



Pearson

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2018

Pearson International Advanced Level
In History

WHI03: 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 2018

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

General marking guidance

- All candidates must receive the same treatment. Examiners must mark the last candidate in exactly the same way as they mark the first.
- 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.
- All the marks on the mark scheme are designed to be awarded. Examiners should always award full marks if deserved. Examiners should also be prepared to award zero marks if the candidate's response is not worthy of credit according to the mark scheme.
- 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

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 their professional judgement to decide which level is most appropriate.

Placing 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.

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.

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 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	
1	<p>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 that is indicated as relevant. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the reasons for the growing electoral popularity of the Nazis in 1930.</p> <p>Source 1</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Solmitz was an eyewitness to the events she is describing• Being diary entries they might be expected to reveal her true feelings• Despite her husband being Jewish, the tone of the source is one of admiration for Hitler and the organisational skills of the Nazis. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons for the growing electoral popularity of the Nazis in 1930:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It claims that the crowd was enormous and drawn from all ages and classes indicating a broad popular appeal• It implies that Hitler presented himself as an ordinary man of the people• It claims that Hitler was viewed by many in reverential terms. <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In the election of September 1930 the Nazis won 107 seats, becoming the second largest party in the Reichstag• The communists polled over 13% of the popular vote highlighting the growing polarisation of opinion in Germany and persuading

Question	
	<p>many that the Nazis were best placed to counter this</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Propaganda during the campaign emphasised the importance of the Führerprinzip, which was popular with those looking to a return of strong leadership in Germany. <p>Source 2</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The purpose of the manifesto was to outline the policies of the National Socialist party and appeal to a wide section of the voters • The tone of the manifesto is condemnatory of other political parties • The tone of the manifesto is avowedly nationalistic. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons for the growing electoral popularity of the Nazis in 1930:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It claims that National Socialist victory is assured but also implies that the struggle will be a long one • It implies that the 1920s has been a wasted decade for Germany • It claims that, unlike the Nazis, other politicians are mendacious. <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The election took place against a backdrop of economic uncertainty and rising unemployment • Hitler campaigned countrywide, attending hundreds of political rallies, in a professional and well-orchestrated campaign in which he offered Germans hope of a better future • The Nazi electoral breakthrough came in the September 1930 election with particularly strong support coming in rural areas such as East Prussia and Schleswig-Holstein. <p>Sources 1 and 2</p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p>

Question	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both sources lay the blame for Germany's ills on existing politicians • Both sources portray the National Socialists as the saviours of the nation • Source 1 emphasises the centrality of Hitler's personality to the Nazi cause in a way that Source 2, with its emphasis on Nazi ideology, does not.

Section B: Indicative content

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

Question	
<p>2</p>	<p>Answers will be credited according to their 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.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how accurate it is to say that the Weimar constitution of 1919 differed considerably, on most important points, from the German constitution of 1871.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence that point to considerable differences should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There were considerable differences in the political structure created by the constitutions. Under the Weimar constitution Germany was to be a Republic. In 1871 it was an empire • Under the Weimar constitution the Head of State was the elected President. In 1871 the Head of State was the Kaiser who was always to be the King of Prussia • There were considerable differences in the position of the Chancellor. In 1919 the Chancellor was accountable to the Reichstag whereas in 1871 he was answerable to the Kaiser • Voting for the Reichstag differed considerably. In 1919 all eligible men and women over the age of 21 could vote. In 1871 it was only eligible men over the age of 25 • Under the Weimar constitution basic rights were established as to the German state's responsibility for welfare. This was not the case in 1871 • Under the Weimar constitution the army was to be united as a national German body. In 1871 it consisted of four different Länder armies under Prussian control. <p>Arguments and evidence that point to similarities should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p>

3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both were federal states with considerable powers given to the Länder • Both had an elected Reichstag and so, to varying degrees, embraced the important principle of participatory politics • Both had a bi-cameral system in which the Bundesrat and the Reichsrat represented the interests of the Länder • Under both the head of government was the Chancellor • Under both the Chancellor was appointed either by the Kaiser after 1871 or the President after 1919. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p> <p>Answers will be credited according to their 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.</p> <p>Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the statement that the USSR played the key role in both the formation of, and the collapse of, the GDR.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The GDR borders were those of the Soviet zone of occupation and the Soviet occupation authority transferred full administrative rights to the new GDR • Soviet desire for buffer communist satellite states in Eastern Europe encouraged the formation of the GDR after the formation of the FRG • The Soviet-led blockade of Berlin in 1948 increased tensions within Germany making any hopes of reunification even less likely • After 1985 Gorbachev began winding back both financial and military assistance to the GDR, thus helping to speed up the decline of their economy and encourage an exodus of refugees • Gorbachev visited the GDR on 7 October 1989 and made it clear he would no longer support Honecker's government. This further encouraged dissent and popular protest. <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The partition of Germany in 1945 and subsequent Cold War tensions, made it almost certain that, at some time, separate 'west'
---	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

and 'east' countries would be formed

- The Allies accepted, at the London conference 1948, that a permanent division of Germany was likely. This hastened the formation of the FRG and subsequently the GDR
- Honecker's unwillingness to reform, when other countries in Eastern Europe did, weakened his authority and the security of communist rule
- The opening up of borders by neighbouring states and the willingness of the FRG to accept 20,000 East German refugees in September helped create a refugee crisis threatening GDR stability
- The collapse of the Berlin Wall hastened the demise of the GDR.

Other relevant material must be credited.