



# **Examiners' Report June 2024**

**GCSE History 1HI0 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](http://www.edexcel.com) or [www.btec.co.uk](http://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](http://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](http://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](http://www.pearson.com/uk).

June 2024

Publications Code 1HI0\_31\_2406\_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

## Introduction

Examiners commented that most students seemed to find the paper accessible and were confident in tackling the various questions. 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 Interpretation 2. It is therefore important that students appreciate the difference between sources and interpretations, and the focus of the different parts of question 3.

In particular, there are still a number of students who do not understand the difference between question 3(b) and question 3(c). In question 3(b), students should identify the difference between the views offered in the two interpretations and support this with details from each interpretation. Most students found this straightforward but they sometimes repeated those points in question 3(c). When they are asked about a reason for the different views, students should remember that the authors have constructed these interpretations and chosen to present them in this specific way. The most common explanation for the difference was that the authors had chosen to place weight on different sources but it is important to support this with details from the interpretations and the sources in order to meet the mark scheme requirement that 'An explanation of a reason for difference is given, **analysing the interpretations**. The explanation is **substantiated effectively**'. This support does not need to be detailed but many answers included only quotations from, or references to, the sources or the interpretations but not both. It should also be noted that 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; the date of publication is not significant unless it is assumed that everyone writing in a specific year shared the same view.

The focus of question 3(d) is on the interpretations, and students who provide their own view of the issue in the question are unlikely to access the higher levels of the mark scheme. Similarly, every level of the mark scheme above Level 1 refers to 'interpretations'. There is no expectation that both interpretations are dealt with in equal depth, but both should be examined explicitly. Answers which only analyse one interpretation can score above Level 1 if they perform well in other strands of the mark scheme but are unlikely to achieve a high mark.

The use of contextual knowledge is an important element in this evaluation, but it must be precisely selected to support the evaluation of the interpretations and not just used to display knowledge. Students should be reminded that the content from the sources may also be used to provide contextual knowledge for the interpretations.

By question 3(d), students will have thought about the difference between the interpretations and will have recognised that both these alternative interpretations can be valid. A feature of strong answers in 3(d) is to show an understanding of how the authors have conveyed their different views. This could be through their use of language, the tone of their writing, their choice of details to include or omit, their decision of how to present their material, and their choice of emphasis. Answers need to show an understanding of the language the author has chosen to use or what to emphasise; they do not need to judge how effective this is. This element of their argument is even more effective if it is integrated into the answer rather than left as a stand-alone comment. Incorporating this understanding can be seen in comments such as 'the author presents this as a positive aspect', 'the interpretation focuses on ... and omits ...', 'the language is very critical' or 'only including this at the end plays down its significance'.

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

The answer spaces provided are 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.

### **GCSE History specification and assessment changes**

This note is a reminder that minor changes are being made to the Pearson Edexcel GCSE History specification content and assessment model. Assessment and language changes apply from the June 2025 exam series onwards, and content changes from the June 2026 exam series onwards.

We strongly recommend, if you haven't already, that you familiarise yourself with these changes in time for the start of the new academic year in September 2024. Some options are affected more than others, but all options are affected by the assessment changes.

Below is a link to the summary guidance document, which will help you to find all the specific information and guidance available to help you take on board these changes:

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/content/dam/pdf/GCSE/History/2016/Teaching-and-learning-materials/gcse-history-changes-for-2025-and-2026-summary-guidance.pdf>

If you have any queries, please contact Mark Battye, our History subject advisor, at [TeachingHistory@pearson.com](mailto:TeachingHistory@pearson.com).

## Question 1

This question requires students to make two inferences from a source. Students need to be sure that the inferences they make from the source are not based on their own knowledge as this question assesses AO3 (analyse, evaluate and use sources) and no marks are available for AO1 (knowledge and understanding). Students also need to ensure that the inferences they make relate to the enquiry in the question. Many answers began by repeating part of the question to ensure that the inferences were valid. In some cases, the detail offered to support the inference was not properly explained, for example some students suggested that there appeared to be a bodyguard standing behind Hitler and claimed this showed people were intimidated but it is not clear how this increased support for the Nazis. Students should recognise that details from the source can only be rewarded if they are provided as support for an inference. No marks are available for students who provided simple paraphrases, description, or comprehension of the source.

