Mark Scheme (Results)

June 2024

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

June 2024
Question Paper Log Number P75800A
Publications Code WHI03_1C_2406_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 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. Other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited. Candidates must analyse and evaluate the sources to investigate the ending of the Second Reich in November 1918. **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: • Brecht was a senior government official and so might be expected to have a sound understanding of the unfolding political events he had witnessed • Brecht was writing many years after the events described, with the advantage of hindsight as to how the events had developed • Brecht tries to outline the facts relating to the events in an objective manner. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the ending of the Second Reich in November 1918. • It indicates that there was external pressure being applied to bring about the downfall of the monarchy ('result of this communication, the issue of the Kaiser's abdication moved into the centre of debates.) • It claims that the ending of the Second Reich was sparked by the naval mutiny at Kiel ('The German Revolution of November 1918 did not start… but in Kiel among the sailors.) • It implies that drastic action was necessary to avoid a social upheaval in Germany ('ever more difficult to restrain the masses in Berlin.',' thus to avoid violent revolution.'). 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 Kiel, sailors, soldiers, and workers began electing Workers' and Soldiers' Councils modelled after the Soviets of the Russian Revolution of 1917 • Allied military offensives, after August 1918, had brought the German military to the brink of defeat • On 9 November 1918, the 'German Republic' was proclaimed by Philipp Scheidemann outside the Reichstag building in Berlin.

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: • Wilhelm, as Kaiser, was central to the events he is describing • Wilhelm, in his memoirs, might want to portray his actions in the best possible light • The tone and language used is bitter as to the events leading up to abdication. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the ending of the Second Reich in November 1918. • Wilhelm claims that he acted in the best interests of his people throughout ('I wished to spare my people civil war.',' If my abdication was indeed the only way to prevent bloodshed, I was willing…') • He indicates that his abdication was announced before he had agreed to it ('consider my position and my decision would be...' 'Prince Max… own initiative, had already announced my abdication.') • It indicates that he hoped to cling to power by trying to retain the title, King of Prussia, with all the constitutional privileges that post held ('renounce the Imperial throne… not to abdicate as King of Prussia.') • He implies that he was wronged by being asked to abdicate and indicates that it achieved nothing ('Sacrificing my position was in vain.', 'nor did it prevent civil war'). 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: • On 7 November, Prince Max met with Friedrich Ebert, leader of the SPD, and discussed his plan to convince Wilhelm II to abdicate • Prince Max originally intended there to be a regency under another member of the Hohenzollern family • Following the abdication of the monarchy negotiations towards a ceasefire accelerated. On 11 November 1918, an armistice was signed at Compiègne by German representatives. **Sources 1 and 2** The following points could be made about the sources in combination: • Both sources indicate that Friedrich Ebert played a central role in the events which led to the end of the Second Reich • Both sources indicate that Germany was on the brink of civil war at this time • Source 1 highlights the role played by President Wilson and the allies in hastening the end of the Second Empire in a way that Source 2 doesn't.

Section B: Indicative content

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

Question	Indicative content
2	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on the extent to which the nature of Bismarck's to government in the years 1870–79 was similar to the nature of Adenauer's government in the years 1949–60. 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. They were both conservative and pragmatic in their approach to government • Both projected themselves as being a strong and stable presence for turbulent times; Bismarck to restore Germany's political stability following the Franco-Prussian War and Adenauer following the Second World War • Both were influential in helping to formulate constitutions for their new state. Adherence to these constitutions formed the basis of governance for both • Neither Bismarck nor Adenauer were Head of State but in practice they both marginalised their titular superiors while retaining good relations with them • 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 was able to use the constitutional position of Chancellor in relation to the Kaiser to avoid being dictated to by the Reichstag. Adenauer, by contrast, fully supported the parliamentary system • Adenauer encouraged Erhard to develop 'social free market' economics, which was fundamentally different to Bismarck's support for economic protection • Bismarck was hostile to those whom he perceived as *Reichsfeinde*. Adenauer, by contrast, was prepared to work with ex-Nazis and even appoint them to his cabinet • Bismarck remained hostile to France throughout the period, whereas Adenauer looked to build alliances through European co-operation. Other relevant material must be credited.

	Indicative content
3	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. Candidates are expected to reach a judgement on whether economic problems were mainly responsible for both the collapse of Weimar democracy in the years 1930–34 and for the collapse of the GDR in the years 1989–90. Arguments and evidence supporting the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Economic difficulties after 1929 led to an unemployment rate of 6 million by 1932. This undermined the stability of the Weimar governments and threatened democratic government • Growing economic crisis had a major impact on the appeal of the NSDAP who were hostile to the notion of parliamentary democracy. By July 1932, the Nazis had 230 seats in the Reichstag • Reparations payments, up to 1932, both undermined economic growth and enabled political extremists to use xenophobia as an appeal for support • Honecker's unwillingness to introduce economic reform when other countries in Eastern Europe did so, weakened his authority and the security of communist rule • After 1985, Gorbachev began winding back financial assistance to the GDR thus helping to speed up the decline of their economy and encourage an exodus of refugees, which accelerated in 1989. Arguments and evidence opposing the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Political manoeuvring by politicians such as von Papen, von Schleicher and Von Hindenburg helped Hitler to get into a position of power to undermine Weimar democracy • Growing terror in 1933–34, using the Decree for the Protection of the People and the State and the Night of the Long Knives, gave overall momentum to support for the Nazis' efforts to undermine democracy • In 1989, 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 • Gorbachev visited the GDR on the 7th of October 1989 and made it clear he would no longer support Honecker's government. This further encouraged dissent and popular protest • 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