

Examiners' Report

June 2025

GCE History 9HI0 37

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 <https://www.edexcel.com> or <https://www.btec.co.uk>.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our [contact us page](#).



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 <https://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: <https://www.pearson.com/uk>.

June 2025

Publications Code 9HI0_37_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Introduction

It was pleasing to see candidates across the ability range engaging with a range of questions on Paper 37.2, Germany, 1871-1990: united, divided and reunited.

The paper is divided into three sections. Section A contains a compulsory question that is based on two enquiries linked to one source. It assesses source analysis and evaluation skills (AO2). Section B comprises a choice of essays that assess understanding of the period in depth (AO1) by targeting five second order concepts- cause, consequence, change and continuity, similarity and difference and significance. Section C comprises a choice of essays that relate to the process of change over a period of at least 100 years (AO1).

Most candidates appeared to organise their time effectively and very few did not complete all 3 sections. There were, however, some scripts where reading the handwriting was a serious problem.

Question 1

Candidates found the source clear and many made effective use of the caption in their evaluation. The source was interrogated by many candidates in order to identify points relevant to both enquiries. There was much effective deployment of accurate contextual knowledge to develop points although this was generally stronger in addressing the second enquiry. Answers were generally well structured and a pleasing number of candidates weighed up the evidence opening up access to the higher levels.

Question 2

Stronger candidates relished the source and were able to identify and develop reasoned inferences relevant to both enquiries. A significant number established Kohl's qualities but some were less confident in dealing with his policies, especially when dealing with the international context in which he was operating. Many candidates made explicit use of the provenance and integrated their comments into their discussion about both enquiries.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 1 ☒ Question 2 ☒

Overall, source 2, ~~which~~ which is an extract from Helmut Kohl's speech to the Bundestag, offers varying levels of usefulness to the two enquiries. While the source offers more surface level information in regards to Kohl's "aims" in his policies, making it straightforward, the source presents a nuanced character for Kohl, meeting the understanding of Kohl's qualities more complex, yet intrinsically valuable to a historian.

In terms of the source's value for revealing Kohl's aims in putting forward his policy, the source consistently provides an insight into Kohl's aims. The source paragraphs consistently demonstrate his aims, as the source highlights Kohl's aim of "dealing with the vast number of refugees", imposing "fundamental reform of the economic system", and establishing a "European order of peace". Thus, the source clearly and continuously provides the historian with the aims of Kohl, improving its usefulness due to the source's streamlined and consistent narrative. However, these aims are often weakly explained, as the source is both a summarisation of the speech, and also has weakly developed point in aims. For example, while the source does refer to imposing 'Reforms of the economic system', it fails to develop on reasons, or desirable outcomes of the aims, as the source simply states that the FRG would aim to give "GFR a rapid

access to a proposed single market." The source mixes out on proposed deregulatory reform, such as privatisation, which would be a reversal from the 90% state owned enterprise by 1960's, or Erhard's introduction of co-determination, or job creation. Considering the fact that the source is of a first-person nature may mean that Kohl could alter his aims in a way to appease the Bundestag, enabling him to retain and re-assert his political candidacy, as phrases like "no certain answers", or "step by step" demonstrate Kohl's pragmatic approach in his 28th November 1989 speech. For example, the lack of direct clarity over his "points", such as "deal with the refugees" demonstrates both an inability to fully reveal his aims to protect his career, or more simply, could signify that these changes are driven by popular pressure, which has rapidly diminished by late 1989, as opposed to logically structured "aims". Thus, overall, the source offers varying, but useful value to the enquiring about Kohl's aims.

Now, in terms of the source's value for revealing Kohl's enquiries as a political reader, the source becomes more nuanced, bring the historian at times to read between the lines. This is primarily driven by the source's provenance, as when you consider the fact that Kohl had to appeal to the "Bundestag", and that Kohl wants to avoid political isolationism and lack of support, it becomes clear why Kohl isn't direct about his enquiries. Firstly, Kohl aims to subtly demonstrate his determination as a leader, as he "sets out a plan", and

