



Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2026

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

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"> • 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	<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 democratic government in Germany in 1871.</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">• Sybel, as a respected academic and also an experienced liberal politician, might be expected to welcome any political decisions or structures which might be perceived as being democratic• Sybel was writing at the very start of 1871 just before the formal declaration of the new German Empire and while consideration of a new German constitution was just starting• The tone of the article is hopeful and positive regarding the democratic future of the new German state. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about democratic government in Germany in 1871.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It claims that Germany in 1871 already has many of the institutions needed for a functioning democratic state ('We already have parliaments, a North German and a Prussian one.')• It suggests that Germany needs to be a compromise between traditional Prussian values and new democratic principles ('the good threads of our political tradition are not torn apart carelessly.')• It implies that Germany is well protected against any anti-democratic political tendencies ('represents a significant barrier to any arbitrary absolutism by government.'). <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">• In January 1871, after the victorious war against France, the southern German states joined with the North German Confederation to form new German Empire with a new constitution• The National Liberals, a powerful force in German politics, supported Bismarck's creation of a unified German nation based on what they believed to be a more democratic system of government• Prussia was the dominant political force within the new empire with the Prussian King Wilhelm being crowned Kaiser.

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"> • Bebel, as a leading socialist, might be expected to oppose measures he saw as centralising Prussian control over German political life • His speech was made just a few months after the introduction of the new German constitution but with enough time having elapsed to consider some of the implications of its inception • The language and tone used is broadly hostile to the powers possessed by the Federal government. <p>2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about democratic government in Germany in 1871.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It indicates that Prussia has overridden the liberal inclinations of the smaller German states ('liberal attitudes have completely vanished from the small states.', 'no longer ... resist the pressure... Berlin.') • It implies that Bismarck is deceiving the German people ('he believes... he has become more of a constitutionalist. But what about the reality.') • It claims that Germany is an illusory democracy ('the German Reich Constitution – that is really reactionary.', 'hiding behind a parliamentary framework.'). <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"> • The socialists were a small and relatively new political group attracting only 3.3% of the popular vote in the Reichstag election of March 1871 • Bismarck labelled socialist members of the Reichstag as 'Reichsfeinde', as he viewed them as a threat to the stability of the German state • The German constitution was based on universal manhood suffrage and secret ballots for elections to the Reichstag. <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 accept that Prussian traditional values still play a key role in the German political system • Source 1 takes a more optimistic view of the democratic development of Germany whereas Source 2 believes that Germany has more autocratic tendencies • Source 1 suggests that the smaller German states still have a degree of political autonomy whereas Source 2 suggests that Prussian dominance has browbeaten them into political subservience.

Section B: Indicative content

Option 1D: 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 how accurate it is to say that Ebert's aims for Germany, in the years 1918–24, and Hitler's aims for Germany, in the years 1933–39, were essentially similar.</p> <p>Arguments and evidence supporting the view that Ebert's aims for Germany, in the years 1918–24, and Hitler's aims for Germany, in the years 1933–39, were essentially similar should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Both aimed to restore political stability to Germany following periods of instability caused by war (1916–18) and economic and political dislocation (1930–33) • Both aimed to transform Germany economically. Ebert by taking advantage of the ending of the war and a resumption of exports, and Hitler by turning Germany into a command economy set up for war • Both aimed to enhance Germany's international standing. Ebert by improving relationships with neighbouring states; Hitler by restoring greatness through overthrowing the terms of the Versailles treaty • Both aimed to deal firmly with those on the radical left considered a revolutionary threat to Germany. Ebert through the Ebert-Groener Pact and Hitler using anti-communist purges. <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ebert believed in democracy and aimed to build a system based on the power of the Reichstag. Hitler wanted all power and established himself as Führer on the death of Hindenburg in 1934 • Ebert was determined to turn Germany into a constitutional state after 1918 whilst Hitler, after 1933, was determined to rule free of accepted constitutional restraints • Following the end of the Great War, Ebert was keen to avoid undesirable future wars. By contrast Hitler welcomed future war as the likely consequence of his racial ideology and desire to restore Germany's status • Hitler's policies were aimed at making Germany more overtly centralised with Gleichschaltung neutering regional and local government. The Länder had considerable authority under Ebert • Hitler aimed to completely suppress dissent in Germany through political party bans, and a draconian terror state. Ebert encouraged a nation based around democratic, fair and free elections. <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 whether the USSR and the West share equal responsibility for both the formation and collapse of the GDR.</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 support from both 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 • Intransigence on both sides during the crisis which led to the blockade of Berlin in 1948 increased tensions within Germany making any hopes of reunification even less likely • Ideological differences between both sides made compromise over the course of the Cold War almost impossible and a willingness to push for German unity difficult • The Western allies encouragement for anti-GDR protests in 1989 and the unwillingness of the USSR to aid in their suppression encouraged the collapse of the GDR • Both the Western Allies and the USSR encouraged the removal of Honecker as leader of the GDR in October 1989, which only sped up events leading to the fall of the Berlin Wall. <p>Arguments and evidence opposing the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The USSR had more responsibility as the GDR borders were those of the Soviet zone of occupation and the Soviet occupation authority transferred full administrative rights to the new GDR • The ideological and financial commitment to buffer communist satellite states in Eastern Europe encouraged the formation of the GDR. The ending of this support in 1989 hastened the demise of the GDR • 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 • The Western Allies had more responsibility as they 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 efforts to accomplish it and hasten the end of the GDR, e.g. Kohl's 'Ten Point Programme for 'Overcoming the Division of Germany and Europe' • Neither were responsible for the collapse of the GDR as it was Honecker's unwillingness to reform, when other countries in Eastern Europe did, which weakened his authority and the security of communist rule. <p>Other relevant material must be credited.</p>