The most common inferences were that Hitler was making a speech, that he was a passionate speaker who engaged his audience, that there was growing interest in his views (shown by the fact that there was not enough room for all the audience to be seated), and that he appealed to a wide range of people. Some inferences that relied on own knowledge and therefore could not be accepted, included that Hitler's meeting was taking place in a beer hall, that he was explaining his 25 point programme or spreading his ideas about the Jews, or that he was using propaganda to increase support for the Nazi Party.

There were very few blank answers but sometimes the two inferences and the supporting details were too similar for both of them to be credited.

(i) What I can infer:

Hitler was a good public speaker

Details in the source that tell me this:

The people who are there ~~at~~ look  
to be drawn in by him speaking

(ii) What I can infer:

He's very passionate about sharing  
his ideas

Details in the source that tell me this:

~~He~~ His body language shows he's  
talking rather intently



Two inferences are identified – Hitler's effect on his audience and his quality as a speaker. These inferences are valid because they look at different aspects of the way Hitler's speeches increased support, and different detail is offered in support of each inference.



Make sure the inferences are relevant to the question.

(i) What I can infer:

He was a good, clear speaker.

Details in the source that tell me this:

Everyone is looking at him while he talks.

(ii) What I can infer:

He wanted a better Germany.

Details in the source that tell me this:

More people watching him talk.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

The first inference is valid and is supported by reference to details in the source. However, the second inference cannot be supported from the source and is invalid. The support offered does refer to the source but those details cannot support the inference being made and they are also the same as the details used to support the first inference.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Make sure you do not base an inference on your own knowledge or repeat the details used as support for the first inference.

## 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 are available to reward such evaluation, however strongly argued. Instead, the most successful students showed a consistent analytical focus throughout their answers and a pleasing number of students 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 at the higher levels, 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: reasons why the situation in Germany was unstable in the years 1918-23. Students who responded to the topic rather than the focus of the question were unlikely to achieve high marks, despite producing detailed descriptions of the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, the Spartacist rebellion and Kapp Putsch, the invasion of the Ruhr and hyperinflation.

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. These answers explained how resentment of the Treaty of Versailles led to opposition towards the government, the attempted coups showed the weakness of the government whose retention of control was dependent on the Freikorps or a general strike, that the invasion of the Ruhr emphasised the military weakness of the country and the threat from France, and how hyperinflation destabilised the economy and society. Some answers included details of the Kaiser's abdication and the weak position of the politicians taking control or explained how proportional representation made it difficult to produce a strong government. A few answers also mentioned Hitler's Munich Putsch.

Many students had excellent knowledge about this period and examiners commented on the number of impressive answers. Some answers used a chronological structure while others discussed the political and economic issues creating instability. However, some knowledgeable students failed to score highly because they offered detailed descriptions of hyperinflation or the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, accompanied by the assertion that this was a reason for Germany's instability.

At times, details were confused, especially between the Spartacist Revolt and the Kapp Putsch, or between hyperinflation and the Depression. Answers which discussed the work of Stresemann and the recovery from instability could not be rewarded and some students thought that Hitler was in power at this point. Nevertheless, there were few Level 1 answers.

Students should realise that any information in the sources and the interpretations for Question 3 is unlikely to be relevant in another question and furthermore, any attempt to use such details in this question is likely to mean that these sections of the answer cannot be rewarded and the answer as a whole then lacks coherence. In this case, question 2 was about instability in the early years of the Weimar government, while the sources and interpretations in question 3 covered the period of Nazi rule after 1933.

The situation in Germany was unstable in the years 1918 - 23, this is because of events like the Spartacist revolt in 1920. In this year there was multiple formations of new political parties the Spartacists being one of them, they were strong left-wing communist lead by Rosa Luxemburg, and their aim was to act out against the Weimar government to broadcast their ideas on how the country should be controlled. However this did not work as president Ebert sent in Freikorps (ex army soldiers) to diffuse the revolt and the Spartacists failed. This meant Germany was unstable because it showed how easily a group could revolt against the government and it led to other parties trying a similar thing like the Kapp Putsch in 1921. Germany was facing lots of opposition and had a lot of contrasting political parties making it hard for the country to agree on decisions.