that he isn't "afraid to move forward". These are signs of clear political ploy, which a historian would spot, helping him assess the true value of the source, and determine the extent to which Kohl under/overplays his qualities. Another quality, and probably the one Kohl mostly wants to entrench into the Bundestag, is the fact that he is benevolent and caring. This is consistently seen throughout the source, as Kohl "listens to all points", "aims to provide humanitarian aid", and offers phrases like "give" signifying a certain tone of philanthropy, as Kohl's tone is also crucial when assessing value, because his wife and ~~best~~ behaviour and informative tone is crucial for establishing context in the Bundestag. Finally, the context of this speech is also crucial, as Kohl avoids, rather pragmatically, going too deep in the refugee problem, or the very obvious "Ostpolitik" ideology, as not exacerbate the uncertainty which centres around the "step by step plan", in the hopes of not miring the "maneuver" or the pace of change. While indirect, this ~~fact~~^{fact} ~~fact~~ Kohl's pragmatism as a political leader, making it useful to a historian for uncovering his "qualities".

Overall, the source offers various value in terms of the two enquiries, as the prominence, factual detail and legibility all vary. However, overall, the enquiry of assessing "Kohl's aims" is understood better with the source, as it offers more usefulness for it, whereas the enquiry in terms of Kohl

Character is more complex, province affected, making it
less useful to a historian, unless it also maintains some
degree of usability.



The response merits a sound level 4. It addresses both enquiries but is stronger in dealing with the qualities of Kohl as a politician than in identifying and explaining the aims of his policies. It discusses the political context in which the speech was made and develops a reasoned inference by identifying Kohl's 'nuanced character' and referring to his 'step by step' approach. It also makes effective points about the tone of the speech.



It is important to address both enquiries effectively in order to access the highest level.

Question 3

This question promoted many well informed and balanced responses although there tended to be more specific development of points about the significance of technology. There were some very well argued responses which were rich in specific detail from the campaigns Moltke was involved in. Answers were generally organised and clearly expressed.

Question 4

There were some excellent responses to this question which illustrated and explained the deployment of technology in the Battle of Cambrai and its impact on the Western Front. These answers tended to adopt a before and after approach weighing up the impact of the use of technology in that campaign. However, a minority of candidates did not go far beyond the shock effect of the deployment of tanks.

Question 5

This was the least popular question in this section of the paper. Most candidates identified a range of points to weigh against the nominated factor, eg Bismarck's relations with the Reichstag, the national liberals and the Kulturkampf. There was also some effective discussion of Bismarck's attitude to the rise of Socialism.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒ Question 4 ☒

Question 5 ☒ Question 6 ☒

In 1871, the Kaiserreich was established and the northern and southern confederation of Germany was unified into one country. It could be argued that the 1875 War in sight crisis ^{which} ~~was~~ saw the idea of Germany potentially going to war with France which raised tension in international relations was ^{increasingly} ~~most~~ important in consolidating the new German state. Equally, the constitution of 1871 could be perceived to have had a significant impact on consolidating the new Germany in the years 1871-9. Meanwhile the Kulturkampf that was introduced in the the early 1870s also could have been permanent. On balance, taking the criteria of widespread impact across Germany (the 1871 constitution held the ^(defined by stability) most importance in ~~for~~ consolidating the new Germany to a greater extent than the war in sight crisis and Kulturkampf.

In regard to the 1875 War in sight crisis, this was engineered by the Prussian chancellor Otto von Bismarck. This was significant because his personal dislike with the rising Catholic opposition toward Germany - catalysed by Pope Pius IX's 1864 Syllabus of Errors which proclaimed opposition to the liberalism and progression Bismarck had stood for in regard to unification and the 1870 doctrine of Papal infallibility also highlighting the spiritual authority of the Pope to Catholics - had

consequently fuelled fears of a threat to German unity. As a result, as this threatened the consolidation of the new country of Germany a series of articles were published in newspapers such as the *Kölnische Zeitung* that claimed "War was in sight?" in regard to Germany and France potentially having to go to war due to the latter's defence of Catholicism that threatened German unity. Although this was paramount in raising international alarm it lacked importance in consolidating the new Germany as it turned out to be a failure on Bismarck's part. This was because it unnecessarily raised concern about international alarm across Europe with Russia intervening by arranging a talk with the Kaiser and as a consequence the new Germany was not consolidated as, instead, the diplomatic relations it had built up in a three-way pact between Russia and Austro-Hungary ^{to defend each other if needed} were tarnished as Bismarck was furious at Russia's involvement. Additionally, while fuelling diplomatic isolation which worked against stability of consolidation while failing to resolve the issue of Catholic opposition, on balance, although the 1875 war in sight crisis had a widespread impact in raising the alarm of war across Germany and Europe it was not effective in this sense at consolidation and stability and proved to be the opposite.

