



Examiners' Report

Principal Examiner Feedback

November 2020

Pearson Edexcel GCSE

In History (1HI0)

Paper 31: Modern depth study

Option 31: Weimar and Nazi Germany,
1918–39

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

November 2020

Publications Code 1HI0_31_pef_20210211

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2020

PE Report Paper 31

Introduction

Due to the special circumstances in which candidates sat the November series papers the entry for this paper was much smaller than usual. This means that lessons learned from this series reflect the outcomes for this small candidature and may not accurately reflect patterns and trends for a larger cohort. Therefore, in seeking further understanding of how the marking operates on this paper it is recommended that interested parties also read the reports from Summers 2018 and 2019.

It was noted in the 2018 and 2019 reports that candidates were well prepared for this unit. Although candidates appeared to have been well prepared on the specification, there were fewer examples of the wide-ranging knowledge seen in previous series. Despite seeing some good knowledge and understanding of the period fewer candidates than in previous series were able to precisely select material to address questions directly. Candidates appeared to be reasonably comfortable in dealing with a range of political, economic and social aspects of the period. Candidates were generally well prepared for the question styles and there was evidence of good understanding of the demands of all questions. The improvement in approach to the inference question which was noted in 2019 also continued in this series.

The Modern World Depth Studies are designed to encourage candidates to understand the complexity of a society within a short coherent period and the question styles reflect this. Section B provides a single enquiry based on two interpretations and two contemporary sources with the focus in this paper being Nazi policies towards women. The questions in this section form a coherent package leading to a final question in which candidates, 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. Because of the specific focus in section B, the questions in section A are designed to explore other areas of the specification which are not covered in B.

In Q1 candidates are asked to provide two supported inferences from source A. No marks were available for candidates who either provided simple paraphrases of the source or ignored the specific focus of the question.

In Q2, 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. The most successful candidates showed a consistent analytical focus throughout their answers which was supported by relevant knowledge. In Q2 the stimulus points in the question will often be useful reminders to candidates of specific areas of content which they can write about. Candidates do not need to use these stimulus points but there is an expectation that there will be some depth of knowledge, evidenced by three discrete aspects of content being covered (although this does not mean candidates need to identify three different causes or events). The knowledge displayed by candidates was generally good although candidates need to remember that the focus of the question is on causation, with many providing descriptions of the context rather than engaging with the analytical focus of the question. It is also important to remind candidates that the

analytical focus of their answers is on the years stated in the question. Examiners cannot reward lengthy descriptions of the background to the period as this knowledge is unlikely to be relevant to the specific enquiry.

All of the sub-questions in section B relate to either the two interpretations, sources B and C, or both the sources and interpretations. Q3(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 Q3(b), Q3(c) and Q3(d). In Q3(a) candidates 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 the question. These strands are linked and should be dealt with together, rather than in isolation. There is no need to compare the two sources and very few candidates attempted to do so in this series.

Q3(b) and Q3(c) examine the views expressed in the two provided interpretations. It should be recognised that the interpretations offer alternative views but do not necessarily conflict with each other. Candidates are expected to identify the main difference between the views in 3(b) and use the interpretations to support those claims. This question was generally well done and most candidates who were able to show how the interpretations differed could also support their answers with direct references to, or examples taken from the interpretations. The focus in Q3(c) is on why the interpretations might differ and many questions answered this question successfully. It is not possible to provide effectively substantiated reasons why the interpretations are different based on such things as where and when the interpretations were published although some candidates still attempt to do so.

Q3(d) carries the highest number of marks on the paper. Successful candidates will have already seen how the views in the interpretations are different, why this might be the case and, in completing Q3(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 Q3(d), therefore, focused clearly on the interpretations themselves, reviewing the alternative views and coming to a substantiated judgement. Candidates 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 than those who considered the alternative views from both interpretations and the majority of candidates did focus on both this year. 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 to support the evaluation and most candidates were able to use their knowledge to support their analysis. In addition, some of the strongest answers were able to show how the differences of view in the two interpretations were conveyed in reaching their overall judgements.

