

Examiners' Report

June 2025

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 <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 1HI0_31_2506_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2025

Introduction

Examiners felt that most students seemed to find the paper accessible as there were few blank answers. Students also seemed confident in tackling the various question styles, including the new format of question 2, which offered a choice of topics.

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, analysed 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 important that students appreciate the difference between sources and interpretations, and the focus of the different parts of question 3. There are still a number of students who do not understand the difference between question 3(b) and question 3(c). In question 3b, 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 and many scored the full 4 marks. However, when they are asked about a reason for the different views in question 3(c), 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 just need to show an understanding that the author has chosen what language 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.

Question 1

This question requires students to make two inferences from a source and it is sometimes regarded as an 'easy' question. However, students need to be sure that the inferences they make from the source are not 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; in this case, the enquiry was about the impact of hyperinflation, not about women's position in society. Most answers consisted of inferences that hyperinflation meant that wages had to be paid every few days, that prices rose rapidly, and the urgency to spend the paper money as quickly as possible. Students should recognise that details from the source can only be rewarded if they are provided as support for an inference; marks cannot be awarded if the detail from the source does not support the inference in the answer. No marks are available for students who provided simple paraphrases, description, or comprehension of the source.

- 1 Give **two** things you can infer from Source A about the impact of hyperinflation in Germany in 1923.

Complete the table below to explain your answer.

(i) What I can infer:

The mothers and wives seem very desperate to get the money from their husbands to be able to buy food

Details in the source that tell me this:

They wait ^{almost} every morning outside factories and ~~rush~~ 'hurry' to the stores.

(ii) What I can infer:

Prices were growing very quickly so people would buy things as fast as possible before prices rose

Details in the source that tell me this:

'the prices are usually higher' ^{again} in the afternoon. This shows how rapidly prices were going up.



The answer makes 2 valid inferences about the impact of hyperinflation - that it made mothers and wives desperate to be able to buy food, and that prices rose very quickly, therefore women felt the need to buy food as quickly as possible. In each case, a relevant detail from the source is provided as support for the inference. It scored 4 marks.



Make sure the inferences are relevant to the question - the impact of hyperinflation.

- 1 Give **two** things you can infer from Source A about the impact of hyperinflation in Germany in 1923.

Complete the table below to explain your answer.

(i) What I can infer:

Hyperinflation meant that the money had to be spent when earned otherwise it'd be worthless the next day.

Details in the source that tell me this:

"All the stores closed at this time, when the stores opened again, the prices would usually be higher"

(ii) What I can infer:

~~At~~ People were paid 3 times a week

Details in the source that tell me this:

"3 times a week, about 10 o'clock in the morning... so the women wait for the man to hand them money"



The first inference is valid - that money loses its value very quickly. However, the second answer is comprehension, not an inference. It scored 2 marks.



Make sure that your inference is something that can be worked out from the content of the source and not something that is stated in the source.

Question 2(a)

This year, for the first time, candidates had a choice in question 2. Question 2a, about why support for the Nazis increased in the years 1929-32, was more popular than question 2b, about why young people opposed the Nazis in the years 1933-39.

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 breadth 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.

In both options, a number of answers remained at Level 3, despite excellent knowledge, because they missed the focus of the question. Such answers to question 2a offered detailed descriptions of the Wall Street Crash and the Depression in the USA or included details of hyperinflation, the Munich Putsch and the early years of the Nazi Party without explaining how this related to increased support for the Nazis in 1929. Other answers assumed that the Nazis controlled radio broadcasts and newspapers during the election campaigns. A few also wrote about the Reichstag fire and how Hitler used this as an opportunity to attack communists.

In question 2b, the tendency was to describe the activities of Hitler Youth, Edelweiss Pirates, Swing Youth, and education policies. Some answers also discussed the White Rose group, although this was outside the timescale of the question and the specification.

In question 2a, strong answers explained how the failures of coalition government led many people to turn to extremist parties and fear of communism meant that many turned to right wing parties, such as the Nazis. Hitler's abilities as a speaker and the use of propaganda were also discussed in question 2a.

In question 2b, strong answers made points such as 1 million young people refused to join the Hitler Youth organisations even when membership was made compulsory, demonstrating opposition to the Nazi programmes of activities. These answers made reasonable suggestions that such people objected to the highly regimented nature of the Hitler Youth.

