ability of the Republic to maintain order leading to demands for change. Arguments and evidence opposing the statement and/or other factors were mainly responsible should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Communist Spartacist League directly challenged the legitimacy of the new republic. Being crushed by the Freikorps rather than the army highlighted the weakness of the early republic • The Kapp putsch 1920 and Hitler's attempted putsch in 1923 showed that right-wing nationalists were prepared to organise armed uprisings against the republic • The world economic crisis after 1929, and its major effects on employment in Germany, fundamentally eroded support for Weimar democracy • President Hindenburg, his use of Article 48 and the actions, intentions and lack of support for the Republic from the German political elites made it difficult for democracy to survive. Other relevant material must be credited.

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's role in the Second Reich in the years 1870–79 and Adenauer's role in the FRG in the years 1949–1960 were equally significant in the development of their nations.' Arguments and evidence supporting the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Both were the dominant politicians and served as Chancellor throughout the periods • Both provided an image of reassuring stability and security, conservative and pragmatic in their approach to politics • Both were influential in helping to formulate constitutions for their new state. These formed the basis for governance • Both were tireless in their efforts to deal with internal opposition. Bismarck through the Kulturkampf and anti-socialist legislation. Adenauer in banning the neo-Nazi Socialist Reich Party • Both were tireless in dealing with external threats. Bismarck's alliances to isolate France and Adenauer's support for the FRG's involvement in NATO and the EEC. Arguments and evidence opposing the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Bismarck's role was greater. As Minister-President of Prussia he was an influential force behind the war of 1870 and the negotiations with the southern states, which created the German Empire • Adenauer's role was greater. He worked tirelessly to integrate ex-Nazis into FRG society. In contrast Bismarck alienated significant sections of the population through policies such as the *Kulturkampf* • Economic factors such as Prussian strength through the *Zollverein* and Erhard's 'Economic miracle' were more important to the development of the new states than Bismarck or Adenauer • Fear of foreign threat was a more important contributor to both the formation of the German Empire and the FRG. France in 1870 and fear of Communist East Germany in 1949 • It was a weak and divided opposition, which allowed both Bismarck and Adenauer to dominate politics. Other relevant material must be credited