



Examiners' Report June 2022

GCSE History 1HIA 31

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications come from 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.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

ResultsPlus is Pearson's free online service giving instant and detailed analysis of your students' exam results.

- See students' scores for every exam question.
- Understand how your students' performance compares with class and national averages.
- Identify potential topics, skills and types of question where students may need to develop their learning further.

For more information on ResultsPlus, or to log in, visit www.edexcel.com/resultsplus. Your exams officer will be able to set up your ResultsPlus account in minutes via Edexcel Online.

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 2022

Publications Code 1HIA_31_2206_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2022

Introduction

It was pleasing to see that students seemed confident in tackling this paper after a three-year gap in formal examinations. They coped well with the range of question styles, which covered all four Assessment Objectives, and they responded particularly well to the enquiry 'package' in question 3.

Questions on this paper cover all the Assessment Objectives but over half of the available marks are for question 3, which focuses on sources and interpretations. These questions form a coherent package leading to a final question in which students, having explored the utility of the provided sources, analyse the different views presented in the interpretations and the reasons for those differences, and are then invited to judge the extent to which they agree with one of the interpretations. It is therefore important that students appreciate the difference between sources and interpretations, and the focus of different parts of question 3.

The answer space provided is intended to be sufficient for the question to be answered in full and although some students did write on extra sheets, they were not always as successful as those who produced more concise answers. Where additional space is needed, it is important that students clearly state the answer is continued elsewhere and that this is done on paper, and not in the answer space for another question.

Question 1

This question requires students to make two inferences from a source and it is sometimes regarded as an 'easy' question. However, students need to be sure that the inferences they make from the source are not dependent on their own knowledge. It was easier to select details in the photograph which supported inferences about the membership or activities of the Hitler Youth than its role in society. For example, the photograph showed boys of a range of ages, all in uniform and therefore valid inferences were made that the Hitler Youth membership was restricted to boys, included boys of a range of ages, that uniform was compulsory and that there was a military style discipline. They also had large backpacks, so inferences that members of the Hitler Youth engaged in outdoor activities such as camping trips were also credited. However, claims that the Hitler Youth was restricted to Aryan boys or that it was intended to inculcate devotion to Hitler or to train boys to be soldiers could not be supported from details in the photograph. The focus of the question also needs to be addressed; inferences had to be about the Hitler Youth, not the Nazis or society in Germany.

It should be recognised that details from the source can only be rewarded if they are provided as support for an inference. No marks were available for students who provided simple paraphrases of the source and some students tried to use the source attribution but this often resulted in claims that the boys had been invited to a party.

(i) What I can infer:

I can infer that Hitler Youth ^{was} ~~was~~ ~~mainly~~ ^{copy for} ~~mainly~~ ~~boys~~ was mainly targeting young boys.

Details in the source that tell me this:

The source shows only boys.

(ii) What I can infer:

I can infer that Hitler Youth was provided with strict training.

Details in the source that tell me this:

The source shows all the boys are standing in a military, orderly fashion.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The two inferences are valid and supported by details from the source.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Make sure the inferences are relevant to the question.

(i) What I can infer:

Hitler indoctrinated young people

Details in the source that tell me this:

Young ~~people~~^{men} dressed up as Nazis

(ii) What I can infer:

They were forced to ~~wear~~^{follow a dress code} ~~shorts~~^{and} ~~and~~
~~and~~

Details in the source that tell me this:

everyone in the ~~picture~~ photograph are
wearing the same clothes



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The first inference is not valid – nothing in the photograph can be used to support the idea that Hitler was indoctrinating members of the Hitler Youth.

The second inference, that a uniform is compulsory, is valid.



Make sure the inferences can be supported from the source and are not based on your contextual knowledge.

Question 2

In question 2, the focus will always be on causation but the question does not require a judgement to be made or for the answer to prioritise or show interaction of factors and no marks were available to reward such evaluation, however strongly argued. Instead, the most successful students showed a consistent analytical focus throughout their answers and many were able to access Level 4 by doing so.

The stimulus points in the question will often be useful reminders to students of specific areas of content about which they can write. Students do not need to use these stimulus points but there is an expectation that there will be some depth of knowledge, shown by three discrete aspects of content being covered, although this does not mean students need to identify three different causes or events.