There were fewer impressive answers to this question than in previous series although most candidates dealt comfortably with the interpretations, taking a range of approaches. However, this question was accessible to all candidates and even those who did not score highly understood the need to offer evaluative responses leading to

an overall conclusion. Only a few candidates were unable to identify the view being offered by the interpretations, so the majority were able to construct a response in relation to these views. Once again, candidates rarely seemed rushed and full answers were generally provided showing that timing wasn't generally an issue on this paper.

Sufficient space is provided in the exam papers for all questions to be answered in full and although some candidates did write on extra sheets they were not always as successful as those who produced more concise answers. It was noted last year that it is of vital importance that candidates do not continue answers from one question in the space reserved for another and, if they wish to write more than the booklet allows, they should clearly identify this on the paper and ask for additional sheets. It was pleasing that the vast majority of candidates followed this instruction carefully. It is intended that the space provided is sufficient for the majority of the candidates to be able to construct a fully rewardable response.

Spelling, punctuation and grammar were assessed on Q3(d). Although the general quality of SPaG was not as high as in previous series it was once again clear that the most impressive aspect of this strand was again the use of specialist terms which perhaps reflects the good understanding most candidates had of this depth study.

Question 1

In Q1 candidates were invited to make valid inferences about the treatment of the Jews during Kristallnacht. There were two marks available for each inference; one for the inference itself and one for the supporting information.

Most candidates seemed to understand how to make an inference, and most used the content of the source to provide support. There were fewer examples of candidates simply paraphrasing the source than in previous series, which shows an improved understanding of what it means to make an inference from a source about a specified enquiry.

Successful candidates tended to make inferences about the nature of the cruel and inhumane treatment of the Jews. Other candidates managed to draw out inferences about the planned nature of the attacks, or the ways in which the Nazis specifically targeted aspects of Jewish economic and religious life through the attacks on shops and religious buildings. On the other hand, a small number of candidates used their own knowledge to support inferences but this does not meet the assessment objective for this question.

Candidates made appropriate use of the table provided for their answers.

1 Give **two** things you can infer from Source A about the treatment of the Jews during Kristallnacht.

Complete the table below to explain your answer.

(i) What I can infer:

I can infer that the treatment of Jews during Kristallnacht is that they were treated harshly ~~and~~ ~~authoritative~~

Details in the source that tell me this:

'Two old men had their walking stick broken by Nazis'

(ii) What I can infer:

Another thing I can infer is that the Jews were not treated with respect.

Details in the source that tell me this:

'We were ordered to get dressed quickly with the bedroom door open'

Examiner comments:

The candidate has provided two clear inferences about the specified enquiry which are supported by details taken from the source.

Question 2

Candidates performed very well on this question and it was clearly based on a topic for which they had been well quite well prepared. A good number of candidates were able to explain why the German economy recovered in the period 1924-9 and nearly all candidates had a good general understanding of the changes which took place. Knowledge of the role of Gustav Stresemann was good. Candidates knew about other reforms and successes like the Dawes and Young Plans, although there was some slight confusion between the two.

Where candidates were able to go beyond the stimulus points, apart from using the Young Plan, they sometimes focused on Germany's improved standing in the international community. This knowledge was used appropriately by some candidates to show how this greater stability provided a platform for international trade but those who simply recounted the achievements of Locarno, for example, could not really access the higher levels of the mark scheme. There was little understanding of broader contributions to economic recovery such as increased mechanisation and wage growth.

The main problem in answering this question is that candidates clearly had a very detailed knowledge of the problems which preceded the period 1924-29. So, for example they provided lengthy explanations of the privations caused by hyperinflation or the problems caused by the French occupation of the Ruhr. However, the focus of this question required candidates to explain *why* these problems were overcome in the period 1924-29 and too many candidates focused exclusively on the preceding period which meant that they could gain little credit for their knowledge.

Candidates gaining level 4 did so because they gave an analytical explanation which was directed consistently at the conceptual focus of the question supported by knowledge which was precisely selected to address the question directly. At level 3, candidates often displayed good knowledge but did not select examples with precision to support a consistent analysis of causation. At level 2, candidates often described the nature of the economic recovery which left links to the question too implicit to meet the AO2 focus on analysis. At level 3, candidates were mainly focused on the conceptual focus of the question but sometimes lacked the wide-ranging knowledge

Overall, it was clear that candidates were generally quite secure in their understanding of this style of question and this topic.