Many students had excellent knowledge about this period and examiners commented on the number of impressive answers. However, 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.

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 2(a) ☒ Question 2(b) ☒

Write your answer here:

One reason support for the Nazi party grew was because of the Wall Street Crash in 1929. The Wall Street Crash was the crash of the American stocks and economy, causing the USA to recall ~~loans given~~ 800 million worth of loans given to Germany ~~to be recalled~~. Germany relied on these loans as the economy had just begun to recover, so when the loans were recalled, businesses had to close ^{increasing unemployment} and ^{causing} the German economy ~~to collapse~~ again. This, and how poorly the Chancellor Brüning handled ^{the crash} it caused many Germans ^{to} lose faith in the government, ^{resorting} ^{supporting} going to extreme parties as a result. This led to a growth in the support for the Nazi party as Chancellor Brüning attempted to cut ~~taxes~~ unemployment benefits to resolve the economy, showing that the government did not know how to deal with the issues, furthermore, the Nazi party promised to resolve the issue resulting in more support and faith for the Nazis instead.

Another reason for the growth of support for the Nazis was because of propaganda. For example, ~~many~~ ^{many} households in Germany owned radios or often read the news, which the Nazis used to their advantage by gaining support from newspapers. ~~The Nazis~~ ^{Hitler} often gave speeches too, and ~~was~~ ^{and was} described as a powerful speaker ^{and more reliable than the Republic} influencing people to support the Nazis. Furthermore, they often held rallies which also led to further support. Within the speeches and rallies, Hitler promised "work and bread" to workers and "blood and soil" to farmers, using their aims from the 25 point programme to attract all classes ^{votes}. Hitler also convinced businessmen that ~~the party~~ ^{they} party ~~was~~ would defeat communism, securing ~~with~~ ^{winning} support. This led to an ~~increase~~ in Nazi support as they used ~~their~~ wishes and fears of all classes to attract their support and votes in return ^{hope} of ~~for~~ what they wish came to be ^{completed} ~~done~~.

Another reason for growth in Nazi support was the SA. The SA were Hitler's personal army, which ~~eventually~~ had around 800 members and later 100,000. The SA dressed in brown uniforms, making them stand out and often removed opposition from other parties through violence. The SA were also used to intimidate and bully candidates during elections, ~~later on~~. The SA made the party look organized, powerful and disciplined, which contrasted the current government who seemed weak, leading to a growth of support as Germans were impressed by the SA and looked up to them. Although, some may have feared them due to their violence ~~to~~ and intimidation tactics towards opposition still securing support. ~~It is~~ ^{the} ~~reliance that~~ ^{hope that} they would restore Germany.



The answer gives a clear explanation of the Weimar government's failure to cope with the Depression and the consequent growth in support for the Nazi Party. It also explains how Hitler's speeches were aimed at various groups within society and finally it explains how fear of communism was used to gain support from businesses. Although the later points are not developed in as much detail as the first one, the analysis is clear and supporting detail is offered in each case. It scored the full 12 marks.



Make sure that details are included to support the analysis and that you do not just describe the situation.

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 2(a) ☒ Question 2(b) ☒

Write your answer here:

SUPPORT grew for the Nazi Party because ~~known~~ of events like the wall street crash, thanks to this ~~known~~ the Nazi Party was able to increase their reputation and popularity. They did things like offering jobs and food, this attracted lots of people and made them look good while also making the government look bad for not helping their people. Also, they had Hitler in their party, and this helped them grow as Hitler was very charismatic. His speeches helped gather all kind of Germans as his speeches were ~~more~~ meant for ~~all~~ men, women and children.

Also the Nazi Party's support grew thanks to people looking for a new government, because at the time, the Weimar Republic was not offering much support to its people. ~~the~~ The Nazis' support grew due to how what the Nazis were offering as both poor and rich was satisfied with the Nazi's party's goals and changes.



This answer makes similar points to the previous answer. It identifies Hitler's speeches, dissatisfaction with the Weimar government and the Nazi promises as reasons why support for the Nazis grew. However, the analysis is not developed and there is limited supporting detail. This means that the answer is placed at the top of Level 2 for both AO2 and AO1 and scored 6 marks.