A number of answers remained at Level 3, despite excellent knowledge, because they missed the focus of the question. The mark scheme's bullet point for Assessment Objective 2 (analysis) at Level 4 expects an analytical explanation, directed consistently at the conceptual focus of the question. Students who responded to the topic rather than the key idea were unlikely to achieve high marks. Those who did reach Level 4 realised that the topic provides the context but that there is a specific focus, which the analysis should address.

Students should also realise that any information in the sources and the interpretations for question 3 is unlikely to be relevant and furthermore, any attempt to use such details in this question is likely to mean that those sections of the answer cannot be rewarded and the answer as a whole then lacks coherence. In this case, question 2 was about the use of propaganda after the Nazis were in power, while the sources and interpretations in question 3 covered the period before Hitler became Chancellor.

Many students had excellent knowledge about how the Nazis used propaganda to control people's attitudes and examiners commented on the number of impressive answers. Detailed information was given about the way the Nazis controlled the press and ensured that people received Nazi ideology through their daily newspaper. There were also good explanations of the use of radio and loudspeakers to broadcast Nazi ideas, Goebbels' control of films and culture to reinforce Aryan stereotypes, the use of rallies to encourage a sense of community and the Berlin Olympics to portray Nazi superiority. While censorship is not the same as propaganda, many students pointed out that censorship was used to ensure that there was nothing to counteract the effects of propaganda. High scoring answers often stressed that the German public became indoctrinated because propaganda was integrated into many aspects of daily life.

However, some knowledgeable students failed to score highly because they did not properly address the focus of the question. This was not simply a question about propaganda or a question about control and therefore descriptions of propaganda or analysis of methods of control which included the use of fear and coercion, could not receive high marks. Some answers stated that education and Hitler Youth activities were used to indoctrinate young people but these were not explaining the use of propaganda. Other answers were clearly based on Nazi use of propaganda to gain votes and support during the 1920s, rather than to control people's attitudes during the 1930s.

2 Explain why the use of propaganda helped the Nazis to control the attitudes of the German people in the years 1933–39.

(12)

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- newspapers
- Nazi rallies

You **must** also use information of your own.

→ films
→ radios

Propaganda was a useful way to indoctrinate the German population with Nazi ideologies and this was achieved in a range of different ways. In 1933, Nazis only controlled 3% of newspapers and what was being published, however by 1944, Nazis controlled 84% of newspapers. This meant that the Nazi ideologies were being mass produced and shared around the entire population. This helped the Nazis control the German population as the entire population were coherently pushed into reading only about Nazi beliefs in newspapers which slowly helped the Nazis gain control the attitudes of the German people in 1933-39, and the Nazi party gained support as a result.

The Nazis also gathered rallies in which German leaders would spout Nazi ideologies such as the 'Hitler myth' in which Hitler was depicted as a God and the saviour of Germany. This caused many German citizens to idolise Hitler

and the Nazi party overall. Hitler would also speak at rallies in which people said his patriotic ~~and~~ and well spoken speeches were a convincing form of propaganda. Many said Hitler was a charming speaker with ^{powerful} ~~strong~~ tactics involved in his speeches which gained the support of many German citizens. Overall the rallies acted as a useful form of propaganda as it gained the attention from people which led into support ~~and~~ and popularity as a party.

Another way Hitler used propaganda to control the German people was through the media. In hundreds of films, ~~the~~ the Nazis were depicted as strong whereas the enemies were seen as weak. This also gained the support of many German citizens as they would constantly ~~to~~ ^{view} ~~see~~ these movies and ~~these~~ ^{from have} the idea embedded into their minds. In order to make these films, you needed a registration which was useful as anti-Nazi films would have not been shown around the population. The Nazis also used cheap radios in which they contained only Nazi radio stations and were full of Nazi propaganda. Around 1939, 70% of homes contained the radio meaning Nazi ideologies were once again ~~being~~ being spread around the German

population. Overall the mass media production of Nazi ideologies helped the Nazis gain control over Germany as a large majority ~~there~~ were being fed the same ideologies constantly everyday.

~~However, it is hard to say how useful Nazi propaganda is as many ideologies that were spread were already believed in by a wide majority of the German population.~~



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer has a consistent focus on why the Nazis could use propaganda so effectively to control people's attitudes (Level 4 of Assessment Objective 2, analysis) and includes precise details to support the analysis (Assessment Objective 1, knowledge and understanding, Level 4). It explains that Nazi control of newspapers meant they could control the information reaching people and therefore influence their attitudes, the use of rallies reinforced messages about Nazi ideologies, and propaganda through films and radio meant that people were 'being fed the same ideologies constantly every day'.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Make sure you address the focus of the question and not just the topic.

