GradeMax



Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2017

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level
In History (WHI01)

Paper 3: Thematic Study with Source Evaluation

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



Edexcel, BTEC and LCCI qualifications

Edexcel, BTEC and LCCI qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body offering academic and vocational qualifications that are globally recognised and benchmarked. For further information, please visit our qualification websites at www.edexcel.com, www.btec.co.uk or www.lcci.org.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus

About Pearson

Pearson is the world's leading learning company, with 40,000 employees in more than 70 countries working to help people of all ages to make measurable progress in their lives through learning. We put the learner at the centre of everything we do, because wherever learning flourishes, so do people. Find out more about how we can help you and your learners at: www.pearson.com/uk

January 2017
Publication Code WHI03_1C_1701_MS
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2017

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**	• 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.

Level	Mark	Descriptor
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.
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.

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 that is indicated as relevant. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to consider how far the historian could make use of them to investigate the significance of Bismarck to the consolidation of the new German state in the years 1871-79. 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: • The speech is by Bismarck himself and would look to reinforce his credentials as a great patriot • Dated in 1881 it allows him to reflect on the whole period of consolidation 1871-79 • His self-aggrandisement was well known and reflected in the nature of the speech. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the significance of Bismarck to the consolidation of the new German state 1871-79: • It provides evidence of his commitment to the cause of national unity • It shows an understanding that he may have promoted unpopular policies • It claims that he is flexible in his viewpoint and open to criticism in his unstinting pursuit of the consolidation of the state. 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: • Unstinting support for the launching and subsequent continuation of the Kulturkampf suggested a lack of flexibility • Bismarck's alliance with and subsequent ditching of the National Liberals hints at either flexibility or political realpolitik • Over 100 acts were passed to bring administrative and economic unity. These included introducing a Reichsbank, a single currency and new commercial and legal codes.

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:

- Eugen Richter was the leader of the Progress Party and took a much more liberal view to governance
- He was a formidable opponent of Bismarck in Reichstag debates
- The tone of the source reflects his personal hostility to Bismarck's style of governance.

2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the significance of Bismarck to the consolidation of the new German state in the years 1871-79:

- It claims that Bismarck adopted an intolerant attitude to those who had differing views to his own
- It implies that the government has been deliberately provocative in attacking various religions
- It implies that his arrogance and lack of appealing for consensus has led to abrasive politics.

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:

- The failure of the Kulturkampf forced Bismarck into looking for other Reichsfeinde
- Bismarck's decision to distance himself from the National Liberals and build a more protectionist conservative alliance necessitated targeting the newly emerging socialist challenge
- The assassination attempts on the Kaiser when linked to the perceived socialist threat, as seen during the Paris Commune, enabled broad support for an anti-socialist policy.

Sources 1 and 2

The following points could be made about the sources in combination:

- Source 1 suggests that Bismarck was primarily concerned with unity whereas Source 2 suggests he was fomenting division
- Source 2 implies that Bismarck's claim to 'have never been politically unbending and inflexible' in Source 1 is incorrect
- The sources show conflicting views as to what was the national aim.

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 that is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on how significant the nature of the Weimar Constitution (1919) was in explaining the rise of the Nazis in the years 1930-33. Arguments and evidence supporting the significance of the Weimar Constitution should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The introduction of proportional representation for voting helped small fringe parties such as the Nazis establish themselves electorally • The growth of a range of smaller parties made coalition governments the norm, thus leading to instability and dissatisfaction with conventional political leadership 1930-33 • The use of article 48 to effectively bring in presidential government (1930-33) created further political instability and made the promises of the Nazis more electorally appealing • The stipulation of a 2/3rd Reichstag majority in the constitution was used to pass the Enabling Act 1933. Arguments and evidence countering its significance should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The leniency of the judiciary to Hitler in 1923-24 helped him establish himself as a national politician • External factors such as the growing economic crisis had a greater impact on the growing appeal of the NSDAP • The political manoeuvring of Von Papen and Von Schleicher, as well as others, help explain Hitler's appointment as Chancellor • Clever propaganda and cultivation of the image of Hitler partly explain the Nazis popularity throughout this period • Events such as the Reichstag Fire gave opportunities to the Nazis to vilify their opponents • Growing terror in 1932-33, using the Decree for the Protection of People and the State, gave overall momentum to support for the Nazis. 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 that is indicated as relevant. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the extent to which the post-war economic success of the FRG was responsible for the undermining of the East German state and its eventual collapse in 1989. Arguments and evidence supporting its responsibility should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Erhard's liberal economic policies, embracing a free market economy, created an 'economic miracle' which was not replicated in the GDR • The involvement of the FRG in the move towards greater European unity in the 1950s provided it with access to a larger market, this was not available to the GDR • The GDR's command economy had never kept pace with economic growth in the FRG • The GDR was heavily dependent on loans from West Germany • The economic disparity established in the 1950s and even more apparent in the late 1980s between the FRG and the GDR fatally undermined support for the GDR • The East German economy was one of the strongest in the Soviet Bloc but still unable to provide the standard of living enjoyed in the West. Arguments and evidence countering its responsibility should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: reduction of • Reform in the USSR meant a 50 per cent reduction in military expenditure on maintaining communist states in Eastern Europe • Policies of Perestroika and Glasnost in the Soviet Union suggested that the allegiance to the age of command economies was gone • The unwillingness of Honecker to reform when other countries in the region were doing so exacerbated political discontent • The opening up of borders by countries such as Hungary offered escape routes to citizens of the GDR, which created panic in their government, as it felt it was losing control over its citizens • The collapse of the Berlin Wall hastened the demise of the GDR. 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