Another reason why Germany was unstable in the years 1918-23 was because of how much the German public did not trust their government. In 1918 Germany was forced to sign the Treaty of Versailles. This was a contract that meant Germany had to pay 6.6 billion of war reparations, except all the guilt from the war, their military was reduced and important industrial land was taken off them. The German public saw this as a 'stab in the back' and nicknamed the government as the 'November criminals'. The people in Germany did not think it was fair that they had to accept all the guilt and thought it made Germany look weak. This was a huge problem for Germany as their own people did not even have the confidence in them making pride extremely low.

A further reason why Germany was unstable in the years 1918-23 was because of hyperinflation. After the war Germany's economy suffered massively as they had lost a lot of money and men during the war (employment was low, trade was low, morality was low and wages were low). The

government did not have enough money to pay people fair wages and so farmers and shopkeepers had to find a way to earn enough money for basic needs so prices increased massively (one loaf of bread cost 100,000 million marks). Germany had also lost the Ruhr to the French, this was an important workplace for Germany's economy, the government was also actively trying to pay back war reparations. Germany did not have enough money, so the government decided to print more money which in time made money worthless and people would burn it to keep their houses warm as it would cost less. This made Germany unstable as the government very unpopular, especially with the working class losing their savings.



The answer makes clear links between the information being provided and the instability in Germany. The end of the first paragraph is particularly strong but there is a thread running throughout the answer which explains how different events led to instability.

Both Assessment Objectives are Level 4.



Make sure you address the focus of the question and not just the topic and then ensure that each point is explained (not just stated) with precise details being used to support each point of analysis.

Due to failure of world war 1, money became scarce leading to inflation. As jobs couldn't pay the required amount, the government decided to print more money. This cycle repeated itself until money's value was a problem. This was hyper inflation. To buy a piece of bread costed a million of the marks and the public was holding onto thousand mark bills to pay. This ~~kept a~~ <sup>resulted in a</sup> poor solution and led to extreme poverty throughout Germany.

Another problem was the slow increase of poverty and unemployment. Because of the treaty of Versailles the german army had to be cut off to only 100,000 soldiers big. This led many soldiers to be

become homeless and unemployed. This bad state of the country led to the Government to be corrupt. As they were unable to afford to pay workers, and the citizens an appropriate amount. It was struggling to pay its required reparations amount. This led to Government failure and pushed people towards different parties.

The Germany was unstable in the years 1918-23 because of the aggression of civilians towards the government. They were creating riots throughout the country for a new and better government.

~~Furthermore in the end of 1923, the Government appeared~~



The answer suggests that the link between hyperinflation and instability is understood but it is not expressed clearly and the link to instability is not properly explained. There is a brief mention of political unrest at the end of the answer but it is stated in too basic a way.

The analysis is left implicit (AO2 L2) and the knowledge is used to provide description rather than support the analysis, and some of the details are incorrect (AO1 L2).



Keep the focus on causation, making clear why events led to instability, not just describing events.

### 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 of the sources, 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 Nazi methods used to control Germany. These strands in the mark scheme are linked and should be dealt with together, rather than in isolation.

Answers suggested that students found the sources accessible and were confident in showing that the content of the sources was relevant for the enquiry and therefore useful. The best answers were explicit about how the information could be used by the historian, for example using the content of Source B to explain the Nazi Party's aims as well as methods of control. Some answers commented on language within Source B, noting the imperative tone but this was often linked to a mistaken assumption that the instructions were directed at the whole of German society.

Students should read the attribution of the sources carefully. Many thought that Source B was a set of instructions for ordinary Germans and did not recognise the significance of this being a book produced by the Nazi Party to instruct Party officials. Similarly, a number of students found it difficult to say much about the provenance of Source C because they focused on it as a photograph, usually just saying it was a snapshot of a single event. However, the attribution stated that this photograph was printed in a newspaper – those who recognised this often developed their comments to discuss it as an example of propaganda being spread through two forms of media.

Many students use the acronym NOP (Nature, Origin, Purpose) when discussing provenance but it should be remembered that they only need to discuss one of these aspects and they should think carefully about which is the most relevant. For example, a number of answers suggested that the photograph of Goebbels was staged without linking this to comments about its purpose. Good answers could make points about the significance of the provenance for the usefulness of the content, or use own knowledge to discuss the provenance. Many answers could offer detailed comments about radio ownership or Nazi control of newspapers but this information was not always used to evaluate the source.

When considering provenance, students should try to avoid 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. Such comments could be made without any reference to the individual source and therefore remained at Level 1.