2 Explain why the use of propaganda helped the Nazis to control the attitudes of the German people in the years 1933–39.

(12)

You **may** use the following in your answer:

- newspapers
- Nazi rallies

You **must** also use information of your own.

One way the Nazis used propaganda to control the attitudes of German people was newspapers. For example, they would burn any newspapers if they did not approve of and punish the authors and publishers. Furthermore, they glorified the Nazi work rather than showing what was really happening. This led to attitudes being controlled as they only showed the Nazis in a positive light and hid away the reality.

A second way Nazis used propaganda to control the attitudes were Nazi rallies. For instance, they would gather huge crowds of people wanting to listen to Hitler speak. They used Hitler's powerful speaking to gain many people's trust. Hitler would speak about how he will help the country by not talk about his evil plans. This helped control the attitudes as they were

censoring the bad information and reality and only showing the positives.

A further ~~reason~~ way the Nazis used propaganda to control attitudes were radios. For example, radios were only for the upper class, until the Nazis took control. The Nazis created ~~the~~ people an affordable radio called the peoples receiver. They aired Hitler's speeches and other speeches that promoted Nazi policies and the system. This helped control the attitudes of German people as they provided affordable equipment and also were able to promote the Nazis through it.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer has the understanding that newspapers, rallies and radios were used to influence people's attitudes. It recognises that propaganda was used to present a positive image of Hitler and the Nazis but does not show why the use of propaganda allowed the Nazis to control people's attitudes, for example because of the way that propaganda permeated daily life. It also lacks precise details to support the analysis. This answer meets the Level 3 descriptors for both Assessment Objectives.



Make sure each point is explained (not just stated) and try to include precise details to support each point of analysis.

Question 3 (a)

Question 3(a) targets the ability to analyse and evaluate source utility and, in doing so, introduces the enquiry which will be dealt with in further detail in questions 3(b), 3(c) and 3(d).

In question 3(a) students are expected to evaluate the usefulness of the content, taking account of the provenance of the sources and applying contextual knowledge in making judgements about the utility of the sources as evidence for the specific enquiry, in this case the reasons why Hitler became Chancellor. These strands are linked and should be dealt with together, rather than in isolation. There is no need to compare the two sources and, indeed, only a handful of students did attempt to do this.

Students found the sources accessible and were confident in showing that the content of the sources was relevant for the enquiry and therefore useful. They could also make a number of points about the significance of the provenance for the usefulness of the content, although sometimes this consisted of simple statements rather than a developed explanation. When considering provenance, generic comments about a source being biased (with no explanation of how that bias could be detected or why it occurred) or about the source being reliable because it came from the time under investigation, could be made without any reference to the individual source and therefore remained at Level 1. This type of generic assumption was seen when some answers assumed that the authors of the sources would be biased or that the accuracy of Source B would be affected by the passage of time.

At Level 2, developed comments were made about the content of the sources, for example, that the fact that in Source B, people waited for hours to hear Hitler speak, showed the depth of their support, or the details in Source C showed the key role of Hindenburg as the only person with the authority to appoint Hitler Chancellor. There were also good comments made about the provenance of the sources – that Speer had personal experience of the support for Hitler and, writing with hindsight, may have wanted to provide an explanation of the context of Hitler's rise to power. Similarly, von Ribbentrop was seen as offering insight into the circumstances in which Hitler was appointed and as the source was taken from his diary, it should be an accurate record of events.

However, some very good answers could not access the higher marks because they did not include contextual knowledge. Contextual knowledge is mentioned at every level of the mark scheme and failure to include it limited a number of otherwise good answers. Students should recognise that it is not enough to repeat a detail from the source and assert that this can be confirmed from the student's own knowledge or to give generalised comments such as 'I know that Hitler was a popular speaker' – some additional detail is needed as a demonstration of that own knowledge. Contextual knowledge should be relevant to the enquiry and used to assess the source, for example, to add detail about something mentioned in the source, to add weight to an aspect of the provenance, to place the source in a broader context, or to assess whether the source gave an accurate view or showed a typical situation.

At Level 3, comments need to consider the effect of an aspect of the provenance on the usefulness of the source content, and contextual knowledge should be integrated into the process of reaching a judgement, not simply provided as information.

It is important to note that the question asks about the usefulness of the sources in relation to a specific enquiry, in this case, an enquiry into why Hitler became Chancellor. Sources should not be dismissed because they do not cover every detail that might be helpful in an investigation and students should recognise that unreliable sources can be very useful.