2 Explain why the German economy recovered in the years 1924-29.

(12)

You may use the following in your answer:

- Gustav Stresemann
- Dawes Plan - 1924

~~young plan~~
US loans - 800 mil

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

One reason why the German economy recovered in the years 1924-1929 was the Dawes Plan. This was created in 1924 and it reduced the amount of reparations that Germany ~~was~~ paid yearly. This meant that Germany had more money to spend on themselves and getting the economy started up again. This would therefore prove why the Dawes Plan helped the German economy to recover in the years 1924-1929.

A second reason why the German economy recovered in the years 1924-1929 was US loans. This is because \$800 million ~~was~~ ~~more~~ was loaned to Germany. This meant that German business could start up again and that German citizens could start working and earning money again. This would therefore prove why the US loans helped the German economy recover in the years 1924-1929.



A final reason why the German economy recovered in the years 1924-1929 was Gustav Stresemann. This was because he scrapped the old currency, that was currently being destroyed due to hyperinflation, and brought out a new currency called the Rentenmark. This meant that the issue of hyperinflation was gone and German workers could now earn useable and valuable money again. This would therefore prove why Gustav Stresemann helped the German economy to recover in the years 1924-1929.

Examiner comments:

This answer securely meets the requirements for both A01 and A02 at level 3. An explanation is given, showing some analysis, which is mainly directed at the conceptual focus of the question. It shows a line of reasoning that is generally sustained, although some passages may lack coherence and organisation. [AO2] The response meets these requirements but does not develop analysis sufficiently for L4.

Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of the required features or characteristics of the period studied. [AO1] the knowledge about loans and other factors is not all completely accurate but there is certainly sufficient awareness of three aspects of content.

Question 3(a)

This was probably the question where candidates' performance was most unbalanced and few managed to display the analysis required to reach level 3. Although many answers consisted of thoughtful comments about the content of the sources, there are three strands to the mark scheme that all need to be addressed. Candidates need to approach the utility question bearing in mind that judgements about utility should be based on the usefulness of the sources for the specified enquiry, in this case the extent of support for the Nazi regime in the years 1933-9. The best responses were those that were able to address 'how useful' by establishing the strengths sources have as evidence before determining how far the limitations affect their usefulness.

It is important for candidates to remember that judging utility may involve some comments about reliability but answers which focus solely on this criterion do not fully consider the value of the sources as evidence. Reliability can only ever be a small element of utility because an unreliable source can still be very useful. In addition, candidates need to consider provenance with greater care in order to access the higher levels. For example, comments which make simplistic remarks about provenance, such as stating that the source comes from a witness so it is useful, need to think about how utility can be assessed for this particular author in these circumstances. For example, in dealing with Source B many candidates considered the viewpoint as being from a witness without taking into account that the witness was an opponent of the Nazi regime. Further still, very few candidates were able to adequately demonstrate how the provenance affects the usefulness of the source content, as required for level 3. In many cases, candidates either explored the utility of the content or the provenance but failed to consider both which made it impossible for them to gain marks above level 2.

The third strand which candidates need to address in any assessment of utility is the use of contextual knowledge in the process of interpreting the sources and applying criteria for judgements on source utility. Many candidates displayed awareness of the context and used this to reject or support claims made in the content of the source but fewer applied this knowledge to the provenance. Contextual knowledge need not be highly detailed but an awareness of the situations in which the sources were created is an essential part of any response and some otherwise impressive answers remained in level 2 because of this lack of contextual awareness.

There were generally fewer answers at level 1 which provided generic points about provenance than in previous series, such as Source C being a photograph and therefore a 'snapshot in time.' At level 1, most responses simply extracted detail from the sources and stated that they were useful without explaining how the source content could be used by a historian addressing the specified enquiry.

SECTION B

For this section, you will need to use the sources and interpretations in the Sources/Interpretations Booklet.

3 (a) Study Sources B and C.

How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into the extent of support for the Nazi regime in the years 1933–39?

