Pearson Edexcel

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 2023

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 2023
Publication Code: WHI03_1A_MS_2301
All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2301

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 approach of the Nazi regime to dealing with opposition in the years 1933-34. **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 author was an eyewitness to the events he is describing. He was a well-educated observer living in the capital city, Berlin, at the time • It was written six years after the events being described, when he was in exile, but appears not to have been intended for publication • The language used and tone of the source appear saddened by the events he describes and display a feeling of helplessness. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the approach of the Nazi regime to dealing with opposition in the years 1933-34. • It claims that the political landscape and German society were changing at an alarming rate ('Every day one looked around and something else had gone.') • It suggests that there was a deliberate attempt to create an intimidatory atmosphere based around the use of threats and violence ('Famous people… disappeared into exile', 'More unsettling was') • It implies that across a wide range of areas the regime was successful in imposing its political will on the German people ('Readers were deprived of their world overnight.'). 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 Nazi party retained extensive support, as evidenced through the ballot box, for dealing with their political opponents • Extensive powers of coercion had been legally granted to the Nazi regime through the Decree for the Protection of People and the State and the Enabling Law • The policy of Gleichschaltung began to be implemented in 1933 to

Question	Indicative content
	coordinate German institutions into an acceptance of Nazi rule. **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 written and published in the weeks after the events might have allowed time to reflect and consider viewpoints other than those disseminated by the Nazi regime • Reporting for an American magazine might allow a more neutral perspective on events • The language used and tone of the article suggest scepticism as to the rationale for dealing with opponents. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the approach of the Nazi regime to dealing with opposition in the years 1933-34. • It provides evidence of the concerted propaganda methods used by the regime to justify their actions in dealing with opponents ('rigged up loudspeakers in almost every public square throughout the Fatherland.') • It suggests that the invocation of the Führerprinzip was seen as a central tool to quell any potential opposition ('In this hour of danger, I was responsible for the fate of the German nation') • It suggests that the regime's political opponents in the Reichstag lacked the will to overtly resist ('The other Deputies turned out to cheer him, thanking their luck for having survived.'). 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 Reichswehr, as well as leading Nazis such as Himmler and Goering, viewed the SA as a threat and so persuaded Hitler that they needed to be dealt with • Nazi propaganda presented the murders as a preventive measure against an alleged imminent coup by the SA under Röhm – the so-called Röhm Putsch • Hitler posed as the saviour of the German people. **Sources 1 and 2** The following points could be made about the sources in combination: • Both sources point to the use of force and intimidation to deal with political opponents

Question	Indicative content
	• Both sources reference the importance of controlling the media in dealing with opposition • Source 1 is more detailed and wide-ranging in its explanation of the methods used to control whilst Source 2 is more specifically about dealing with internal Nazi political opponents.

Section B: Indicative content
Option 1A: 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 statement that there was little meaningful cooperation between Germany and its international neighbours in the years 1870-1939. 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 between the two nations • The terms of the Treaty of Versailles, and the perception in Germany of it being a 'diktat', inflamed significant sections of German society against meaningful cooperation with her neighbours • 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 alarmed the international community and Germany's immediate neighbours • Anschluss with Austria in 1938 led Hitler to the conclusion that he could use more aggressive tactics in his 'roadmap' to expand Nazi Germany. Arguments and evidence opposing the statement and/or that other factors were more important should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Bismarck showed some willingness to cooperate with his neighbours by

	ending the War in Sight crisis (1875) to avoid escalation • In signing the Dual Alliance with Austria (1879) Bismarck defused tension with a neighbouring state and helped unite his nation by portraying Germany as a peacemaker and preserver of the European status quo • Germany had better relationships when Stresemann and Briand worked more closely together, e.g. Locarno Pact, 1925 • Some French governments in the 1930s followed a policy of appeasing Germany as an attempt to reduce hostility and encourage cooperation • The Anglo-German Naval Treaty (1935) was an ambitious attempt on the part of both the British and the Germans to reach better relations by placing limits on the sizes of their navies. Other relevant material must be credited.

Question	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 the statement that the Western powers played the key role in both the formation of, and the collapse of, the GDR. Arguments and evidence supporting the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The support, from the Western Allies, for 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 Western 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 • The willingness of the FRG to accept 20,000 East German refugees in September 1989 helped create a refugee crisis threatening GDR stability • American support for reunification emboldened Chancellor Kohl to speed up his efforts to accomplish it, e.g. Kohl's announcement of a detailed 'Ten Point Programme for 'Overcoming the Division of Germany and Europe'.

	Arguments and evidence opposing the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • 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 • Honecker's unwillingness to reform, when other countries in Eastern Europe did, weakened his authority and the security of communist rule. 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