Similarly, the focus should be on assessing the usefulness of what is in the source rather than listing details which are not mentioned. It can be valid to note the limitations of a source but these points need to be used in an overall evaluation of the usefulness of the source; an answer which focuses on 'missing' information without weighing the positive aspects of the source, is unlikely to score highly. If the answer identifies omissions from the source as limitations on its usefulness, this could be linked to a consideration of the provenance, showing whether this is the result of lack of knowledge or deliberate omission.

The question asks 'how useful' the sources are, so a judgement should be made on the usefulness of the source's evidence for the specific enquiry. Good answers made clear the criteria being used to assess the usefulness for the enquiry of the sources, weighing the value of the content in the light of the provenance and the student's own knowledge. Various criteria could be used, for example accuracy of detail, reliability, the relevance of the source, the way it could be used by the historian, how representative the source is etc.

Although a judgement should be reached on the overall usefulness of each source, there is no requirement to compare the sources or to use them in combination and no marks are available for this. Students who focused on comparisons between the sources often failed to develop their judgement on each source properly; if this approach is used, it is important that the answer still comes to a judgement on each individual source.

Very few answers only considered one source but it should be noted that every level of the mark scheme refers to 'sources' and therefore answers which do not consider both sources cannot access high marks.

3 (a) Study Sources B and C.

How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into the reasons why Hitler became Chancellor in 1933?

Explain your answer, using Sources B and C and your knowledge of the historical context.

(8)

Source B is useful for an enquiry into the reasons why Hitler became chancellor because it shows that many people were in support of Hitler and the Nazi party, "A roar of applause burst out!" Source B is also useful as it matches with my own knowledge about how Hitler had obtained 11 million votes in the elections of 1933 but lost against Hindenburg, showing that many people supported him.

Source B is ^{also useful} ~~useful~~ as it ^{contains} ~~contains~~ a ^{useful} ~~useful~~ ^{praeenance} ~~praeenance~~, it was written by Albert Speer who had a first hand account of Hitler's growing support as he was the junior member of the Nazi party. ^{growing support meant that it was more likely} ~~and also helped with architecture~~ for Hitler to become Chancellor.

In conclusion, source B is useful into an enquiry into ^{why Hitler became} ~~the growing support~~ chancellor as it contains relevant points, matches with my own knowledge and ^{has} ~~has~~ a ^{useful} ~~useful~~ ^{praeenance} ~~praeenance~~.

Source C is useful info ^{for} why an enquiry into why Hitler became chancellor as it shows the process that ~~the process~~ ^{Industrialists and businessmen} supported Hitler, 'I eventually convince von Papen'!

Source C is also useful and matches with my own knowledge about how Hitler made promises to wealthy industrialists to remove communist threat and so they supported him, ~~source~~ as more people supported he became more powerful and more likely to become chancellor. Source C is also useful as the provenance is useful, it is written by someone who was there at the time but it also might be implying that he was ^{at Hitler's becoming chancellor} the cause which ~~was~~ is uncertain and so it is useful but not as much. In conclusion, source C is useful as it contains relevant points, matches with my own knowledge and has a useful provenance.



This answer links contextual knowledge to a discussion of the usefulness of the source content (and the comment about elections is clearly intended to refer to 1932, not 1923). The provenance of each source is considered but the explanation of its significance is not clearly explained. The answer reaches Level 3 as a consideration of source content, provenance and contextual knowledge is given for each of the sources but the comments about provenance are not clearly linked to an evaluation of the utility of the sources, therefore it is mid-level rather than top of the level.



Rather than making several points about the source content, make sure you cover content, provenance and contextual knowledge.

Sources/Interpretations Booklet.

3 (a) Study Sources B and C.

How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into the reasons why Hitler became Chancellor in 1933?

Explain your answer, using Sources B and C and your knowledge of the historical context.

Nazis SS good speaker
wrote mein Kampf
↓
how to rule Germany

(8)

Source B and C are useful for an enquiry into the reasons why Hitler became Chancellor because, Source B focused on an election rally and people's excitement to see Hitler 'thunderous applause from the crowd', from this we can interpret that Hitler was a loved and well-known man in Germany, he was a celebrity to many.

Also in the second part of the source it states 'crowd had still waited for hours' by this we can also suggest no matter what the people of Germany had faith in Hitler in turning Germany's luck around.