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

(8)

Source B is partially useful for an enquiry into the extent of support for the Nazi regime in the years ~~1933~~ 1933–39. On the one hand, ~~the~~ Source B is useful because it discusses the views of the working class, one of the major groups ~~that~~ the Nazis tried to target with ~~prop~~ propaganda. In the account it describes 'they kept talking loudly amongst themselves until members of the SA forced them to be quiet'. From my own knowledge, I know that, ~~the~~ despite the Nazis targeting the ~~to~~ working class with propaganda and slogans such as 'work and bread', the working class generally favoured the ~~Communist~~ Communist Party. Also, the description of the SA ~~and~~ aligns with my own knowledge, because the Nazis used them to enforce order during ~~the~~ the Nazi Party ~~and~~ speeches, and to disrupt others, such as ^{by} the communists. This therefore makes the source more reliable. However, the provenance of the source limits the usefulness, because it ~~is~~ was written by an opponent of the Nazi regime. This therefore makes the source limited in usefulness, because they have a purpose



P 6 2 4 6 5 A 0 7 1 6

7
Turn over ▶

to dissuade people from supporting the Nazis, ~~so~~ overall making the source partially useful for an enquiry into the extent of support for the Nazi Party, 1933-39.

Source C is also partially useful for an enquiry into ~~the~~ the extent of support for the Nazi Party from 1933-39. On the one ~~hand~~ hand, Source C is useful because it is a photograph, which does not ~~in fact~~ appear to be staged, therefore making it more useful for ~~with~~ an enquiry into real-life support of the Nazis. In the source, ~~it~~ it shows ^a large crowd of people saluting Hitler ~~from~~ on a train. ~~From~~ From my own knowledge, I know that the Hitler Nazi salute ~~of~~ was one form of indoctrination used by ~~the~~ the Nazis, to subconsciously reduce opposition. The fact that ~~Hitler~~ Hitler is on a train is useful, because I know he travelled around Germany giving propaganda speeches, so this ~~may~~ ^{might} be his arrival to one of the speeches. However Source C is ~~to~~ limited in ~~its~~ usefulness, because it is taken from a German ~~magazine~~ magazine in 1936. From my own knowledge, I know that by this time, lots ~~of~~ of censorship was in place and over 1600 non-Nazi newspapers and magazines were shut down, so the ~~no~~ magazine probably has a purpose to ~~to~~ support Nazis, therefore ~~so~~ making it partially ~~useful~~ useful, but also limited ~~for~~ for an enquiry into support for the Nazis from 1933-39.

**Examiner Comments:**

This response meets the requirements for level 3 on all three strands of the mark scheme by showing how provenance affects the utility of the content and using contextual knowledge in the process of interpreting the sources.

Question 3(b)

In this question candidates are expected to identify the main difference between the views presented in interpretations 1 and 2. In this case, the interpretations provided different views about the extent of support for the Nazi regime in the years 1933-39. In order to access level 2 marks, candidates were expected to provide some support from the given interpretations, which many did, in the form of well-chosen, short quotations. Most candidates were able to identify the differences of view and supported these statements with details from the interpretations for level 2 marks.

It is important for candidates to gain a clear understanding of the different views presented in the interpretations in order to support their answers to Q3(d) which are based around having a clear understanding of the different views being presented.

(b) Study Interpretations 1 and 2. They give different views about the extent of support for the Nazi regime in the years 1933-39.

What is the main difference between these views?

Explain your answer, using details from both interpretations.

The main difference is that ~~OR~~ ⁽⁴⁾ interpretation 2 says people did not conform with the Nazi regime and interpretation 1 says people did conform with the Nazi regime.

Interpretation 1 says people ~~protested~~ ^{protested} against going Nazi conform and made fun of the Führer while interpretation 2 says ~~few~~ ^{thousands} joined the Nazi party and in the years 1933-39 the Nazi party had over four million new members.

Examiner Comments:

The candidate has identified a difference of view between the interpretations and supported this with details from both interpretations.

Question 3(c)

There was a much stronger understanding of the demands of this question this year and many candidates were able to provide convincing explanations of why the interpretations may differ. The majority of candidates gaining marks at level 2 explained that the historians might have relied on different types of sources in forming their opinions and used sources B and C to support this explanation. In order to gain marks at level 2 it is also essential the explanation is substantiated effectively and this might be based on information taken from either the sources or the interpretations themselves depending on the approach taken.