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 the Nazis used the radio to spread their propaganda' – some additional detail is needed as a demonstration of that own knowledge. In relation to Source B, many answers mentioned the Gestapo, SD, or concentration camps. Source C prompted comments about Goebbels, the People's Radio, and Nazi control of the radio. Yet additional information should not be added as a stand-alone point.

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. Examiners commented that a number of answers used the comment about Hitler Youth in Source B as a springboard for lengthy details about the Hitler Youth or the Edelweiss Pirates without actually using these details to evaluate Source B. Nevertheless, examiners felt that more students than previously made an effort to include contextual knowledge and therefore accessed Level 3.

Many lengthy answers make a number of points about content and/or provenance but without contextual knowledge. Students should realise that an answer consisting of several points about content will remain at Level 2, while an answer making one point about content, provenance and using contextual knowledge, has the potential to reach Level 3. Some answers use a checklist approach, offering brief comments about content, provenance and contextual knowledge. At Level 3, comments should be able to link these three elements in an overall evaluation of the usefulness of the sources, considering the effect of an aspect of the provenance on the usefulness of the source content, and integrating contextual knowledge in the process of reaching a judgement.

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 Nazi methods of control. 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 if this leads to a distorted impression or if the limitations are linked to a consideration of the provenance, for example, whether the limitation is the result of the author's lack of knowledge or a deliberate omission. However, 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.

Good answers made clear the criteria being used to assess the usefulness of the sources for the enquiry, weighing the insight provided by 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, and how representative the source is.

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.

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. There are also no marks for students' own views of Nazi methods of control.

Source D is useful into an enquiry into Nazi methods of controlling the people because it was written, published and promoted by the Nazis during Nazi rule. This allows us to get first hand opinions directly from the party. Its purpose was for it to inform and entail directly to the party officials their duties and roles to support the party. ~~It's contents include~~ Its contents include how any rumors of harm to the party must be reported on and I know this is accurate of the time because the state was a police state which relied on the peoples honesty as well as the Gestapo and police to find any unlawful citizens. The source also states that the officers must aim for all their children to attend Hitler groups, which I know was typical because during this time period other youth groups were banned and attendance to the Hitler youth became compulsory. Therefore, this source is very useful because it provides a direct message from the Nazis of their methods of people control.

Source C is useful for an enquiry into Nazi methods of controlling the people because it demonstrates the importance of propaganda for the Nazis. It is a photograph which can be staged however I know that radiobroadcasts and other methods of new technology were widely used by Nazi propaganda in order to spread Hitler's messages to a much wider range of people. The content of this picture is crucial as it shows Joseph Goebbels who I know Hitler appointed as his leader of Nazi propaganda reading out one of Hitler's speeches which was commonly done because I know Hitler was an extremely charismatic speaker. Therefore this source is very useful to the enquiry because it was written in 1935 ~~and it shows~~ so it directly demonstrates a large method of propaganda and influence used by the Nazis.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

This answer covers all three strands of the mark scheme (content, provenance and contextual knowledge) at Level 3 for each source. Notice how contextual knowledge is woven into the answer rather than being offered as a stand-alone comment, for example noting that the photograph (Source C) might be staged and linking that to a comment about the use of propaganda.



Don't feel you have to fill the answer space – this is a concise answer which covers all the mark scheme's required elements for each source.

Source B is <sup>very</sup> useful for an enquiry into Nazi methods of controlling the German people as it shows the 'duties' of officials in the Nazi party. Using the source we can infer the type of duties placed on the officials and how they were used to control the Germans. In the list it says 'it is your duty to identify people spreading rumours harmful to ~~the~~ party ... so that they can be reported to the government authorities'. This shows how the Nazis tried to gain control over the people and it shows their methods of manipulation. In the list of duties it also talks about sons and daughters and how they have to become members of various Nazi organisations and that they <sup>must</sup> attend the Nazi meetings, rallies and celebrations. This shows how the Nazi lifestyle was pressurised onto the youth and that they had to conform to the ideal society.

In my opinion, I think Source C is ~~not~~ useful for an enquiry into Nazi methods of controlling German people as it is ~~just~~ an image of Hitler's minister for Propaganda reading a message from Hitler on a radio broadcast.

