

Mark Scheme (Results)

January 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

January 2026

Question Paper Log Number P78984A

Publication Code WHI03_1C_2601_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd

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 reasons for the Anschluss (1938). 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: • Fodor was writing in 1936, three years after Hitler came to power, by which time he would have been able to track clearly the spread of Nazi ideology within Austria • The author was an eyewitness to some of the events he is describing. He was a well-informed observer living in Austria at the time • As someone who had offended the Nazis in some way, he might be expected to be critical of their actions in his article. The tone of the source seems to support this. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons for the Anschluss (1938). • The source claims that Anschluss had been long demanded by many Germans ('is an old idea', 'The idea of union was strong before') • The source implies that support for Anschluss in Austria was waning which helped fuel German demands to push for it ('previously desired to join Germany', 'Social Democrats ... turned away from the idea') • The source indicates that the authorities missed opportunities to suppress calls for Anschluss and thereby encouraged them ('failed to take the opportunity to break up the Austrian Nazi organisation'). 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 idea of a <i>Grossdeutschland</i>, incorporating all Germans into one nation, had been one pre-dating German unification in the 1870s • Hitler was Austrian by birth and so committed to the idea of Anschluss from an early age • Hitler's determination to overturn the Treaty of Versailles had been well documented in both <i>Mein Kampf</i> (1924) and his <i>Zweites Buch</i> (1928). 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: • Schuschnigg, as Austrian Chancellor, might be expected to have a good understanding of the events and issues surrounding Anschluss

Question	Indicative content
	- Schuschnigg might be expected to try to present his actions in the best possible light to exculpate himself over Anschluss - The tone and language used is angry and regretful of the decisions that have had to be made. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about the reasons for the Anschluss (1938). - The source claims that the decision to allow Anschluss has been difficult but necessary for Austria ('tragic and decisive situation.', 'details of the disastrous events of today.') - The source indicates that Anschluss has been forced on Austria ('This ultimatum', 'did not comply with this, then German troops would invade Austria.') - The source indicates that the Austrian government has been undermined by a carefully organised German disinformation campaign ('reports that have been circulating', 'These are all lies') - The source suggests that Anschluss had been allowed partly as a result of the altruism of the Austrian government ('we are not prepared, even in this terrible situation, to shed blood.'). 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 early February 1938, Schuschnigg met with Hitler and, under great pressure, agreed to Anschluss. Once back in Austria, he decided to call a national plebiscite on the issue - Faced with the uncertainty of not getting a favourable result from the national plebiscite, Hitler decided to issue an ultimatum to the Austrian government - Anschluss was confirmed by an April 1938 plebiscite (99.7 per cent), itself almost certainly rigged. Sources 1 and 2 The following points could be made about the sources in combination: - Both sources indicate Germany's determination to bring Anschluss about - Both sources highlight weakness on the part of the Austrian government - Source 1 highlights the longer-term factors that led to Anschluss, whilst Source 2 concentrates on the more immediate events.

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 how accurate it is to say that Weimar Germany, in the years 1919-24, was much more democratic than Bismarck's Germany in the years 1870-79. Arguments and evidence supporting the view that it is accurate to say that Weimar Germany, in the years 1919-24, was much more democratic than Bismarck's Germany in the years 1870-79 should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Weimar Germany was a Republic with an elected President. By contrast, Germany after 1871 remained an empire with the King of Prussia always appointed Emperor. • In Weimar Germany, the principle for voting was Universal Suffrage. Elections to the Reichstag after 1870 were based on the narrower principle of Universal Manhood Suffrage only • Under the Weimar Constitution, basic rights were established as to the German state's responsibilities. This was not the case in the constitution of 1871 • Under the Weimar Constitution, the army was to be united as a national German body, constitutionally responsible to an elected President. In 1871, it comprised four Länder armies under Prussian monarchical control • Unlike after 1918, Prussia, after 1871, held dominance over the Bundesrat with representatives sent chosen by the Landtag, which had been elected using an undemocratic, property-based, three-tier voting system. Arguments and evidence countering the view should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Both had written constitutions that introduced new political structures with democratic features, e.g. an elected Reichstag utilising a secret ballot • Both had an elected Reichstag and so, to varying degrees, embraced the important principle of widespread participatory politics • Both constitutions recognised that the Head of State wielded considerable power, as Kaiser after 1870 and through the potential to use Article 48 for the President of the Weimar Republic • Both were federal states where significant political powers were given to the Länder • Both had a bi-cameral political system in which the Bundesrat and Reichsrat helped to ameliorate executive decisions and protect the interests of the Länder

- | | |
|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Demands for meaningful and further democratic change, from political opponents in both Bismarck's Germany and Weimar Germany, suggests that neither can be clearly described as essentially democratic. |
|--|---|

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 relative weakness of the GDR compared to the FRG from 1949 was the main cause of German reunification (1990). Arguments and evidence supporting the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • From 1949, the GDR needed to rely heavily on support from the USSR to maintain its independence. When largely withdrawn in 1989, the GDR was undermined and a potential obstacle to reunification was removed • Erhard's policies created an 'economic miracle' in the FRG that was not replicated in the GDR and increasingly highlighted economic imbalances which, in 1989-90, made reunification more attractive • The GDR's economy never kept pace with FRG economic growth, resulting in the GDR becoming heavily dependent on loans from West Germany; economic symbiosis made economic reunification simpler • The East German economy was one of the strongest in the Soviet Bloc but still unable to provide the standard of living enjoyed in the West. A desire for equivalence helped fuel demands for reunification. Arguments and evidence opposing the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Basic Law of the FRG (1949) looked forward explicitly to a future when there was a constitutional, free and united German state • 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 opening of borders in 1989, by countries such as Hungary, offered escape routes to citizens of the GDR. This further undermined the GDR state and made reunification a more realistic option • The swift collapse of authority in the GDR, and the dismantling of the Berlin Wall, called into question the viability of the GDR to exist as an independent state • Impetus was given for calls for reunification after Chancellor Kohl signalled his intention to push for it by publishing his 'Ten Point Plan' in November 1989 • The influence of the USA, in not opposing reunification and entering into the 'Two plus Four' negotiations, gave a great boost to the cause of reunification. Other relevant material must be credited.