In trying to give an explanation for a reason for difference between interpretations, some candidates are still attempting to use aspects of the provenance such as the date produced, or even the title of the book, to provide this explanation and this is unlikely to provide a valid basis for a response to this question. This was mentioned in the 2019 Examiners' Report but this approach is still being taken by a number of candidates. The full reasons why these approaches are unlikely to be valid are explained in the Getting Started Guide on pp 43-44: '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.'

(c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the extent of support for the Nazi regime in the years 1933-39.

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

(4)

One reason why the interpretations differ is because they are based on different historical sources. Interpretation 1 is based on the people that disagreed with the Nazis, whereas interpretation 2 is based on the new Nazi support. For example, Interpretation 1 will be based off sources like source B that claims that very few people had interest in Hitler. However, Interpretation 2 will be based off sources like source C which depicts Hitler as being popular as it shows a picture of Hitler being greeted at a railway station.

Examiners Comment:

Explanation of a valid reason for difference is given, in this case that the historians have relied on different types of source, and supported from the evidence given in the sources.

Question 3(d)

Most responses attempted to evaluate the different views presented in the two interpretations. These answers were well focused on the AO4 target for this question, namely the analysis and evaluation of interpretations. The overall quality of a response to this question is determined by reference to the three strands presented in the mark scheme:

- the quality of the judgement based on reasoning;
- the analysis of the provided material;
- the deployment of knowledge of the historical context to support the application of criteria.

A number of candidates produced responses which were solely based on the consideration of one interpretation (which limited the candidates' performance particularly on the second strand), most candidates were able to establish some form of discussion based on the different views which they had established in Q3(b). The question informs candidates that they must address both interpretations but some otherwise well-informed candidates only focused on the view given in interpretation 2 without any reference, implicit or otherwise, to interpretation 1.

On the other hand many candidates produced responses which considered the view presented in interpretation 2 and then contrasted it with the view given in interpretation 1 and this structure produced some good responses. A very few candidates looked to compare the different views directly and used both interpretations throughout the response and this was often used to very good effect. At level 4, candidates are expected to demonstrate precise analysis of the interpretations indicating how the differences of view are conveyed. Only a very small number of candidates were able to meet this strand of the mark scheme during this session. This can, however, be achieved in a variety of different ways but those candidates who examined the different points of emphasis in the two interpretations were often able to make a very convincing case; others were able to examine how the selection of information in the two interpretations influenced the views presented. There is additional guidance provided in Getting Started pp43, 45 and 47-9.

In previous series there have been candidates who largely ignored the interpretations and simply wrote about the specified enquiry. Very few candidates followed this approach during this series which was pleasing. However, there were still instances of candidates making brief references to one or both interpretations, then writing about the issues without analysing the claims made in the interpretations in detail.

The selection of contextual knowledge to support the evaluation was often a strong aspect of candidates' responses with most candidates showing a good awareness of how to deploy their knowledge as well as being in possession of an appropriate level of detail. Most candidates were able to provide full and structured responses with very few appearing to be rushed or running out of time.

It is expected that candidates will reach a judgement when answering this question and the strongest candidates 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 to challenge those views, before reaching the view that interpretation 2 was 'somewhat accurate' or saying that they 'partially agreed with the view.

Spelling, punctuation, grammar and use of specialist terminology will be assessed in part (d).

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the extent of support for the Nazi regime in the years 1933-39?

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

(16)