This shows that Hitler's messages came straight from him and he had propaganda people to spread the message like for example, on the radio. In Germany many people listened to the radio which supports Hitler as he could influence ~~people~~ people through it. It also shows he had a propaganda team to spread the false image of the Nazi party to fool the Germans. This is why Source C is useful for an enquiry on how the Nazi party controlled the Germans.



The answer comments on Source B's content and hints at its purpose but there is no contextual knowledge, so it cannot move beyond mid-Level 2.

The comments on Source C's content are supported by some contextual knowledge but there is no discussion of the source's provenance, allowing this to move to the top of Level 2 but not into Level 3.



Make sure that you cover all three strands of the mark scheme for each source.

## Question 3 (b-c)

### Question 3(b)

In this question, students are asked to identify a difference in the overall views 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 rather than minor differences in detail but should also provide support from each interpretation to demonstrate that difference. However, the support does not need to be quotations, as long as the reference to the interpretations can be identified.

Many answers recognised that the two interpretations offered different views about Nazi methods of control and could select detail from the two interpretations to support the explanation of that difference. Answers identified a focus on the use of terror or propaganda, that control was subtle or brutal, or that the 'positive' view in Interpretation 1 contrasted with the critical or negative view in Interpretation 2.

However, some answers merely selected details from the interpretations or described the views of each interpretation in turn, without explaining how this demonstrated the difference in the overall views. It is important for students to remember that the focus of this question is to identify the differences between the overall views rather than identifying differences of surface detail as the latter can only be awarded marks in Level 1. Similarly, responses which asserted differences without support, 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.

### 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 the authors have offered different interpretations about the focus of the enquiry. They should be able to support their answer with reference to the interpretations but they should also make sure that their answer to 3(c) does not simply repeat their answer to 3(b). The best answers have a clear understanding that the interpretations are the result of decisions made by the authors.

Examiners commented that students have become more confident in answering this question, particularly those who understand that historians use sources as the building blocks to form views and interpretations. Where answers suggested that when carrying out research, the authors had placed weight on different sources, students could 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 merely stating that 'the author of Interpretation 1 might have used Source C' or 'interpretation 1 and Source C are both about propaganda'. They should also try to avoid statements such as 'Interpretation 2 supports Source B' as this suggests they have not understood the relationship between the sources and the interpretations. The question is about the interpretations as the end-product of the research process and Level 2 of the mark scheme refers to answers analysing the interpretations and substantiating their explanation.

Alternative explanations also recognise that the historian's approach may affect his or her research and conclusions, for example, whether an historian focuses on the Nazi police state or the use of propaganda. The difference could also be accounted for by the authors' 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 and an explanation of why the different focus of the authors led to different views. It is not enough to simply state that the author of Interpretation 1 focused on propaganda while the author of Interpretation 2 looked at the mechanisms of coercion; details from the Interpretations must be used to exemplify the different approaches of the authors of the Interpretations.

Speculation that the difference between the Interpretations 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.'

While 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 3b, asserted that the authors were biased (sometimes suggesting one author was a supporter of the Nazis) or made statements that did not explain why authors might reach different conclusions.

Some students are still not clear about the different focus of questions 3(b) and 3(c) and find they have pre-empted question 3(c). These students need to repeat their answer in the question 3(c) answer space and write a fresh answer to question 3(b) on separate paper.

Interpretation 1 was mainly focusing on how Hitler spread his words and ideas in a ~~strong~~<sup>subtly</sup> way. However, for example, the highlighted quotation "Radio broadcasts created an emotional tone." This is using propaganda to get people to agree with Hitler and the Nazis. However, Interpretation 2 focused on mainly violence and the consequences if anybody talked bad upon Hitler and the Nazis. "109,000 people imprisoned without trial" This is using interrogation and violence through law to get people to ~~q~~ like Hitler and the Nazis.

Interpretation 1 mainly explained Nazis and Hitler's views through propaganda to not scare Germany's people and Gestapo put on a nice cover so people would vote and join the Nazis. However, Interpretation 2 gives a more truthful, upfront view on how Nazis took control over Germany. This is to make people scared to talk about Hitler and the Nazis badly. The reason both interpretations give different views is to show the impact Hitler and the Nazi Party had on people who were apart of Germany.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

A difference between the views is identified (propaganda v interrogation and violence) and supported by quotations from each interpretation.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Make sure you say what the difference is and then support your answer with details from each interpretation.

