



Mark scheme (Results)

January 2025

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

January 2025

Question Paper P76213A

Publication Code: WHI03_1C_2501_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

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.

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	<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"><li data-bbox="408 253 1390 383">• 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.<li data-bbox="408 398 1401 562">• 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.<li data-bbox="408 577 1406 734">• 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	Indicative content
1	<p>Answers will be credited according to their deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the generic mark scheme.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to investigate the leadership of Erich Honecker in the GDR in the years 1985-89.</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"> • As one who deliberately travelled throughout Germany, he would have seen at first hand and interviewed people as to their feelings towards Erich Honecker • Sommer was writing in 1986, before the upsurge in problems that ultimately brought down Honecker's government and caused the collapse of the GDR • The tone of the article is very positive towards Honecker and can be said to reflect the views of someone who wanted to build better relationships between the FRG and the GDR. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the leadership of Erich Honecker in the GDR in the years 1985-89.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It indicates that the GDR is a good place to live because of Honecker ('The country embraces change instead of stagnation.', 'Above all, the country seems more content') • It claims that Honecker is a dynamic initiator of change in the GDR ('Most reforms can be credited to Honecker.', 'He believes in getting things done:') • It suggests that, despite not overtly promoting a cult of personality, one had developed anyway ('The citizens of the GDR show him what almost amounts to quiet admiration', 'about the secret affection'). <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"> • Under Honecker, the GDR gave greater welfare security to its citizens than the FRG. High state spending and subsidies for food and housing gave security from hunger, want, homelessness or unemployment • The East German economy was one of the strongest in the Soviet Bloc but it was also a tightly regulated police state where too much dissent towards the leadership was not tolerated • Under Honecker, the GDR did begin to normalise relations with the FRG. In 1986, he signalled his intention to have a state visit to the FRG.

Question	Indicative content
	<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"> • As a senior American diplomat to the GDR, Bindenagel would be expected to keep abreast of all developments and present accurate information to his own government • The language used and tone of the telegram is one of cautious optimism that things will improve in the GDR following the removal of Honecker • The confidential nature of the telegram enabled Bindenagel to be candid in his observations. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the leadership of Erich Honecker in the GDR in the years 1985-89.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It indicates that Honecker, in his later years, became out of touch with events in the GDR ('particularly that the Party under Honecker, had not listened to their complaints') • It suggests that Honecker's leadership had become a severe brake on the development of the GDR ('now eager to use the Bishops ... whereas Honecker had refused discussion for the last two years.') • It claims that, following Honecker's removal, there was a palpable sense that the GDR was changing ('<i>Neues Deutschland</i>, sought to emphasise change in an editorial'). <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"> • Growing political discontent in the GDR in 1989, over the unwillingness of Honecker to reform when other countries in the region were doing so, exacerbated discontent and helped fuel calls for reunification • The withdrawal of much of the support of the Soviet Union, following Gorbachev's policies of Perestroika and Glasnost, undermined Honecker and contributed to his political downfall • Egon Krenz lasted less than two months as leader of the GDR, in comparison to the 18 years of Erich Honecker. <p>Sources 1 and 2</p> <p>The following points could be made about the sources in combination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both sources make the claim that Honecker had been an influential leader, although Source 1 more so than Source 2 • Source 1 eulogises Honecker to an extent, whereas Source 2 seeks to denigrate him • Source 1 presents Honecker as a flexible and pragmatic political leader, whereas Source 2 presents him as inflexible and ideologically dogmatic.

Section B: Indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
2	<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 whether Communist opposition posed a serious threat to the governments of Germany in the years 1919-24 and 1930-39.</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 Spartacist Rising seriously challenged the new democratic government forcing it to convene in Weimar in 1919 because the streets of Berlin were too dangerous • The level of violence employed by the Freikorps, such as the murders of Liebknecht and Luxemburg, suggest that the Communist threat was considered serious • The 'Red Rising' in the Ruhr in 1920 raised a force of over 50,000 workers to seize control of the industrial plants of the Ruhr. The KPD in December 1920 had nearly half a million members • In the November 1932 election the KPD increased its share of the vote unlike the Nazis and the SPD. The fortunes of the Communists seemed to be on the rise thus posing a threat to the Republic • The seriousness with which the Communist threat of political revolution was taken is evident from Hindenburg's readiness to grant Hitler 'Emergency Powers' after the Reichstag Fire. <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communist political violence 1919–23 was put down easily as Ebert had the support of the Freikorps. He also used Article 48 of the constitution to mobilise the army against threats to the government • The spate of Communist risings 1919–23 had little chance of success, as the majority of workers remained loyal to the SPD-led government • Although the KPD nearly doubled its number of seats in the Reichstag between 1928 and 1932, support for the Communists did not expand beyond their traditional working-class base • Communist association with the Reichstag Fire proved useful to the Nazis. Hitler used Emergency Powers to arrest thousands of Communists, close down their newspapers and ban their meetings • Underground Communist resistance to the Nazi regime existed between 1933 and 1939, but it was limited in its ability to challenge the government and was seriously undermined by the Gestapo. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

Question	Indicative content
3	<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 significant was the leadership of Ebert to the formation of a democratic German state in the years 1918-24 and the leadership of Adenauer to the formation of a democratic West German state in the years 1949-60.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the significance of the leadership of Ebert to the formation of a democratic German state in the years 1918-24 and the leadership of Adenauer to the formation of a democratic West German state in the years 1949-60 should be analysed and evaluated.</p> <p>Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ebert played a key role in the establishment of the German Republic and took responsibility as its first President. He was influential in supporting the drafting of a democratic constitution • Ebert confronted the violent and radical challenges that threatened revolution in Germany by the pact with Groener, which played a part in restoring stability • Adenauer enabled the smooth formation of a democratic German state after 1949 by enabling former Nazis to reconcile themselves with democracy • The 1957 election victory was a personal triumph for Adenauer with the CDU/CSU winning 50.2% of votes. He captured the moderate conservatism of voters to consolidate the new democracy • Adenauer ensured that the FRG became a member of the ECSC, NATO and the EEC, which brought greater security and economic prosperity to Germany, thus strengthening the new democracy. <p>Arguments and evidence countering the significance should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ebert failed to reform the military leadership and power remained with the Prussian elite. Ebert relied on the Freikorps to suppress risings, which set a dangerous precedent • Ebert was linked with the acceptance of the Versailles Settlement which, to many, undermined the legitimacy of the Weimar Republic • Adenauer was not Head of State, yet he worked hard to marginalise his titular superior, thereby undermining elements of the democratic structure of the FRG • Under Adenauer the continuation of personnel from the Nazi period and the intolerance of dissent suggested that the system and the population still had work to do to become a well-functioning democracy • It was a constitutional commission, in both 1919 and 1949, that produced the eventual draft constitutions for Germany. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>