While the 1875 War in Sight crisis was a diplomatic issue, engineered by Bismarck the 1871 constitution was a much more stable contribution to the new Germany. The overarching stability and

continuity it provided was Prussian dominance. This is evident ^{rather} through the ~~leader~~ who was the prior Prussian King having powers over foreign policy and the ability to appoint the Chancellor with the also Prussian Bismarck reinforcing the consolidated persistence of Prussian dominance. In terms of the Bundesrat, this was further accentuated as while twenty-five states were represented seventeen seats were Prussian and a vote of fourteen was needed to block legislation which again shows how the constitution consolidated the stable establishment of Prussian dominance. While these are all undemocratic bodies due to being unelected and unaccountable the democratic counterpart of the Reichstag which was voted on using secret ballot for all men over 25 still was subject to Prussian dominance. This is because although the outcome of the Reichstag affected Prussian counterparts with Bismarck wanting to break up the National Liberals on the topic of tariffs which contradicted with their principle of free trade as an example they lacked legislative powers as a body over the Bundesrat could veto them which reinforces the consolidation of and stable persistence of Prussian dominance which the constitution was likely designed to do. Overall, compared to the war in sight crisis which lacked in the importance of the consolidation of the new Germany due to its failure to establish a widespread, stable resolution to Catholic opposition the 1871 constitution was by contrast much more significant of the new Germany in 1871-79 as it consistently

perpetuated the stability of Prussian dominance it was likely designed to uphold with this having a widespread impact across Germany.

In contrast to the 1871 Constitution's aim for a consolidated Germany and like wise to the 1875 law in sight crisis, the Kulturkampf which was introduced by Bismarck sought to limit the influence of Catholics who he perceived as an obstacle to the stable consolidation of a new Germany in 1871-79. As a nation, one-third of the population were Catholic and despite often seeking external representation and authority from the Catholic Church and Pope, the rise of the Catholic focused Centre Party within Germany saw a significant vote share go to the promotion of Catholic rights. Consequently, Bismarck's vision of a German nation that was not influenced by external influences like the Pope was threatened and in turn the Kulturkampf took anti-Catholic measures such as banning ^{and} results, taking away the role of Bishops who did not openly commit to German unity. As a result, while this was an attempt to suppress Catholic influence in Germany so Bismarck in his vision could consolidate ^{it} as a stable new German nation failed. This was because Catholic resistance was bolstered by these repressive measures with the Centre Party gaining in its vote share and prominence which is antagonistic to the consolidation of the new Germany in 1871-9 that was envisaged by its leadership. Overall,

Similarly to the 1925 war in sight crisis, the Kulturkampf was not significant in the consolidation of a new Germany in the years 1871-79 as it was similarly counterproductive and bolstered Catholic support rather than addressing the issue that was supposedly inhibiting the stable consolidation of new ^{Germany} Germany in 1871-90.

In conclusion, it is apparent that the 1875 war in sight crisis was not the most important factor in regard to consolidating the new Germany in 1871-79 as it instead saw instability rise with Germany becoming diplomatically isolated and well as the issue of Catholic identity being a threat to the new Germany not being resolved. Similarly, the Kulturkampf was also for the most part a failure in consolidating the new Germany in 1871-79 as it contradictorily bolstered Catholic sentiment and support that challenged the consolidation and stability of a united, unified Germany ^{rather than} ~~and instead~~ suppressing it. Therefore, it is evident that it was not the 1875 war in sight crisis but the 1871 Constitution that was important in consolidating the new Germany in the years 1871-79 as its design to maintain the stability and perpetuation of Prussian dominance was returned with a widespread extent across ~~over~~ the new Germany which was consolidated in this aspect.



This response merits entry point for level 5. It identifies a range of points, eg the nature of the constitution and the impact of the Kulturkampf, as well as addressing the nominated factor. It deploys some effective contextual knowledge, eg French statements about Catholic rights, and begins to weigh up the relative significance of the different factors.



It is important to deploy contextual knowledge to support all points identified in order to promote a substantial overall judgement.