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

Question 2(b)

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 2(a) ☒ Question 2(b) ☒

Write your answer here:

~~One reason the support for the Nazis goes down~~

One reason there was opposition from some young people towards the Nazis in the years 1933-1939 was education policies. This was when young people became surrounded by Nazi propaganda and continuously brainwashed about Nazi ideals. All teachers had to ~~join~~ join the Nazi Teachers association otherwise they would be fired. 97% of teachers joined. The entire curriculum was re-written to fit Nazi ideas, 15% more PE was introduced in the school week to create healthy boys for the military and girls for childbirth. New subjects like eugenics and race studies were introduced and all textbooks were re-written to include propaganda like myths being about how many more marriage loans they could give out instead of spending it on caring for disabled people. Radios were constantly broadcasting Hitler and Nazi posters were all around school. Each lesson started and finished with a ~~to~~ salute. This caused opposition from the youth as many children didn't want to follow the curriculum. Some children didn't want to grow up and be in the military (boys) or stay at home (girls). Many children also opposed the fact that they couldn't marry anyone or have children with anyone they like, it had to be someone who was a pure German. This led many children to oppose what they were being taught at school.

Another reason was the Hitler Youth and the ~~League of German Maiders~~ League of German Maiders. This was when by 1938, the Hitler youth had become compulsory for boys to attend. At first, many young children enjoyed the ~~tasks~~ tasks, the ~~teamwork~~ teamwork and the ~~friendship~~ friendship. Poor boys ^{from the city} also got to a camp in the countryside which they ~~would~~ wouldn't have ~~been~~ previously been able to do. However, as time went on and it became compulsory, it became more like a chore. They had to do ~~more~~ military drills, practice shooting and overall prepare to be a soldier. Some boys opposed it as they found it ~~for~~ boring, others just didn't want to be soldiers. The ~~Hitler~~ Hitler Youth became a ^{hard} training place for them rather than a fun club to socialise ~~at~~ at. Children were also ~~also~~ encouraged to tell on their parents if ~~they~~ they spoke badly about the ~~Nazis~~ Nazis at home, they would be ^{arrested or} sent to concentration camps if they had. This meant many ~~for~~ boys opposed the Nazis as they were using them to prepare for war while also taking their ~~parents~~ parents away. The ~~for~~ League of German Maid Maiders was essentially the ~~for~~ girls version of the Hitler Youth. Here, girls were taught how to cook, clean, sew, and look after the home and children. Many young girls opposed this as ~~they~~ they wanted to ~~work~~ have a job and work for the family. They didn't ~~just~~ just want to have children and stay at home. This meant there was opposition as children's lives ~~was~~ were being controlled out of school as well as in.

A final reason was youth opposition groups like the Swing Youth and Edelweiss Pirates. The Swing Youth were children from wealthy families who ~~smoked~~ smoked, drank, and listened to music. They refused to comply to Nazi ideals and instead opposed them. Swing Youth members set up illegal dance clubs that were attended by over 6000 young people. In these dance clubs, they listened to jazz music which was ^{banned as it was} seen as the music of black people who were viewed as inferior ~~to~~ by Hitler. Their favourite was the jitterbug. This showed opposition as it directly went against Nazi wishes. Another group was the Edelweiss Pirates. These were youth from poorer families. They wore their hair long, copied American style clothing and hung around on street corners. When they came into contact with Hitler Youth members, they beat them up or teased them. This showed that there was opposition youth groups set up to oppose the Nazis. Some Edelweiss Pirates were executed and despite this, people still joined the opposition. ^{showing how much they opposed it} However, there was only 2000 Edelweiss Pirates in comparison to 8 million Hitler Youth members showing that there weren't as many children willing to openly oppose the Nazis. This showed that many children did oppose the Nazis, but some were too scared to go against them completely.



The answer has a clear focus on opposition from youth, suggesting that they resented the curriculum changes that were intended to spread Nazi ideas, the compulsory membership of the Hitler Youth and League of German Maidens and the nature of their activities. The answer was consistently focused on explaining why young people would have opposed the Nazis and the explanation is supported by relevant details. This reached Level 4 for AO2 and AO1, so it received the full 12 marks.



Spend some time thinking and planning your answer before you start to write - this answer only took 2 pages.

