GradeMax



Mark Scheme (Results)

October 2018

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced Level in History (WHI03/1C)

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

October 2018
Publications Code WHI03_1C_History_58207_1810_MS
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**	• 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 to investigate the political problems confronting the Weimar Republic in 1923. 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: • As one who deliberately travelled to Bavaria he would have seen at first hand the fervent and growing opposition to the Republic • Reporting for a British newspaper might allow a more neutral perspective on events • The title of the article might indicate the viewpoint of the journalist. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the political problems confronting the Weimar Republic in 1923: • It claims that aggressive anti-Republic sentiment is deep seated in Bavaria and partly fuelled by regional resentment of North Germany • It implies that there is major political confusion in Bavaria • It suggests that Adolf Hitler is a growing influence on anti-Republic politics in Bavaria ('pushed his way to the front of these opponents'). 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: • Nazi party membership was growing especially in Bavaria • Kaiser Wilhelm II, in exile in Holland, still retained extensive support within Germany • Growing economic turmoil, especially caused by the collapse in pensions and savings, threatened political stability in 1923.

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: • Being a personal letter to her American friend it might be expected to be candid in its content • Being in Germany at the time meant that Smedley witnessed these events first hand • Being American might allow her a more dispassionate view of the events she is describing. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the political problems confronting the Weimar Republic in 1923: • It claims that opposition to the Republic exists beyond Bavaria and spans the political spectrum • It implies that opponents of the Republic are being manipulated by others • It suggests that workers who might be expected to support the Republic are growing increasingly hostile to it (‘not the class we usually think of’). 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: • Armed Communist and right wing militaristic (Freikorps) challenges to the authority of the Republic had been a common feature of the years to 1923 • Violence and political assassinations were a regular feature of Weimar politics • Growing disenchantment with spiralling hyperinflation were further fuelling resentment and challenges to the Republic in 1923. Sources 1 and 2 The following points could be made about the sources in combination: • Both sources highlight growing aggressive opposition to the Republic particularly in Bavaria but Source 2 also ranges wider geographically in its observations • Source 1 alone emphasises the particular role played by Adolf Hitler • Both sources emphasise that extensive support for the monarchy remains evident in Germany at this time. Other relevant material must be credited.

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 how accurate it is to say that the nature of the government of the Federal Republic of Germany in the years 1949–60 was completely different from that of the Nazi regime in the years 1933–39. Differences in the nature of the Federal government from that of the Nazi regime should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Basic Law (1949) guaranteed multiparty democracy and included safeguards against anti-democratic political parties. This was not the case under the Nazis • Free elections were a regular feature of politics in the FRG 1949–60. These were ended within the first year of the Nazi regime • The government of the FRG was based around the separation of powers of the President, the Chancellor and the commander of the armed forces to prevent the re-emergence of a demagogue such as Hitler • Government in the FRG was based on a commitment to the basic democratic principles of freedom of expression and assembly. These principles had been eroded by the Reichstag Fire Decree in 1933 • The commitment to and support of the de-Nazification programme implemented after 1949 • The commitment to and implementation of social market policies by the government of the period as opposed to the control and demand policies of the Nazi era. Areas of similarity and/or continuity should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The banning of political parties such as the Reich Socialist Party in 1952 and the Communist Party (KPD) in 1956 had some similarities to the actions of the Nazis • The political domination of one man, Konrad Adenauer, as Chancellor throughout the period 1949–60 had similarities to the authoritarian nature of the Nazi regime • The attempts by Adenauer to restrict some elements of free speech and to arrogate most major decisions to himself, treating his ministers as mere extensions of his authority • The presence of former Nazi members in key political and government positions, e.g. Adenauer's head of the chancellery, Globke. 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 confrontation rather than cooperation marked Germany's relationship with France in the years 1870–1990. Arguments and evidence supporting the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The defeat of France in 1871 and the proclamation of the German Empire in the Palace of Versailles created rancour between the two nations • The German annexation of Alsace and Lorraine and their return to France in 1919 produced a long-running territorial dispute which fuelled hostility • French occupation of the Ruhr in 1923, in pursuit of reparations, further produced confrontation • Hitler's rearmament policies, overt nationalist rhetoric and the reoccupation of the Rhineland in 1936 whipped up confrontation with France • Political disquiet in the early years of the FRG was caused by France, as an occupying power, retaining a legislative influence • Proposals for German reunification in 1990 were met with some hostility by the French President Francois Mitterrand. Arguments and evidence opposing the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Some French governments in the 1930s followed a policy of appeasing Germany as an attempt to reduce hostility and encourage cooperation • The FRG and France cooperated closely on developing a strong European identity through the establishment of European institutions • Adenauer encouraged closer economic cooperation with France firstly through the European Coal and Steel Community 1951 and then the European Economic Community in 1957 • After lengthy discussion and compromise, France supported both the General Treaty on Germany and the membership of the FRG in NATO in 1955 • France was a signatory to the 'Treaty on the Final Settlement with Respect to Germany' 1990 which brought about the reunification of Germany. Other relevant material must be credited.