Firstly, to a ~~small extent~~ ~~to disagree~~ ~~to disagree~~ ~~to disagree~~ I agree with the Interpretation 2 to a great extent, because of the mass ~~surge~~ surge in support for the Nazi party. This is witnessed with the party gaining "four million new members", which ~~was~~ ~~due to~~ was due to ~~because of~~ ~~Hitler's~~ ~~Hitler's~~ ~~Hitler's~~ ~~Hitler's~~ widespread support, ~~particularly~~ particularly with numerous rallies pulling out millions of people. Moreover, ~~the~~ the idea that people "became devoted to Hitler", can be ~~as~~ supported by the Youth programmes, like 'Hitler youth', that ~~draw~~ draw many teenage boys into training. Similarly, ~~the~~ ~~Lebensberg~~ ~~programme~~ ~~asked~~ ~~for~~ ~~women~~ ~~to~~ ~~produce~~ ~~babies~~ ~~with~~ ~~members~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~SS~~, ~~promoted~~ ~~to~~ ~~'donate~~ ~~to~~ ~~the~~ ~~Führer~~ ~~'~~ ~~and~~ ~~the~~ ~~'honour~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~German~~ ~~mothers~~ awarded medals to ~~the~~ ~~the~~ ~~amount~~ ~~of~~ ~~babies~~ ~~they~~ ~~could~~ ~~produce~~ ~~women~~ ~~could~~ ~~produce~~, such as eight babies would receive a gold medal. These programmes ~~very~~ aptly depict the ^{large} extent of support amongst German people to approve ~~the~~ Hitler and ~~the~~ the Nazi party.



P 6 2 4 6 5 A 0 1 1 6

However, I agree with Interpretation 2 to a ~~lesser~~ ^{quite huge} degree, ~~and~~ with the opposing suggestions in Interpretation 2. This is ~~also~~ because of Interpretation 1 discussing ~~that~~ that "people protested against the 'Heil Hitler' greeting and salute", ~~and~~ and the "Nazi control of schools". ~~And~~ ~~it was~~ ~~then~~ ~~Flowerer~~, I know that in schools, for example, at the start of each lesson students were expected to 'Heil Hitler', and that 97% of teachers swore loyalty to the Nazi ^{party's} ~~teacher~~ teacher organisation. Likewise, the textbooks ~~were~~ were very ~~strict~~ ~~when~~ ~~Nazi~~ orientated, with the use of Mein Kampf (Hitler's book). Hence, Interpretation 1 helps to ~~also~~ convey how ~~particularly amongst the younger generation~~ there was a great deal of support of the Nazi party ^{particularly} ~~especially~~ ^{especially} in the education sector.

Finally, I agree with Interpretation 2 to a lesser extent with the evidence presented in Interpretation 1. This is because Interpretation 1 states "how there was opposition in 'churches' and people dancing to 'American swing music', ^{which} is seen to be quite prevalent in Germany during the years 1932 to 39. This is ~~also~~ noticed with the youth groups like 'The Young Vults' or 'Eldewiet's ~~and~~ Pirates', whom, were opposition groups from the youth, both rebelling in clothing and music of the Nazi regime. Yet, there did not ~~pose~~ ^{pose} a ~~great~~ ^{huge} threat,



unlike the Catholics and Protestants. They were much harder to remove away, due to many German believing in Christianity, and usually supporting the Centre party (ZP), a political opponent of the Nazi party. Hitler even created a new religion, but only 3% of Germans subscribed to this. Therefore, Interpretation 1 reflects how to some extent there was not so much support as Interpretation 2 suggests, "a flood of people also joined other Nazi organisations".

Overall, despite the Interpretation 1 depicting the Nazi party as having a strong large amount of support, despite Interpretation 1, calling a light on the opposition to the Nazi party, Interpretation 2 reflects how there was actually a huge amount of support for the Nazi party during the period of 1933-39.

Examiner comments:

This answer meets the requirements of the mark scheme at a secure level 3.

There is an explained evaluation agreeing, in part, with the claims made in Interpretation 2. An overall judgement is given with some justification and a line of reasoning is generally sustained. The answer considers both sides of the argument.

Good analysis of the interpretations is shown indicating difference of view and deploying this to support the evaluation despite some lapses in the quality of written communication which cause confusion over which interpretation is being considered.

Relevant contextual knowledge is used directly to support the evaluation.

Paper Summary

Based on their performance on this paper, candidates are offered the following advice:

In Q3(a) focus on using both the provenance and contextual knowledge to evaluate the usefulness of the content of the sources.

When analysing the reasons for the different views in the interpretations focus on their content – candidates should not be concerned with the book title, date or author.

In Q3(d) candidates must review the alternative views in both interpretations as well as use specific contextual knowledge to support the points made. It is helpful to make clear and specific references to both interpretations in the course of the answer.

All the sub-questions in Q3 should be seen as part of the same enquiry with each question guiding candidates towards the final analysis in Q3(d).