In Interpretation 1 they showed the "good" side of the Nazis and how they wanted to be seen.

Although in Interpretation 2, their view was the reality of how the Nazis acted and how people saw them.

A reason could be because the Nazis weren't always seen the same by everyone, and most people would want to hear different views about how the Nazis sounded like and how they acted towards other people.



The answer makes a valid point that Interpretation 1 presents Nazi control as apparently positive while Interpretation 2 presents an alternative view. The use of 'good' in inverted commas and being used to contrast with the reality in Interpretation 2 demonstrates excellent understanding. Unfortunately, this is not clearly stated, for example if the answer had developed the contrast by stating Interpretation showed the violent reality. There is also no support offered from the Interpretations.



Make sure you are showing the difference in views about the enquiry and not simply the difference in individual details, and that you include details from the Interpretations to support your comment.

In interpretation 1, The Third Reich talks about Goebbels, as a minister of ~~Propaganda~~ Propaganda, and how his goal was to spread Nazi ideas in other ways apart from just using overt threats and fear.

While on the other hand, in interpretation 2, Coercion and Consent in Nazi Germany talks about how the main method was to just use fear to control the people of Germany.

This is because people have different opinions on certain things that happen causing there to be two writings about the same objective but different views. This is also because interpretation 1 matches with source C, while interpretation 2 matches with source B, therefore the writers have different reference materials.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Comments

The answer states that people can have different views about the same thing and may have used different reference materials. It matches Source C with Interpretation 1, and Source B with Interpretation 2. However, no details are offered from either the Sources or Interpretations to support this claim.



**ResultsPlus**  
Examiner Tip

Whichever reason is offered for the authors of the Interpretations reaching different conclusions, make sure that it is supported by quotations from, or clear references to, each Interpretation.

The main difference between these views is their opinions on the methods of Nazi control. Interpretation 1's main view is that propaganda was the most common way Nazis controlled people. A quotation to support this is: 'Goebbels, as Minister of Propaganda, aimed to spread Nazi ideas in a variety of subtle ways' whereas Interpretation 2's main view is that the Nazis used their influence over the police and law to control people. A quotation to support this is: 'The main technique used to create terror was the use of the law'

One reason interpretations 1 and 2 differ is because the historians have given weight to different sources. Interpretation 1 focusses on Nazi use of propaganda: 'photographs in magazines... radio broadcasts... mass rallies'. This means that the historian may have used a source like source <sup>C</sup> which also focusses on the use of propaganda: it shows Goebbels making a speech on a radio broadcast. Whereas interpretation 2 focusses on the use of the police: 'the police had the legal power to open people's letters and listen to phone calls'. This means that the historian would have used a source similar to source <sup>B</sup> which also focusses on the role of the law and the duty people had to report others: 'report them to your local Party Leader so that these people can be reported to the authorities'



The answer explains clearly that the Interpretations may be based on different sources and provides details from both the sources and interpretations to support this explanation.



Make sure that your explanation is supported by clear references to the Interpretations. In this case, the reason being offered is that the authors may have consulted different sources so this also needs details from the sources to support the explanation.

### Question 3 (d)

Question 3(d) carries the highest number of marks on the paper. There seemed to be fewer blank answers than previously, which is particularly important as marks for Spelling, Punctuation and Grammar cannot be awarded if this answer is left blank.

Successful students will have already seen how the views in the interpretations are different, thought about 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 Interpretation 2. 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 convincing view.

A number of answers were trapped at the lower level of the mark scheme because they saw this as a straightforward essay question on Nazi methods of control. Although their comments were clearly inspired by the arguments in the interpretations, they offered their own views on Nazi methods of control, without reference to the interpretations, often prefacing their comments with phrases such as 'Some people may think... however, some people may disagree'. Some students also considered a third factor, apparently treating this as a Paper 1 or B Paper 16-mark question. This approach misses the focus of the question, which is about making a judgement on the view offered in Interpretation 2.

While the use of contextual knowledge is an important element in every level of the mark scheme, it must be precisely selected and linked to the evaluation of the interpretation rather than being offered as an answer to the enquiry question. Many lengthy answers included extensive sections of additional knowledge about the Hitler Youth, Edelweiss Pirates, and propaganda but lost the focus on the interpretations; in contrast, a number of successful answers were relatively concise, integrating brief details from contextual knowledge into an evaluation of the interpretations, for example referring to the Gestapo, the People's Court, the Berlin Olympics and Nazi rallies. 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 or irrelevant, for example providing information about the Nazis' rise to power.

