



Examiners' Report June 2023

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 or www.btec.co.uk.

Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.



Giving you insight to inform next steps

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

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

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

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk.

June 2023

Publications Code 1HI0_31_2306_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2023

Introduction

The Examiner report is written for the benefit of centres and candidates to provide feedback on how candidates performed in the examination. It has been formally acknowledged by Pearson that there were aspects of the package of sources and interpretations used for Question 3 that were found to be problematic. Centres and students should also refer to the update on GCSE History Paper 3 Germany for specific information on how these issues have been addressed for the marking on this examination paper. This document also includes a commentary specific to concerns raised about Source B and the Interpretations which form the Question 3 package for the historical enquiry.

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/news-policy/subject-updates/history/pearson-edexcel-gcse-history-paper-3-germany-update-no-2.html>

Despite the issues raised many candidates were clearly well-prepared for this option. Most candidates were clearly prepared for the enquiry focus of the majority of Paper 3 and deployed their skills in responding to the assessment. Many candidates did appear to be comfortable in dealing with the content areas covered in this examination. Most were well-prepared for the various question styles and there was clear understanding of the demands of all questions.

The following information applies to all of the paper 3 options and to comments specific to each question on Paper 31 can be found below the general information.

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

Questions on this paper cover all the Assessment Objectives but two-thirds of the available marks are for question 3, which focuses on sources and interpretations. The four parts of question 3 form a package leading to a final question in which candidates, having explored the utility of the provided sources in part 3(a), and analysed the different views presented in the interpretations and the reasons for those differences in parts 3(b) and 3(c), are then invited in part 3(d) to judge the extent to which they agree with one of the interpretations. It is therefore important that candidates appreciate the differences between the sources and interpretations, and how these are used in the different parts of question 3.

The focus in 3(c) is on why the interpretations might differ and the specific areas of weakness explained below should be read carefully. It is not possible to provide effectively substantiated reasons why the interpretations are different based on such things as where and when the interpretations were published, although a small number of candidates did attempt to do so without success (see specific information about 3c below).

Question 3(d) carries the highest number of marks on the paper. Successful candidates will have already shown how the views in the interpretations are different and why this might be the case and have understood that there is likely to be source evidence in support of both interpretations. They are now asked how far they agree with one of the interpretations. The strongest responses to 3(d), therefore, focused clearly on the interpretations themselves, reviewing the views of the interpretations and coming to a substantiated judgement. Candidates who focused exclusively on the view provided in Interpretation 2 and used this as a basis for a response based on their own contextual knowledge were less successful than those who considered the views from both interpretations. There is no expectation that both interpretations are dealt with in equal depth, but both should be examined explicitly. The use of contextual knowledge is an important element in this evaluation, but it must be precisely selected to support the evaluation and not just used to display knowledge of aspects of the topic which the candidate has revised but are not relevant to the enquiry. Candidates should be reminded that the content from the sources provided may be used to provide contextual knowledge for the interpretations. In addition, some of the strongest responses were able to show how the differences of view in the two interpretations were conveyed in reaching their overall judgements.

Question 1

This question requires candidates to make two inferences from a source. Candidates need to ensure that the inferences made are valid in relation to the question focus and are not just paraphrases or comprehension of the content provided in the source.

The focus of the question was about education in Nazi Germany. There were two marks available for each valid inference – one for the inference itself and one for the supporting information. A significant number of candidates seemed to understand how to make an inference, and most used the content of the source to provide support for the inference. However, many candidates deployed comprehension which is not rewardable.

The majority of valid inferences were made about the prioritisation of certain school subjects which could be supported by 'the number of Physical Training lessons was increased' and the use of education by the Nazis to spread their ideas by quoting 'new books, the new songs, the new curriculum.' Candidates also used the source to make a valid inference that either students supported the changes made or were afraid to challenge Nazi ideas. Some made other interesting inferences such as the Nazis were proud of their changes to education with the support ('a lot of publicity') or that the Nazis were less obvious and overt in their methods to control education with 'some changes had hardly been noticed'.

It is also worth reiterating that this question assesses AO3 (source analysis) only, and own knowledge about the topic which cannot be inferred from the source is not rewardable. A number of candidates stated the use of education to enforce different gender roles or to spread the Nazi's racial policies, which were inferences that could not be made from the source.

1 Give **two** things you can infer from Source A about education in Nazi Germany.

Complete the table below to explain your answer.

(i) What I can infer:

I can infer that the Nazi regime wanted to ~~to~~ keep ^{children} people fit and healthy.

Details in the source that tell me this:

This is shown by 'The number of Physical Training lessons increased'

(ii) What I can infer:

I can infer that the Nazi regime highly regulated the education system.

Details in the source that tell me this:

This is shown by 'the new books, the new songs, the new curriculum, & the new rules'



4 marks. This candidate has made two inferences about education in Nazi Germany supported by direct reference to the source.



Think about the space provided – inferences do not need to be explained in great detail and a single sentence is often sufficient.