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 2(a) ☒ Question 2(b) ☒

Write your answer here:

~~Was~~ Young People in Nazi Germany was a big aspect towards Hitler as ~~young~~ young people ~~are~~ are easier to manipulate and deceive. However, some ~~the~~ young ~~people~~ German didn't want to be manipulated such as the Swing Youth and the Edelweiss pirates. ~~These~~ The Swing Youth was an example of ~~an~~ a rebellion against Hitler as they listened to Jazz music, ~~and~~ drank alcohol and attacked Hitler's SS. Hitler hated Jazz music as it was originated from black people in America. The Edelweiss pirates also rebelled against Hitler ~~and~~ as they did things Hitler hated such as not going to school, not joining the Hitler Youth and also drinking alcohol whilst listening to Jazz music. The Edelweiss Pirates were hated by the Hitler Youth. The Hitler Youth was another way Hitler ~~was~~ could and ~~was~~ manipulate young people as this ~~was~~ trained young people for war whilst it also taught young girls how to clean

houses and had him to look for a
good husband.



The answer has good detail but it is descriptive rather than analytical. This means it is Level 2 for AO2 and AO1; it was awarded 6 marks,



Make sure you use the details in your answer to explain why something happened.

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 living standards in Nazi 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, each source showing a different aspect of the lives of workers in Nazi Germany. Some candidates assumed that the sources reflected the lives of different social groups, or that Source B was propaganda, whereas Source C revealed the reality of workers' lives.

Students should read the attribution of the sources carefully.

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 (Source B) was staged without developing the comment, for example by linking the idea it was staged to comments about its purpose, suggesting it may have been intended to be used as propaganda. Many answers about Source C stated it was an accurate source simply because it was from the time of Nazi rule, or assumed Bernt Englemann was writing about his own experience, while others assumed his memory could not be accurate in view of the time gap. 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.

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. Many answers dismissed the sources on the basis of such comments and similarly, the photograph was commonly assessed as being limited because it was 'only a snapshot of one moment'. While this is true, it does not mean that the image is unreliable or of no value. In a strong answer, this sort of comment could be developed with a discussion of its purpose, or contextual knowledge could be used to assess whether the image shows a typical situation. It should also be recognised that unreliable sources can be very useful, for example, Nazi propaganda provided an insight into the messages that the government wanted to project.

Unfortunately, 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 Strength through Joy organisation arranged cruises' – some additional detail is needed as a demonstration of that own knowledge.

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 confirm or challenge 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 felt that more students than previously made an effort to include contextual knowledge but that it was not always used in the evaluation of the source.

This question is the one where additional paper was used most often. However, it was relatively rare for the additional section of the answer to change the mark earned in the answer space. Many lengthy answers made a number of points about content and/or provenance but 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, one about provenance and using contextual knowledge, has the potential to reach Level 3 because it has addressed all three strands of the mark scheme. Some answers used a checklist approach, offering brief comments about content, provenance and contextual knowledge but not linking them into an overall evaluation of the source, considering the effect of an aspect of the provenance on the usefulness of the source content, or integrating contextual knowledge in the process of reaching a judgement.

The focus should be on assessing the usefulness of what is in the source rather than listing details which are not mentioned and sources should not be dismissed because they do not cover every detail that might be helpful in an investigation. 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 living standards in Nazi Germany.

3 (a) Study Sources B and C.

How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into people's living standards in Nazi Germany in the years 1933–39?

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

(8)

From source B ~~the~~ I can infer that workers often had leisure activities where they had fun which complemented their work. This is shown in the workers taking part in a game with bright smiles, and a crowd cheering them on, also suggesting that they had fun. This is useful as it gives us an insight into the living standards of workers who made up a large population of Germany, and their free time activities. However, the provenance of the source is a photograph which only captures one moment and may have been taken for propaganda reasons which decreases the usefulness of this source as it isn't representative of all living conditions of workers, and may only appear happy, when in reality they were sad, but it shows the overall leisure activities and fun which is useful as it directly impacts quality of life. From my own knowledge I know that this is accurate as German workers had access to cheap leisure, trips and holidays via the strength

through Joy programme, making the source overall useful as it shows that workers had access to fun activities which would imply good living standards however it doesn't describe the daily working and living standards. On the other hand I can infer that living standards were poor for those employed via the ^{RAD} ~~German Labour Front~~, as source C says 'grumbling about the back breaking work, poor housing and bad food they had to put up with' which is useful because it tells us about the poor working and living conditions of many people. The provenance of the source is after the events, however it is an intimate account, which is useful as the writer can recall events without fear of persecution which makes them more authentic which is useful as it serves to make the source more reliable and trustworthy, as he is unlikely to lie. From my own knowledge, I know that this is accurate as the average hours in a workweek increased from 43 in 1933 to 49 in 1939, which backs up the idea that the work was longer and more demanding. Overall the source is useful for an enquiry into people's living standards in Nazi Germany in the years 1933-1939 as it provides accurate details of the long grueling hours and poor living and working conditions, poor food and decreasing wages which contribute to living standards.