Question 6

This was the most popular question in this section. Stronger candidates showed knowledge and understanding of the significance of the Night of the Long Knives and how it fitted into the Nazi consolidation of power, notably how it impacted on eliminating internal opposition. A sound range of other factors were considered, eg the Reichstag Fire, the Enabling Act and the action against the trade unions.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 3 ☒

Question 4 ☐

Question 5 ☐

Question 6 ☒

The Night of the Long Knives marked a key turning point in the violent nature of the Long Knives and the consolidation of power. However, other key events such as the Enabling Act (1933) or the Nuremberg laws (1935) demonstrate other key turning points in the areas of consolidation of power and the Nazis' social outlook, thus limiting the view that the Night of the Long Knives (1934) can be seen as "the" turning point.

Firstly, the Night of the Long Knives (1934) demonstrated a key shift in the violence of the Nazis. After Hitler had received the fabricated evidence from Heinrich Himmler that Röhm was a traitor, Hitler demonstrated the power the Nazis could wield over the course of the Night of the Long Knives, roughly 4000 political enemies outside and inside the Nazi party were killed, some of them with vicious brutality. Therefore, the Night of the Long Knives (NLK) can be seen

as a key turning point in the violence at the brutality of the Nazis as it demonstrates that should you oppose Nazi power then you do so at the risk of your own life, this demonstrates a key turning point for the Nazis as they have moved away from the legal revolution carried out in 1933 and in the years prior to now consolidated power through brutal force and killing. Therefore, there is no doubt that in the years 1933-35 the NLR demonstrates the key turning point for the use of violence the Nazis will carry out in later years.

However, in the area of consolidation of power it is difficult to see the NLR as the only key turning point. The NLR demonstrates the elimination of the now increasingly radical SA leading to an appointment of the army and eventually Himmler swearing an oath to Hitler, making him the supreme leader of the Wehrmacht. Thus there is no doubt that the NLR allowed Hitler to consolidate power and the army and within his party by eliminating political opponents within his

party such as Von Schleicher (an old chancellor viewed to be a leftist Nazi). However, when it comes to political consolidation and social consolidation of power the view that the NLR is the key turning point is limited. In the years prior to the NLR Hitler and the Nazis had carried out the legal revolution. Beginning with a gain of seats in the Reichstag and culminating in Hitler being appointed Chancellor, Hindenburg's death, and the passing of the Enabling Act (1933). The Enabling Act is a key case study in demonstrating Hitler's consolidation of power in the Reichstag as it passed 444-72, only the SPD opposed the act and it resulted in them being banned in March ~~1934~~ 1934 with all other parties in July 1934, except USQAP. Thus the passing of the enabling act demonstrates Hitler's power and control over the Reichstag allowing him to use the emergency powers to dissolve the Reichstag and form a totalitarian state, thus allowing for the actions such as the NLR to take place and so Hitler's consolidation of political power. Furthermore, Hitler's process of Gleichschaltung and the co-ordination of society also limits the

~~self-justification~~ views that the NLR can be viewed as the by turning point for the Nazis. Through the Ministry of Propaganda, led by Joseph Goebbels, Hitler was able to systematically brain-wash a nation into co-ordination such as groups like the German Labour Front (DAF), Hitler Youth or the censorship of medical publications of propaganda. This was the process Hitler called ~~Gleichschaltung~~ Gleichschaltung or the "switching on" and it would have allowed him to consolidate power within society of the people of Germany would have put opposition to Nazi policy, allowing him to carry out actions unchallenged such as the NLR. Overall, the NLR certainly helped to consolidate power however events such as the existing act of Gleichschaltung allowed for Hitler's consolidation of political and social power thus limiting the argument that the NLR was the key turning point for the Nazis.

Finally, while the NLR does provide some ability on ~~view~~ the Nazis racial views and social control it is impossible to view the NLR as the turning point for the Nazis.

society) and Volksgemeinschaft (VG) and rather the Nuremberg laws (1935). The NLR provides an outlook into how opposition of the Nazis will not be tolerated, it does not ~~provide~~ ~~reveal~~ reveal the highly conservative outlook of the Nazis as one of the key victims was Ernst Röhm, leader of the SA, who was a homosexual demonstrating the highly conservative views of the Nazis. However, it is impossible to view the NLR as the turning point for Nazi racial view as this occurs in the Nuremberg ^{laws} ~~trials~~. Directed by Hitler and read by Goebbels the Nuremberg laws, which detail the persecution of the Jewish race in categorizing how 'pure' someone is depending on their ~~heredity~~ heritage, this including stripping Jews of citizenship along with banning marriage / sex between Jews / 'pure' Germans. This merger lays the groundwork for later persecution in Kristallnacht (1938) and later the Holocaust, thus revealing the Nuremberg laws as the key turning point for Nazi persecution and the establishment of the VG as it demonstrates the first time the Nazis openly through legislation persecute the Jewish race. Therefore, it is impossible to see the NLR as the key turning point for the

Nazi state in the years 1933-35 and in regards to the establishment of the NSDAP as the society of the Nazi state and instate the Nuremberg laws (1935) can be viewed as the key turning point in the establishment of the ideal society within the Nazi state.