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. In a number of cases, details from an interpretation were presented as independent confirmation that the interpretation is accurate. The analysis of the interpretations was most successful if quotations or explicit references were included at various points rather than merely being used as an introduction or conclusion to a section on the police state or the use of propaganda. As stated above, the interpretations do not need to be dealt with in equal depth but both should be examined explicitly. Students often successfully used details from Interpretation 1 to counter the view in Interpretation 2. When answers focused exclusively on the view provided in interpretation 2 and used this as a basis for an essay based on their own knowledge, they were less successful.

There is no expectation of a specific structure to answers but it may be helpful to remember that the question asks how convincing Interpretation 2 is, not which interpretation the student finds most convincing. 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 offer a different view, before reaching the judgement 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, merely 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. A number of answers explained that both interpretations could be true, for example saying that the police state apparatus was necessary until the propaganda took effect. This approach was built on a consistent line of argument throughout the answer and an explanation of the criteria being used, which is different from an answer saying the interpretation is 'somewhat accurate'.

Examiners reported some impressive answers to 3(d) and many students were able to engage confidently with the interpretations, taking a range of approaches. It was pleasing to see there seemed to be an increased awareness that the difference in the views in the interpretations can be conveyed through selection/omission or emphasis as well as language and tone.

The focus should remain on the interpretations and students who examined precise details from the interpretations and then used their own knowledge to support these points were more likely to gain the higher levels than those who focused on the enquiry and included extensive sections of contextual knowledge.

The existence of the strands which make up AO4 leads to 'best-fit marking'. All strands are considered before a final mark is decided upon. The most successful students, therefore, were able to display evidence of a clear understanding of all three strands:

- i) The analysis of the provided interpretations
- ii) The deployment of contextual knowledge to support the application of criteria
- iii) The quality of the judgement based on reasoning and the evidence presented.

I <sup>mostly</sup> agree with interpretation 2 about Nazi methods of controlling ~~the~~ their people to a certain extent through the idea that they used laws and fear to control the people. This can be seen when it states, "The police had the legal power to open people's letters and listen to phone calls". From my own contextual knowledge I know this to be true through the actions of the Gestapo. The Gestapo were a secret Nazi police force that were <sup>not</sup> ~~was~~ ~~was~~ would search for political opposition. They would tap ~~phones~~ into phones, had networks of informants and would regularly spy on people, closely linking with the government. They would also sometimes use torture in order to gain confessions. They were also very successful, as <sup>in</sup> ~~by~~ 1939 alone the Gestapo had arrested 160,000 people for political offences, making me agree heavily with interpretation 2 as <sup>the</sup> fear of the Gestapo spying on ~~the~~ the people would allow the Nazis to control the people. Next, I agree with the interpretation when it states that, "New laws were passed to extend the use of the death penalty". From my own knowledge I know this to be true as

Nazis used the death penalty increasingly through their law courts. The Jury was abolished, Judges now decided innocence, guilt and punishment, Hitler sometimes imposing these sentences himself. As a result, punishments became harsher, and between 1934-39, 81 people had been given the death penalty. This heavily contrasts to the death penalty between 1930-32 which was only used 8 ~~times~~ times, further showing how the Nazis used new laws to control their people as these death penalties acted as deterrents, making me agree even further with the interpretation. However I do not agree fully with interpretation 2's idea that law was the ~~the~~ whole reason why the Nazis controlled people. This can be seen when it states, "It was also illegal to tell jokes about Hitler". Whilst I know that this is true from my own knowledge, I also know that this law was not always ~~followed~~ followed; This was through the Gideleweiss pirates, <sup>(founded early 1930s)</sup> a group of teens that opposed the Nazis and Hitler youth. They regularly made jokes about and at Hitler and the Nazis and sometimes attacked Hitler youth members. Furthermore by 1939 their numbers had reached 2000 members, showing their popularity. As a result, whilst it was illegal to make jokes about Hitler, some ~~still~~ still did see through this, making me not fully agree with interpretation 2 as <sup>set</sup> laws

did not always control the German people effectively.