The answer shows the value of the content of each source and then considers whether the provenance strengthens or weakens its usefulness. Contextual knowledge is used to confirm the source content. It gained the full 8 marks.



Make sure you cover all three strands of the mark scheme for each source. Consider the source content in the light of its provenance and use contextual knowledge to help you evaluate the source's value.

3 (a) Study Sources B and C.

How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into people's living standards in Nazi Germany in the years 1933–39?

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

Somewhat (8)

Source B is ~~very~~ useful for an enquiry into people's living standards in Nazi Germany 1933–39. This is Source B shows Germans on board a Strength Through Joy Holiday Cruise Ship. This gives the impression they are enjoying themselves, and because it shows women and men, it shows there was equality. This source presents their living standards as good. I know this source is ~~very~~ useful as I know Strength Through Joy was a campaign launched to improve living standards, offering activities such as sports events and films. However, Source C shares an opposite view. It is a book published in 1986 by a German citizen sharing a conversation he heard. ~~I know this is useful as it shares a personal experience~~ it says 'shovelling dirt for a small amount of hourly pay' which suggests, at least for autobahn workers, living standards were not that great. I know this source is useful as

I know hours went up and real wages fell.
Additionally, Source B could be seen as not
very useful as only the wealthy could attend these
events, so it is only useful into an enquiry of
wealthy peoples living standards.



This answer gained 5 marks. It comments on the source content and adds some contextual knowledge but it cannot be placed in Level 3 as it does not consider the provenance of the sources.



You do not need a lot of contextual knowledge in your answer but it should be used in the evaluation of the sources, for example to confirm or challenge the content of the source or to explain the significance of the provenance. If there is no contextual knowledge, the answer cannot get beyond the mid-mark in Level 2.

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.

Many answers recognised that the two interpretations offered different views about living standards and could select detail from the two interpretations to support the explanation of that difference. Answers identified a focus on the positive aspects of the Strength through Joy organisation and the negative experiences of the workers in Source C.

However, some answers simply 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. 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 easily score the full 4 marks by linking details in the interpretations with details in Sources B and C. However, this should be explained with references to both the interpretations and the sources rather than simply stating that 'the author of Interpretation 1 might have used Source B' or 'interpretation 2 and Source C both give negative views'. They should also try to avoid statements such as 'Interpretation 2 supports Source C' 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 research and conclusions, for example whether an historian focuses on the Nazi control of working conditions and hours or the opportunities offered by the Strength through Joy programme. 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 and 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, asserting that the authors were biased 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.

In interpretation 1 it says "everyday life was affected by an improved economy", "Ordinary Germans were able to take a proper holiday for the first time". This shows that life under Nazi rule had improved. In contrast, Interpretation 2 says "German workers lost their rights under Nazi rule", "The cost of living increased". This shows that the standard of living didn't improve but got worse. The main difference is that Inter 1 shows that living standards improved, but Interp 2 shows that living standards got worse under Nazi rule.

(c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about people's living standards in Nazi Germany in the years 1933–39.

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

(4)

One reason why they give different views about living standards is because they focus on different aspects of ordinary life. Interp 1 focuses on the new opportunities given due to things like the joy ~~pot~~ plan, and the positive side to Nazi Germany. Interp 2 focuses on the negative effects Nazi Germany has on the day-to-day lives of workers and how the new rules imposed by the Nazis' negatively impact workers standard of living.



The answer states the difference between the views expressed in the interpretations and supports this with quotations from the interpretations. It received the full 4 marks.



Use quotations or direct references to the interpretations to support your comments.

The view on interpretation 1 is that strength through joy changed people perspective on Nazi Germany and brought a whole lot of opportunities for German people. I know this because interpretation 1 says "ordinary Germans were able to take proper holiday for first time"

the view on
However interpretation 2 that the Nazis changed life for the Germans and not for the better. I know this because it says "German workers lost their rights under Nazis."