In conclusion, there is no doubt the NKK marks a turning point for the Nazi state, especially in the use of violence and somewhere in the consolidation of power. However, events such as the Enabling Act (1933) and the Nuremberg laws (1935) demonstrate how in the areas of consolidation of power the view for the NKK and the key turning point is somewhat limited as in the area of the building of society the view is ~~largely~~ ^{largely} limited. Overall, the NKK is certainly a turning point for the Nazis but it is not necessarily the definitive one.



This response merits entry point for level 5. It has a sound focus on the nominated factor and identifies a range of points, eg the Enabling Act and the restrictions placed on Trade Unions in order to provide the basis for a balanced judgement. It begins to establish the links between the policies and to weigh up the relative significance of factors.



This response shows how a range of points can be identified and illustrated as well as showing the importance of a strong overall judgement to reach the highest level in all bullet points.

Question 7

This was the most popular question in this section of the paper. The majority of candidates cited examples from across the timeframe starting with the powerful images from Mathew Brady in the American Civil War through to CNN coverage of the Gulf War. Candidates also recognised evidence of advancing technology with reference to film coverage from the Spanish American conflict, through the Great War and the 1930s and then the Second World War with many references to the film images used in the World at War, especially the episode dealing with the Tarawa campaign. Many candidates also discussed, with effective illustration, other ways, including written works by correspondents and novelists and sound recordings, with many citing the work of Ed Murrow.

Question 8

This was the less popular topic in this section but there were a number of well informed and thoughtful responses. The nominated factor was generally addressed well with examples of demonising the enemy and emphasising the cause the Allies were fighting for which continued in the conflicts of the post war period. A couple of candidates wrote powerfully about present day conflicts which could not be credited. Most candidates had a sound coverage of the timeframe with some effective discussion, for instance, of the campaigns on both sides during the American Civil War.

Question 9

By far the most popular question on this section of the paper. The best answers focused on the extent of change in the workplace rather than generic comments on the status of women in a general sense. A significant minority of candidates devoted a substantial part of their response discussing the impact on women during the Nazi period. However, many candidates showed knowledge and a clear understanding of the significance of the growth of female factory workers under the Kaiserreich, the 'new women' of the Weimar period and the opening of opportunities for women post 1945.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 7 ☒

Question 8 ☐

Question 9 ☐

Question 10 ☐

The role of women in the workplace constantly changed in the years 1871-1990, however the most change they saw was during the Weimar Republic in 1919-1933 and also during times of war in 1914-18 and 1945. ~~However, it is not the most important changes for women in the workplace did not occur in 1871-1932, instead they mainly occur~~ The initial changes in the workplace for women did mainly occur in 1871-1932, despite changes also happening after those years.

During the Kaiserreich from 1871-1919 and the Weimar Republic in 1919-1932, a lot of important steps were taken to help out the role of women in the workplace. During the Kaiserreich, Bismarck introduced some new laws for women that had not been in place before. The introduction of maternity leave and a maximum on working hours was showed that the in this period, women in the workplace was an ^{important} ~~big~~ topic. However, these laws show that ~~it was~~ they were mainly trying to minimise how much ^{women worked} ~~a woman works~~. Also, with their role in general ^{on the other hand,} ~~however,~~ women were represented by

Clara Zetkin of the SPD and so were able to get some representation in higher roles. The introduction of international women's day by Zetkin in 1911 also showed a step in the right direction. Nevertheless, women's role in society in general during the Kaiserreich led to little change in the workplace. With the civil code in place, women were seen as secondary to men ~~and~~ which reflected ~~the~~ low wages and ~~so~~ worse economic ~~positions~~. This therefore shows that there was little change in the workplace during 1871-1914. From 1914-1918, women did have to fill up gaps in jobs for the men who were at war, leading to ~~some~~ ~~little~~ change. But still, overall, during 1871-1918 it is unfair to say the most important changes in the roles of women in the workplace occurred.