From my own knowledge, I also know that Hitler was a very convincing and overall popular public speaker. People would listen to his speeches for hours, Hitler was also very popular after he left prison and published his

back the main Kampf detailing what he would do to improve Germany. After that German people had hope that Hitler would revive Germany from the problems the treaty of Versailles caused.

Source C is also useful because it shows how Hitler became chancellor in barely 3 days after he was appointed to Hindenburg by von Papen, this shows how Germany had lots of problems there for needed a solution and looked for quick ones which was Hitler.

Also ~~in~~ the interpretation calls Hitler the 'turning point' strengthening the fact that Germany had great faith in Hitler and believed he could help.

from my own knowledge I know that Hitler later on became the 'furer' ~~agreement~~ ^{chancellor} president of Germany after the last president's death making him even more powerful, this happened because of the enabling act that was signed causing Hitler to become even more powerful. This gives an enquiry of how Hitler became chancellor ~~but~~ because it shows just how persuasive Hitler was.



The answer discusses the source content and includes contextual knowledge related to Source B but the contextual knowledge provided at the end of the answer is not relevant as the enquiry is about why Hitler became Chancellor. As this answer does not consider provenance, it therefore cannot reach Level 3.



Make sure the contextual knowledge you include is relevant to the enquiry.

Question 3 (b)

In this question, students are asked to identify a difference in the overall view being offered in the interpretations; these do not necessarily contradict each other but they do provide alternative views. The answers should identify the key difference but also provide support from each interpretation to demonstrate that difference. Many answers recognised that the two interpretations offered different views about why Hitler became Chancellor and could select detail from the two interpretations to support the explanation of that difference. However, some answers simply selected details from the interpretations without explaining them, or focused on the comments about the amount of support Hitler and the Nazis had.

It is important for students to remember that the focus of this question is to identify the differences between the views rather than identifying differences of surface detail as the latter can only be awarded marks in Level 1. Responses which asserted differences without support, for example stating that Interpretation 1 claimed the Chancellorship was given to Hitler by the men in power, whereas Interpretation 2 said Hitler gained the position because of his widespread support from the people, stayed in Level 1.

Level 2 was achieved when the students indicated a clear difference of view and supported it with detail from the extracts. It was pleasing to see that many students were able to score full marks.

(b) **Study Interpretations 1 and 2.**

They give different views about the reasons why Hitler became Chancellor in 1933.

What is the main difference between these views?

Explain your answer, using details from **both** interpretations.

(4)

Interpretation 1 suggests that Hitler didn't gain the power of Chancellor by himself and was given to him as it says that 'Hitler did not seize power; it was handed to him. This is different to interpretation 2 which suggests that it was an achievement for the Nazi and that they had earned it as it says ~~that~~ that 'it was an extraordinary achievement by the Nazis' which suggests that ~~it was~~ Hitler became Chancellor only because of the Nazi unlike interpretation 1, which



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer is Level 2 as it identifies the difference in the views in the interpretation and supports this with details from each interpretation.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Make sure you support your answer with details from each interpretation.

(b) **Study Interpretations 1 and 2.**

They give different views about the reasons why Hitler became Chancellor in 1933.

What is the main difference between these views?

Explain your answer, using details from **both** interpretations.

(4)

The main difference in ~~the~~ these two interpretations is that interpretation one says how Hitler is "supported by less than half the German population" this implies German people didn't follow Hitler. Whereas Interpretation two makes Hitler ~~the~~ following sound more ~~like~~ ^{was} "Hitler was in charge of a massive movement of 800,000 party members and 13 million voters" this line suggests that Nazis had a "massive" following



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer has missed the focus of the question, about the reasons why Hitler became Chancellor and instead focuses on differences in views about the amount of support Hitler had. It therefore remains in Level 1.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Make sure you are showing the difference in views about the enquiry (why Hitler became Chancellor) and not simply the difference in individual details such as the amount of support Hitler had.

Question 3 (c)

It is important that students recognise the relationship between questions 3(b) and 3(c). Having identified that the two interpretations offer different views, students are asked to suggest a reason why these different views have been reached. They should be able to support their answer with reference to the interpretations. Examiners see each answer separately and therefore cannot be expected to know what has been said in a previous answer. For this reason, students should be explicit in their references to the interpretations. They should also make sure that their answer to 3(c) does not simply repeat their answer to 3(b).