The main difference between interpretation 1 and 2 was that interpretation 1 shows how strength through joy changed Nazi lives for the better while Nazi control changed German lives for the worse.

Interpretation 1 may have used source B as source B says "The strength through joy programme also provided cheap tickets for theatre performances and other events." and interpretation 1 shows us the strength through joy cruise ship and people having fun.

However interpretation 2 may have used sources like source C as source C says "we work outdoors in all kinds of weather, shovelling dirt". and interpretation 2 tells us how Nazis have destroyed Germany.

These interpretations may have used different sources.



The answer explains clearly how the sources could have been used by the different authors of the interpretations; it gained 4 marks.



Be specific, make sure the details from the sources match the details from the interpretations; don't make general points.

Interpretation 1 gives the view that the standard of living improved in the years 1933 - 1939 due to strength through joy and the improvement of the economy. Interpretation 2 gives the view that the standard of living got worse for the German people as trade unions were banned and that people had to work more hours.

One reason why Interpretation 1 by M Hughes and C men gave a different view than Interpretation 2 by S Wagh and J Wright is that they couldn't use the same sources. Source B links to Interpretation 1 so they couldn't use something like Source B and Source C links to Interpretation 2 so they couldn't use something like Source C.



The student knows the answer to this question but has not explained it properly. This answer gained 2 marks.



Make sure you include quotations or direct references to the interpretation and also the sources to show how the interpretations and the sources could be linked.

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, incompleting 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 remained at the lower level of the mark scheme because they saw this as a straightforward essay question on the standard of living in Nazi Germany. Although their comments were clearly inspired by the arguments in the interpretations, candidates offered their own views, with little or no reference to the interpretations, often prefacing their comments with phrases such as 'Some historians 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 life in Nazi Germany 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 Beauty of Labour programme, policies to deal with unemployment, and policies on women. 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.

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 simply being used as an introduction or conclusion to a section on unemployment and the RAD. 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 could not meet all the demands of the mark scheme's higher levels.

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, simply an explanation of the different views, with the acknowledgement that each had some valid points.

The strongest answers to question 3(d), therefore, focused clearly on the interpretations themselves, integrating evaluation while reviewing the alternative views and coming to a substantiated judgement. A number of answers explained that both interpretations could be true, for example saying that relatively few people accessed trips on cruise liners and that the view in Interpretation 2 was more representative of the experiences of the workers. 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. The focus in these answers remained 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:

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

It was also 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 of detail, or emphasis as well as language and tone.

Interpretation 2 offers a critical and statistical tone when discussing the living standards in Nazi Germany. It exposes a well-crafted system which minimised opposition and boosted the economy, but this interpretation does not take schemes that were introduced to increase living standards, ~~like~~ into account.

Firstly, it is evident that interpretation 2 states that under the Nazi regime the living standards decreased due to their tight control in society. This can be seen in, "German workers lost their rights under the Nazis... trade unions were banned." In addition the interpretation proposes that "workers could not negotiate for better pay or reduced hours of work." This conveys that the Nazis ~~were~~ played a key role in changing the living standards in Germany. I know from my own knowledge that the

nazis banned many things like trade unions as well as increasing censorship and propaganda. This ~~was~~ was done to minimise opposition and resistance. In 1933 <10% of newspapers were under Nazi control and by 1944 this increased to 82%. This is why I ~~as~~ partially agree with the interpretation as trade unions were banned and censorship was increased. Furthermore, sources from the period inform of nazis "pushing" workers "harder and harder", showing a lack of ~~the~~ sympathy and compassion. Therefore this shows that worker's rights did decrease ~~in~~ under the Nazi regime.

However, interpretation 1 offers an alternative perspective, ~~to~~ by discussing the other schemes the Nazis introduced to aid German workers. This can be seen in "Strength through joy (KdF) holidaymakers cruised on luxury ships." Moreover the KdF movement allowed "ordinary Germans to take a proper holiday." This perspective clashes ~~with~~ with interpretation 2 by ~~show~~ proposing that workers were able to enjoy life. This is true, as from my own

own knowledge, I know that the government employed many schemes to increase work morale and living standards. One such scheme was the *Volkswagen*. This was a scheme which allowed workers to pay monthly installments towards a *Volkswagen*. This helped clear social class divides as previously only the wealthy owned cars. By giving every German worker a chance to own a car the Nazis improved living conditions. This is why I partially agree with interpretation one about living standards.