During the Weimar period from 1919 to 1933, the most significant changes took place for women in the workplace. Due to universal suffrage, this meant that all political parties had to take into consideration the role of women to have a chance at being in power. This resulted in many parties introducing rights for women or making changes in the workplace to appeal to them. They were allowed to work in any position and in the 1919 election 9.6% of the Reichstag members were made up by women.

That shows a clear improvement in their role in the workforce, as they are not only working in manual labour but also taking on high government positions. However, the amount of change in the workplace for women was also limited in this time as they were still majorly underpaid in comparison to men and many of the changes were focused on urban areas; it was a lot less likely to find a woman with a ~~valuable~~ ^{valuable} job in rural towns. Therefore, during this period, women did see a lot of change in the workforce, making it fair to say that the most change did occur in 1919-33.

During the Nazi period in 1933-45, women experienced a massive setback in society, particularly in terms of work. They were banned from working as doctors, lawyers, and assistant teachers and there was a shift in focus to their health and their role as mothers. The idea of 'Kinder, Küche, Kirche' meant that women were encouraged to focus on their families being of the Aryan race instead of focusing on work. The introduction of the Lebensborn Programme, ~~and~~ the medal system and Nazi's women organisation ensured that women were meant to only focus on their family and making sure they were 'fit'

to raise them. The only ~~relevant~~ significant change in this period was when the war began and women had to take over the job positions of men. This led to a massive increase of women in the workforce, resulting to 60% of the workforce being women by 1945. In a similar way, the role of women in the FRG from 1949-90 failed to see major change until the very end of the period. Although equality in the workforce was reintroduced, this failed to be true equality until around 1957. Even by 1980, very few women had government positions in comparison to the Weimar Republic time, showing a clear decline in importance within the workplace. The main change happened in 1989 when around 41% of university graduates were women, allowing them to take on larger roles and get involved in the workplace. Overall, from 1933-90, women saw some change in the workplace but it wasn't as significant as it had been prior to that.

In conclusion, ~~now~~ I agree with the statement that the most important changes in the role of women in the workplace occurred in 1871-1932 to a certain extent. This is true for 1919-1932, however not for the ~~true phrase~~ of frame of 1871-1919, therefore limiting the value of the judgement.



A sound level 5 which addresses the nominated factor and a good range of other points with some weighing up of the relative significance of points. There is some very effective deployment of contextual knowledge to add substance to the overall argument.



This response is a very good example of thorough and well illustrated coverage of the timeframe.

Question 10

This was the least popular question in this section. There was sound coverage of the timeframe in the majority of responses. Key developments were identified, the policies that developed industrial growth under Bismarck, the economic recovery under Weimar and the policies of Erhard post 1945. Many candidates were able to establish criteria on economic changes and illustrate with specific detail. The strongest candidates made effective comparative judgements.

The question requires an informed review of the success of the German economy with specific consideration of the relative importance of the periods 1871-1939 and 1945-90. It is important to note that the period dominated by the Second World War is excluded. This involves Bismarck's moves towards an industrial economy, the post 1918 problems, notably the impact of the Versailles Treaty and the recovery during Weimar. The Nazi economic policies increasingly dominated by the military build-up. Then the period post 1945 where there is likely to be focus on the Free Market economy and Erhard and the later development of the EEC.

Indicate which question you are answering by marking a cross in the box ☒. If you change your mind, put a line through the box ☒ and then indicate your new question with a cross ☒.

Chosen question number: Question 7 ☒

Question 8 ☒

Question 9 ☒

Question 10 ☒

In the case of the years 1945-90 being less successful than the German Economy in 1871-1939, it can be ~~debatable~~ debated. Because Economics had ~~had~~ ^{big} change very much in both time lines, it needs to be understood the differences, whilst 1871-39 saw ~~many~~ less economic success, there was a great ~~of~~ change due to the three different ~~joined~~ governments.

The German Economy between 1871-1939, saw many changes. The expanding industrialisation of Germany saw an influx of rural proletarian workers, this gave rise to socialism. The population grew 60% from 1871-1914 due to health standards increasing, due to Bismarck's 1883 Sickness Insurance Act and his 1884 Accident Insurance Act, which helped these workers. The working class made up $\frac{1}{2}$ of the German population, due to Prussia having $\frac{2}{3}$ of Germany's land and 60% of the population before the 1900s, the 5% elite in Germany sought to suppress industrialisation (some) because the agricultural part of the economy was in decline after rural workers' pay increased. The middle class made up $\frac{1}{3}$ of the German population and were doctors and ~~large~~ lawyers with the bottom end being from artisanal trades (upon other jobs). The German economy was on a steady rise, with health care increasing and payments of workers.