On the other hand, I only partially agree with Interpretation 21 to a certain extent ~~when it states that~~ that propaganda was used to control the German people seen when it states that, "Mass rallies, such as those at Nuremberg, were a combination of popular celebration". I know this to be true as the Nuremberg rally in 1936, organised by Goebbels, was a mass display of the Nazi party. There were over 200,000 party supporters there, in a large stadium with massive symbols of eagles and hundreds of Swastika symbols. All of this would make the party seem very organised, strong and give the German people the idea of unity, allowing the Nazi party to control people this way. Moreover these rallies were held frequently and especially interested young people as it gave them great excitement. As a result this propaganda allowed the Nazis to control the German people making me heavily agree with this part of the interpretation. However I do not fully agree with the part of ~~some~~ interpretation to a certain extent when it states, "Radio broadcasts created an emotional tone". Whilst it is true that radio broadcasts were a way of propaganda for the Nazis, ~~this broadcasting~~ was still partially enforced. ~~It~~ On regular occasions workers

we forced to stop work and listen to Hitler speak on the radio rather than out of their own will, ~~showing~~ and ~~with~~ would sometimes have no care for his message. This leads me to disagree with interpretation 1 as it shows that some of the propaganda the Nazis produced was still forced and a part of law, linking in with the idea of law controlling the people in Germany in interpretation 2, furthering my agreement with it to a certain extent.

Overall I heavily agree with interpretation 2 to a certain extent as it mentions the Nazis use of law and how to control its people, linking in with my knowledge ~~about~~ of the Gestapo, law courts and death penalty. However it is limited as not everyone was controlled by these laws, such as the Edelweiss pirates which regularly made jokes about Hitler when it was law not to. I only partially agree with interpretation 1 to an extent as while rather interested ~~many people, this was not~~ as many people through propaganda, radio was ~~to~~ sometimes forced, ~~the~~ making one ~~on~~ disagree that propaganda was the reason for this control and again ~~to~~ heavily agree that it was due to law and fear to a certain extent.



The answer is an explained evaluation of Interpretation 2, incorporating contextual knowledge when discussing specific details. Interpretation 1 is also analysed and there is a clear sense of evaluation running throughout the answer. It meets the Level 4 requirements for each strand of the Assessment Objective.



The focus of this question is on how convincing Interpretation 2 is. 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. Notice how frequent references to the Interpretations are woven into the answer, meaning that the answer stays focused on the Interpretation, and contextual knowledge is closely linked to the analysis of the Interpretations.

To some extent I agree with this interpretation and that the Nazis main way of control was through the use of ~~violence~~ <sup>the law</sup>. During many rallies/Reichstag voting elections members of the SA were known for targeting and physically attacking members of the communist party in hopes of scaring them into stepping down from elections. As a result of this the Nazis won 203 ~~votes~~ <sup>seats</sup> in the 1932 election and as a result very quickly changed the laws and created some new ones in order to support their ideologies. The most famous being the Nuremberg laws these were a set of laws implemented by the Nazis that helped to go against Judaism these laws involved things such as Jews could not hold any high level occupation e.g doctor/teacher/judge and that Jews could not attend school. The laws were quickly followed by boycotts and attacks on both Jewish shops and places of worship.

However to some extent I disagree with this interpretation. I believe that the Nazis also mainly

Used violence and fear as their main way of control. They used to make public examples of those who did not follow Nazi orders, people would be beaten or even in some cases killed in the street for disregarding the usual Nazi regime. The most infamous use of violence to threaten and control was aimed at the Jewish population in Germany and came in the place of the night of broken glass or Kristallnacht as it is better known. Kristallnacht was a night that involved many people mostly Nazis breaking windows and doors of Jewish shops or synagogues they also burnt books written by Jewish authors in the streets this included ~~and~~ holy books.

In conclusion I believe that the Nazis mainly used violence and fear to control the German population and that they knew nobody would oppose them if they did so.



The student has understood Interpretation 2 but the analysis lacks a focus on the Interpretations as there are few references to Interpretation 2 and no use of Interpretation 1. There is some relevant contextual knowledge included here, for example the Nuremburg Laws are a valid example of control through the use of law, but details about 1932 are out of period. Overall a 'best-fit' approach results in a Level 2 mark.



Remember that the focus of this question is about evaluating Interpretation 2, not about offering an explanation of your own judgement on Nazi methods of control.

## 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.

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

- Whilst 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 merely 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>