Alternatively, ~~interpret~~ interpretation 2 ~~offers~~ ~~a~~ proposes that living standards continued to decline in the 1930s due to the cost of living increasing. This can be seen in "very few workers could actually afford the more expensive 'Strength Through Joy' activities, such as cruises." This also leads to the supposition that German workers could not afford stuff due to the Wall Street crash in 1929. I know from my own knowledge that approximately 6 million Germans were unemployed due to the

Wall Street crash and the Great Depression, many also lost their savings in banks. This is a crucial point interpretation 2 takes into account, as this economic recession would definitely have caused many Germans to lose a lot of money, thus expensive activities may not be affordable and the government did nothing to improve this. This shows why I agree with interpretation two and its views on living standards in Germany between 1933-39.

In conclusion, it is clear that both interpretations offer a ~~wide~~ ~~different~~ lens into the ^{living} conditions of workers. However, I agree with interpretation 2 the most as it offers a critical and analytical tone when examining the topic of living standards, whereas interpretation one is ~~almost~~ ~~admirable~~ offers a subjunctive tone. This is admiring the KdF and Nazi policies, which impact its accuracy ^{due} to the potential bias involved. Thus I agree with interpretation two.



The answer identifies the overall impression offered by Interpretation 2 and selects key details and uses contextual knowledge to assess the accuracy of this view. It then turns to Interpretation 1, recognising that it presents an alternative view and explaining the difference between the interpretations. Details are selected from Interpretation 1 and contextual knowledge is again used to assess the accuracy of those details. Further details from Interpretation 2 are examined and the answer highlights the importance of the Wall Street Crash and the Depression as a factor affecting living standards in Nazi Germany. The conclusion clearly states the difference between the approaches of the interpretations: 'a critical and analytical tone' compared to a 'subjunctive [subjective] tone'. This meets the requirements of Level 4 of the mark scheme and the answer gained the full 16 marks.



The higher levels of the mark scheme refer to 'analysis of the interpretations' and relevant contextual knowledge being used to support the evaluation, so select key details from the interpretations and use contextual knowledge to assess their accuracy.

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

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about people's living standards in Nazi Germany in the years 1933–39?

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

(16)

~~I agree~~ I fully agree with the Interpretation as I think the living standards got worse in Nazi Germany. ~~to begin with~~ German workers lost many of their rights and trade unions were banned. This meant that workers could not get their working hours reduced or ask for ~~more~~ a higher wage. The working week increased from ~~43 to 47~~ 43 hours a week to 47 hours a week. Wages also dropped which means people were working longer for less money. This meant that people could not afford the rising prices which means many struggled during Nazi Germany.

I partly agree with the Interpretation as I think some people benefited. The Nazis set up a few different things such as the Volkswagon plan. This worked by if you were to pay 5 marks out of your wage, you will eventually get a volkswagon car. Although no-one had been recorded ~~as~~ getting

the car. They also set up the KDF which was the "Nazi Party's strength through joy movement." This was where millions of Germans were ~~entere~~ entered into this. But in the end only 700,000 ~~was~~ people got to go on holiday.

Overall I agree with the Interpretation as I think ~~the~~ the living standards got worse.



The answer recognises the different views in the interpretations and uses contextual knowledge to discuss these overall views. Valid knowledge is included but there is limited analysis of the interpretations. The conclusion offers a judgement and a reason for that judgement but with limited development. It fulfils most of the Level 2 mark scheme and was awarded 7 marks.



Make sure you focus on the interpretations and don't let your answer become an essay using your own knowledge to give your views on the enquiry in the question.

Paper Summary

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

The following points should be noted:

- While there was good knowledge of some topics, students cannot rely on knowing just a few key topics and hoping to use that information whatever question is asked. It is important that students differentiate between hyperinflation and the Depression, and the policies and actions of the Nazis before and after 1933.
- Students need to recognise the specific focus of the question so that the information being offered is shaped to meet the demands of the question rather than simply describing a situation or including irrelevant material.
- Students should appreciate the difference between sources and interpretations and be aware that interpretations are constructed by historians in order to offer their view of events.
- In all parts of Question 3, it is helpful to be explicit about the source or interpretation being discussed.
- Spelling, punctuation and grammar were broadly accurate and many answers used specialist terms with confidence 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 (especially when referring to, for example, the Nazis' policies)
- Weak grammar ('would 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>