The focus here is on the process by which the historian produces his interpretation. Where answers suggested that when carrying out research, the authors had placed weight on different sources, students could easily score the full 4 marks by linking details in the interpretations with details in Sources B and C. However, this should be explained with references to both the interpretations and the sources rather than simply stating that 'the author of Interpretation 1 might have used Source C'.

Alternative explanations also recognise that the historian's approach may affect his research and conclusions. For example, whether an historian focuses on the government and political events, or social developments and the growth of support for the Nazi Party. The difference could also be accounted for by a focus on short-term, immediate events or on more long-term developments.

Here again, the explanation needs to be supported by the use of the interpretations. Therefore, speculation that the difference in interpretation is a result of their provenance, for example the date that the interpretations were produced, is not valid as it cannot be supported with explicit details. The full reasons for this are explained in the *Getting Started Guide* on pp 43-44. There is also some additional guidance in the 2019 Examiners' Report on p.25. As stated in *Getting Started*: 'Students should distinguish between their comments on contemporary sources and on these texts. Responses based on matters such as the origin or time of production of these secondary works are unlikely to be valid for this question.' However, it is very pleasing to note that fewer students than previously tried to provide an explanation of the difference on the basis of such factors as the titles of the books, their origin or date of production. There was still a small number of students who gained no marks on this question as they merely repeated what had been said in question 3(b).

(c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the reasons why Hitler became Chancellor in 1933.

You **may** use Sources B and C to help explain your answer.

(4)

the interpretations
One reason why ~~the interpretations give~~
different views is because of their choice
in sources. Interpretation 1 suggests that
Hitler became Chancellor because of people in
power giving it to him, "It has handed to him
by men who controlled Germany" and source B
shows this too, "I eventually convince von Papen"
whereas
in ~~interpretation 2~~ ^{it} suggests that
the votes ^{and support} were the cause of ~~his~~ Hitler becoming
Chancellor, "13 million voters" and source B
shows that it was also the votes and support, "
A roar of applause burst out"



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The answer shows an understanding that historians' views are influenced by their research and the weight they place on individual sources and explains how the view in the interpretations could have been based on details in the different sources they consulted. It is a Level 2 answer.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

If you are using this approach, make sure you include specific details from the interpretations and the sources.

(c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the reasons why Hitler became Chancellor in 1933.

You **may** use Sources B and C to help explain your answer.

(4)

It is arguable that Hitler was appointed Chancellor due to the perspectives of both interpretations. Interpretation 1 intends to display the more fortunate opinion - that Hitler was simply the only option. Whereas ~~an~~ Interpretation 2 intends to portray Hitler's early dominance and political growth of this time. Both interpretations are correct but intend to glorify Hitler. Interpretation 2 or discredit him like interpretation 1.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This answer recognises that historians may offer different views because they have different perspectives and suggests the authors intend to create different views. However, it remains at Level 1 because it does not provide supporting details.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Make sure you support your explanation with details from each interpretation.

Question 3 (d)

Question 3(d) carries the highest number of marks on the paper. Successful students will have already seen how the views in the interpretations are different, why this might be the case and, in completing 3(a) have understood that there is likely to be evidence in support of both interpretations. They are now asked how far they agree with one of the interpretations. The strongest answers to 3(d), therefore, focused clearly on the interpretations themselves, reviewing the alternative views and coming to a substantiated judgement. Students need to recognise that they are not being asked to treat the interpretation as a source and evaluate its reliability or usefulness but to explain whether they think the historian has offered a valid view.

There is no expectation that both interpretations are dealt with in equal depth but both should be examined explicitly. The use of contextual knowledge is an important element in this evaluation but it must be precisely selected and linked to the evaluation of the interpretation rather than being offered as an answer to the enquiry question. At the same time, merely asserting agreement with points in the interpretation by saying 'from my own knowledge I know this to be true' is not sufficient evidence of contextual knowledge.

In some cases, the contextual knowledge used was out of period, covering the early 1920s or after 1933. Many students forgot that the Chancellor was appointed by the President and assumed that winning a majority of seats in the Reichstag was enough to bring Hitler to power. A number of students also rejected Interpretation 2 as incorrect in its statement that the Nazis were losing support at the end of 1932.

However, some answers attempted to discuss why Hitler became Chancellor with very little reference to the interpretations. This approach misses the focus of the question, which is about making a judgement on the view offered in Interpretation 2.

Students often used details from Interpretation 1 to counter the view in Interpretation 2. At all levels of the mark scheme answers are expected to analyse both interpretations and discuss the difference in the views being offered, so answers should be explicit in their references to the interpretations rather than presenting this as their own knowledge.

