



Mark Scheme (Results)

Summer 2025

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced
Level in History (WHI03)

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

Summer 2025

Question Paper Log Number P76468

Publication Code: WHI03_1C_2506_MS

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

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 political attitudes in the FRG to greater European cooperation. 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: • Schumacher, as leader of the Social Democratic Party, might be expected to be more concerned with reunification with East Germany rather than the creation of a supra-national Europe • He is speaking to other delegates from his own party and so would be expected to focus the rhetoric on appealing to them • The arguments used, regarding the link between reunification and greater European cooperation, were a central feature of German political discourse at the time. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about political attitudes in the FRG to greater European cooperation. • It implies that Germany should be cautious about being too enthusiastic about European cooperation at this stage ('Creating illusions ... the Council of Europe ... is now doing the same.') • It indicates that the people of the FRG broadly support being involved in the political changes taking place in Europe ('the Germans... do not want to be excluded from Europe.') • It claims that there should be more focus on relationships between the FRG and GDR ('we need a statement', 'We Social Democrats regard German unity as a key European matter.'). 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 SPD, under Schumacher, rejected the idea of greater western economic integration as it would force a free-market capitalist economic system on all its member states • Both the FRG and the GDR had come into existence in 1949 thereby formalising the division of Germany • The SPD, under Schumacher, campaigned passionately for German reunification and believed that, despite his rhetoric, Adenauer's policies made that more difficult.

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: • Adenauer, as Chancellor, might be expected to have a good awareness of the difficulties facing the newly formed FRG and its relationship with other European nations • The speech was delivered to the Council of Europe and so might be expected to be firm yet conciliatory in tone and language • The speech was delivered six months after the European Coal and Steel Community had been formed. 2. The evidence could be assessed here in terms of giving weight to the following points of information and inferences about political attitudes in the FRG to greater European cooperation. • It indicates that the majority of Germans support closer European cooperation ('the exception of a tiny minority', 'wants the unity of Europe in some political form.') • It suggests that Adenauer was wary of moving too quickly too soon ('this does not mean that an overall constitution of Europe ... drafted.', 'Other solutions are possible') • It implies that the politics of these decisions needs to be based on pragmatism rather than ideals ('actions must be adapted to the facts', 'proceed step by step'). 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: • Adenauer had successfully campaigned, in the election of August 1949, on the promise of securing economic growth in the FRG. He had largely avoided the issue of greater European cooperation. • The Hallstein Doctrine, which was broadly supported by Adenauer and the CDU, in theory supported reunification but in practice, by not officially recognising the GDR, made it more difficult • Adenauer's Chancellorship led to the FRG having much greater cooperation with its neighbours through joining organisations such as NATO (1955) and the EEC (1957). Sources 1 and 2 The following points could be made about the sources in combination: • Both sources emphasise that the debate on the role that the FRG should play in a post-war Europe is divisive in German politics • Both sources accept that the impetus towards greater European cooperation is happening quickly and that the FRG needs to make its position clear • Source 1 prioritises the reunification of Germany in a way that Source 2 does not.

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 the effects of war were the most significant challenge facing Germany, in the years 1870-79 and in the years 1918-24. Arguments and evidence supporting the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • The Second Reich originated out of war and faced challenges holding a federal system together, where the initial acquiescence of states such as Bavaria had been predominantly achieved through bribery • Following both the Treaty of Frankfurt 1871 and the Treaty of Versailles 1919, Germany was faced with the challenge of managing hostile diplomatic relations with France • The significant costs of fighting by 1918 brought near economic collapse and starvation in Germany and contributed to the development of rampant inflation by 1923 • Defeat in 1919 led to significant territorial loss and military emasculation under the terms of the Treaty of Versailles 1919 • Defeat in 1918 undermined the prestige of the monarchy, led to the abdication of the Kaiser and the formation of the Weimar Republic, the legitimacy of whose governments was constantly challenged 1918-24. Arguments and evidence opposing the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Opposition in the Second Reich was limited and, by 1879, Germany was a prosperous, predominantly stable state with an established constitution and firm political leader • Social and political tensions within the Second Reich, were partly caused by Bismarckian policies such as the Kulturkampf and 'Germanisation' rather than the effects of war • The massive structural economic changes within the Second Reich, rather than the effects of war, were challenging the political structures built around an earlier, different and more agrarian economic system • Emerging political ideologies, such as socialism, were challenging some of the tenets underpinning the Second Reich, such as deference to monarchy. Socialism remained a challenge to some in the years 1918-24 • Germany experienced severe economic challenges after 1918 partly caused by the loss of major coalfields, reparations and currency collapse in 1923. Germany benefitted from reparations paid to them 1871-79 • Germany after 1918 faced real political challenges, from both the left and right of the political spectrum, such as the Spartacist uprising and the Kapp Putsch.

	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 whether, given the extent of the problems they faced, Hitler, in the years 1933-39, and Honecker, in the years 1985-89, were both effective political leaders. Arguments and evidence supporting the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Both leaders understood the need for clear political thinking and the effectiveness of fervent ideological zeal as a means to underpin both states' political and social systems • Both worked to overcome political instability. Hitler maintained a centralised single party state. Honecker, until 1989, maintained a predominantly stable socialist political system within the GDR • Hitler presided over economic regeneration which significantly strengthened the economy of Germany. Honecker maintained the GDR as the pre-eminent economy within the Eastern bloc • They were both effective in dealing with significant opposition: Hitler through emergency powers, draconian legislation and an extensive police state and Honecker through the extensive use of the Stasi • Both Nazi Germany and the GDR pursued a range of populist economic policies over unemployment and social welfare to shore up support for their respective regimes. Arguments and evidence opposing the statement should be analysed and evaluated. Relevant points may include: • Honecker's leadership was ineffective at times, and he was forced to rely on external support from the Soviet Union to reinforce his authority • Honecker's effectiveness and authority was undermined by his inability to deal with growing opposition in 1989 to the GDR state. Honecker left office with the GDR on the verge of political collapse • Honecker was in his 70s during this period and, at times, incapacitated by severe illness. By contrast, Hitler was younger and more energetic and dynamic in his leadership • Many of Hitler's ideologically driven policies were detrimental to the interests of Germany. The <i>Kinder, Küche, Kirche</i> policy led to fewer women in work, to the detriment of economic efficiency • Hitler's leadership led to increasing diplomatic isolation before 1939 and grossly inflated the possibility of taking Germany into a major war. Other relevant material must be credited.