However

However after the WWI, the German economy collapsed, spiraling into a Great Depression. President ~~Ebert~~ The Treaty of Versailles made reparation payment of \$6.6 billion for Germans to make, it limited the German army to 100,000 and took 13% of arable land. The TOV made the economy scarce, and because of President Ebert's attempt in helping the issues were to print more money, the Economy collapsed, in 1923 8000 Mark was equivalent to one dollar, a loaf of bread became over 100 billion Mark and millions went unemployed, overhauling the welfare system.

The US provided the Golden Age of the Weimar Republic by extending loans, however after the Wall Street crash in 1929, US pulled all funding and another Great Depression ensued, with over six million unemployed now.

The Nazi regime took over in 1933 and with their Volksgemeinschaft ideal, they helped the economy become more equal. Hitler plunged Germany into debt by spending 20% of Government revenue of re-armament, however it paid off and in 1941 when Germany conquered most of Europe and they have considerable Iron & Coal reserves, the economy boomed.

The years 1945-90, in terms of 'German Economy' is difficult to navigate since after Trizonia was introduced and the Berlin Blockade went up and down in 1949, in retaliation.

Germany was split into two zones. The Western Capitalist (FRG) and the Eastern Communist GDR. Due to the West's alliance with the US and Western allies, the economy rose 8% per annum, showing there is huge concern in Germany. However, the USSR being economically ruined after WWII left the GDR very poor. When Hungary lifted its borders around 10,000 people moved to the West and around 50,000 waited at immigration camps on the borders of West Germany.

The USSR with Gorbachev in the late years of 1989-90, saw Russia's economy be in decline, however the GDR only increased. With Germany becoming the 3rd most Economically powerful state (country) in Europe. 133,000 immigrated to West Germany from the East, the Brain Drain saw many pivotal characters, like engineers and lawyers fleeing West. The USSR knew it could try to keep control of East-Germany so Gorbachev and Kohl meet in Moscow and agree German people should decide whether or not for reunification. However in a poll, 70% of Eastern Germans voted in favour of reunification. Under the Two Plus Four act, all countries agreed to leave their occupied zones, USSR agreed to leave pull its troops out, however fearing a reunified Germany, military limitations were made. A FRG also said if an Alliance was made they would include the

Deutchmark in Eastern economy, made people in favour. 6,000,000 foreign workers and their families immigrated to Germany and due to its rising economy and soon Germany was made whole and reunified. This made the German Economy boom since the USSR no longer had economic restrictions on GDR. The Ten point Plan also set out GDR to have access to the proposed single market.

In conclusion, because between the Kaiserreich, Weimar Republic and Third Reich, there was so much economic change, ~~strong~~ increasing and decreasing dramatically, it's clear there's more change, with the Kaiserreich increasing and the Weimar Republic taking to enormous amounts of inflation to the Third Reich, Germany becoming a powerhouse country. The change is significant, if the statement was which time had the better economy, it would undoubtedly be the year 1993-90, since revenue increased 8% per annum but because of change, the years 1871-39 saw far more change and I have to agree with the statement



A sound mid level 4 response. Some key issues across the timeframe are identified with some effective deployment of contextual knowledge. There needs to be more explicit focus on the relative significance of points. The answer has a clear chronological structure.



Candidates should focus on making clear judgements of the relative significance of factors.

Paper Summary

SECTION A

It is important to address both enquiries

Candidates should not simply paraphrase the source but identify and develop reasoned inferences

Candidates should deploy appropriate contextual knowledge but it must be used to develop points in their analysis

Candidates should read the caption carefully and make appropriate use of this in their evaluation while avoiding stereotypical judgements.

SECTION B & C

Candidates should plan their answers to ensure that there is a focused and analytical response

Candidates should read the question carefully and take note of the chronological parameters

Candidates should avoid a narrative/descriptive response. Sustained analysis is the characteristic of higher level responses

In Section C candidates must range across the timeframe

Higher level responses will consider the relative significance of a range of factors in order to reach a balanced judgement.

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>