Examiners reported some impressive answers to 3(d) and many students were able to engage confidently with the interpretations, taking a range of approaches. In addition, some of the strongest answers were able to show how the differences of view in the two interpretations were conveyed, for example through the use of language, tone, selection or omission of detail, emphasis created by the structure of the interpretation, etc.

It is expected that students will reach a judgement when answering this question and the strongest students developed their evaluation throughout the answer, creating a consistently argued response. Less successful answers offered points to support the views expressed in Interpretation 2, then used Interpretation 1 and contextual knowledge to challenge those views, before reaching the view that Interpretation 2 was 'somewhat accurate' or saying that they 'partially agreed with the view in Interpretation 2. In these answers, there was little sense of evaluation, simply an explanation of the different views, with the acknowledgement that each had some valid points. The strongest answers to question 3(d), therefore, focused clearly on the interpretations themselves, integrating evaluation while reviewing the alternative views and coming to a substantiated judgement. Students who focused exclusively on the view provided in Interpretation 2 and used this as a basis for an essay based on their own knowledge were less successful.

Yet a full range of responses suggest this question was accessible to students of all ability and full answers were generally provided, showing that timing wasn't generally an issue on this paper.

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the reasons why Hitler became Chancellor in 1933?

Explain your answer, using **both** interpretations and your knowledge of the historical context.

(16)

I agree to a certain extent with interpretation 2 about the reasons as to why Hitler became chancellor in 1933, arguing that the reasons were more significant than Interpretation 1.

Interpretation 2 states that Hitler became Chancellor due to the achievement of the Nazi party in gaining support. This is significant as I know that the Nazis were the largest party in the Reichstag when Hitler was appointed Chancellor, this is supported in the interpretation by the figures of 800,000 party members and 13 million votes in 1932, although this isn't half of the population, it is a significant amount of support that didn't stop growing, which was also supported by the last line of this interpretation, "No other party leader had anything like Hitler's support from the German population."

This support had mainly come through the Nazi party rallies ~~and pro-supported~~ and propaganda. As stated in source B, Hitler had strong oratory skills and always delivered strong speeches to the public in crowds that were packed full of people who admired and supported him. Furthermore, with help from the ^{minister} ~~head~~ of Propaganda, Joseph Goebbels, Hitler was able to convince and manipulate Nazi supporters and the public into ~~believing~~ ^{following} Nazi ideology. This was done through creation of posters depicting Nazi Germany as strong minded and dominating and promising protection from communists to ~~the~~ business owners and large land owners. All of these factors ~~were~~ ^{played} significant roles in gaining Hitler and the Nazis the support of a third of the German population in a short amount of time, 3 years, from 1929 to 1932.

~~So~~ Interpretation 1 is also useful to an extent surrounding the reasons for Hitler becoming Chancellor, this is because of Von Papen and Hindenburgs

role to play in his seize of power. Supported by source C, the Interpretation believes that Hitler was appointed power as a result of those higher up in Germany. This to an extent is true and a good reason as I know that Von Papen heavily influenced Hindenburg's opinion of Hitler as before hand, ~~beforehand~~ this interaction, Hindenburg disliked Hitler, therefore, Von Papen would've had to be extremely persuasive in order to gain Hindenburg's trust of the situation. ~~However~~

The Interpretation states that the Nazi party was "supported by less than half the German population", while this was true and the figures stated a third of the population had support for him ~~in 19~~ between ~~1929~~ 1929 and 1932, Germany's policies towards elections was based on the party with the majority ~~be~~ being elected, and this was what the Nazis were, they were the leading party in Germany.

Overall, I agree more with Interpretation 2 as to the reasons why Hitler became Chancellor in 1933, over the reasons stated in Interpretation 1. This is because the impacts in the first interpretation were short-term and had happened over a span of a few days in comparison to ~~the~~ the impacts of interpretation 2 which had built up over a span of years, mostly coming into play during the Great Depression, in which the trust for the Weimar Constitution was lost and people turned towards extremist parties such as the Nazis for support. While I can understand the significance of Von Papen and Hindenburg's role in Hitler's appointment as Chancellor, due to his many individual successes through rallies, propaganda and his oratory skills I am inclined to agree with Interpretation 2 more.



Both interpretations are analysed and evaluated. In each case, contextual knowledge is integrated into the evaluation rather than simply being offered as information. There is a strong sense of evaluation running throughout the answer, for example acknowledging that Interpretation 1's claim that the Nazi Party was supported by less than half of the population but pointing out that they were still the largest party in the Reichstag. It is also explicit about the criteria being used, comparing the timescale covered by the two interpretations, and clearly explaining the judgement being reached on Interpretation 2. This is Level 4 for all strands of the mark scheme.



Remember that the focus of this question is about evaluating Interpretation 2, not about offering an explanation of why Hitler became Chancellor.

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the reasons why Hitler became Chancellor in 1933?

Explain your answer, using **both** interpretations and your knowledge of the historical context.

(16)

I agree with interpretation 2 about the reasons why Hitler became Chancellor in 1933 because it says "No other party leader had anything like Hitler's support from the German population". I know this is true because Hitler's passionate speeches allowed him to gain the support of the German people very quickly and thousands of people would gather to watch Hitler's ~~spee~~ speeches.

Another reason I agree with interpretation 2 about the reason why Hitler became Chancellor is because it says "Nazi propaganda suggested that victory was inevitable". We know that the Nazi party used a lot of propaganda to convince the German people that the only way was to support the ~~the~~ Nazis and a lot of the German population supported Hitler because they believed he could make Germany a great country again.

However, I somewhat disagree with interpretation 2 about the reason why Hitler became Chancellor in 1933. Interpretation 1 says "Hitler did not seize power; it was handed to him by the men who controlled Germany" and "Hindenburg began to mistrust Chancellor von Schleicher. Meanwhile, von Papen managed to overcome the elderly

President Hindenburg's doubts about Hitler. I know this is accurate because President Hindenburg wasn't sure about letting Hitler be Chancellor and had to be convinced otherwise. And some could argue Hitler didn't get his place as chancellor fairly because the reason von Papen convinced Hindenburg to appoint Hitler as Chancellor is because he was persuaded by a wealthy businessman who supported the Nazi party.

Overall I agree that Hitler had a huge amount of support from the Nazi people, however I also believe that isn't the only reason Hitler got his role as Chancellor in 1933.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This takes each interpretation in turn, offering points of agreement and disagreement and providing some contextual knowledge. Parts of the answer are about support for Hitler rather than being clearly focused on Hitler becoming Chancellor. A judgement is offered at the end but there is no justification for it. This fits the descriptor for all strands of Level 2.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Know what your judgement is before you start to write your answer. In this way, you can build up a coherent answer, with a consistent line of reasoning.

Paper Summary

Examiners commented that there were a number of impressive answers where students seemed well-prepared and demonstrated excellent knowledge being deployed to support thoughtful analysis and evaluation.

The following points should be noted:

- While there was good knowledge of some topics, students cannot rely on knowing just a few key topics and hoping to use that information whatever question is asked. In particular, students need to recognise the difference between the Nazi methods and policies during the rise to power and after 1933.
- Students need to recognise the specific focus of the question so that the information being offered is shaped to meet the demands of the question rather than simply describing a situation or including irrelevant material.
- Students should appreciate the difference between sources and interpretations and be aware that interpretations are constructed by historians in order to offer their view of events.
- In all parts of question 3, it is helpful to be explicit about the source or interpretation being discussed.

Spelling, punctuation and grammar were broadly accurate and many answers used specialist terms with confidence (although there were many variants on the spelling of Goebbels) but a poor standard of handwriting made a number of answers difficult to mark and exacerbated the difficulty in understanding a badly-expressed answer.

The SPaGST marks may be affected if there are weaknesses in these areas:

- Appropriate use of capital letters.
- Correct use of apostrophes.
- Weak grammar ('would of', 'based off of') and casual language, which is not appropriate in an examination.
- Paragraphs: failure to structure answers in paragraphs not only affects the SPaGST mark, but may also make it difficult for the examiner to identify whether three different aspects have been covered in question 2, or how well analysis and evaluation is developed in question 3.

If extra paper is taken, students should state clearly in the answer space for the question that it has been continued elsewhere and it should be stated where the rest of the answer had been written; this should be on an additional sheet rather than elsewhere in the answer booklet and should be clearly labelled. However, in many cases where additional paper had been taken, the marks had already been attained within the space provided rather than on the extra paper and students should be discouraged from assuming that lengthy answers will automatically score highly. Indeed, students taking extra paper sometimes ran out of time on the final, high mark question and therefore disadvantaged themselves.

Grade boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/grade-boundaries.html>