Question 2

In question 2 the focus will always be on causation, but the question does not require a judgement to be made or for the answer to prioritise or show interaction of factors, and no marks were available to reward this evaluation, however strongly argued. Instead, the most successful candidates showed a consistent analytical focus throughout their response. In question 2, the stimulus points in the question will often be useful reminders to candidates of specific areas of content which they can write about. Many candidates were able to give specific details of the Bamberg Conference and used elections to explain decisions made to participate in the democratic process following the Munich Putsch. Candidates do not need to use these stimulus points but there is an expectation that there will be some depth of knowledge, shown by three discrete aspects of content being covered, although this does not mean candidates need to identify three different causes or events.

Candidates awarded Level 4 were confident in analysing the reasons for the reorganisation of the Nazi Party in the years 1924 – 28 with clear and distinct aspects of content in support of their analysis. Responses at the higher levels included the fallout from the failed Munich Putsch, the Party's electoral failures in the 1920s in the context of Weimar's recovery and the impact of Stresemann's policies, the need for Hitler to assert his leadership, the importance for the Party to organise at local level and the need to attract funding. Responses at this level frequently had secure knowledge of the Bamberg Conference to support their analysis such as the resolving of the nationalist and socialist divisions within the Party, the importance of the 25-Point Programme, Goebbels' increasing influence, Strasser's reduced role and the formation of the SS. Responses in Level 3 tended to show less focus throughout their response on the conceptual causation demands of the question.

At Level 2, candidates often described or gave a narrative account of the Nazi Party. These responses often included some accurate information, but frequently included irrelevant material, such as Hitler's early career, the events of the Munich Putsch and the effects of the Wall Street Crash. Level 1 responses were very generalised and with limited knowledge such as the Nazis wanted to get more votes, Hitler wanted to make sure he was a strong leader or that the Nazis wanted more people to agree with their ideas. Some responses at this level went as far as to include material on Hitler becoming Chancellor and the events leading to the establishment of a dictatorship between 1933 and 1934.

2 Explain why the Nazi Party was reorganised in the years 1924-28.

(12)

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

- elections - Munich Putsch/Janine
- the Bamberg Conference (1926)

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

One reason why the Nazi Party was reorganised in 1924-28 is due to the Bamberg Conference that took place in 1926.

This conference occurred with Hitler and other important Bavarian officials to decide and make clear whether the NSDAP (Nazi party) were ~~Socialist~~ or Nationalist. ~~Hit~~ ~~Bavaria~~ ~~this~~ ~~on~~ This was a dispute that caused divisions within the party previously so Hitler decided to call a meeting to sort these issues out. Firstly, he spoke for about 5 hours in order to make it clear that he is in charge and the socialist views lean towards the extreme left wing rather than views such as the communists. This meant he constantly associated socialism with communism which was highly disliked by the NSDAP and claimed anyone who leans towards socialist views is against the Nazi Party and therefore, at a result, the party was now centred on the more nationalist and socialist due to this and Hitler managed to make his point known. Therefore, this caused a reorganisation because there were previous divisions between socialist and nationalist views of the party.

Another reason why the Nazi Party reorganised in the years 1924-28 is due to the previous failed Munich Putsch. This was a failed attempt by Hitler to overthrow the Weimar government

and planned to gain him power as the leader of Germany. He ordered 1000 SA troops to storm into a meeting with other politicians in the Weimar building and at gun point forced ~~3~~ three of them to pledge their loyalty and support to the putsch. The man in charge let those men go however and they immediately informed the army who were waiting for Hitler and the 3000 troops he managed to gather (2000 of which were volunteers). This obviously did not go to plan and as a result Hitler was arrested (served 9 months out of 5 years) and the putsch was put down. Therefore, after the event, Hitler realised the Nazi Party must gain public support and recognition and gain power the way instead of the use of violence and intimidation which led to the reorganisation.

The main reason for the reorganisation is the lack of support for the Nazi Party during these times due to the prosperity and of the Weimar Republic through Stresemann's strategies. This is because the party only had around 106 seats in the Reichstag which is about 2% overall. This meant that the party have not gained enough support from the public. Therefore, to strengthen support and gain seats (500000 votes are equal to 1 seat), Hitler used propaganda. Joseph Goebbels was the master of propaganda and organised posters, speeches, film, rallies etc. convincing the Nazi Party was coming to gain public support in the future elections and gain seats in the Reichstag. The propaganda was specifically targeted towards farmers for example who hated communism so they got a lot of rural

areas & suppressed the Nazi party. Therefore, the reorganisation was needed because the Nazi Party had to get more seats for Hitler to be able to become chancellor, and to grow political power. Therefore, the lack of support, encouraged more propaganda and the reorganisation of the party in the way to gain seats.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Top level 4. The response fulfils all the criteria for Level 4. It is directed consistently on the focus of the question, is coherent and sustained with accurate and relevant information precisely selected and shows wide ranging knowledge and understanding.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Keep the analysis linked to the question throughout the response and make sure that detail is being used to support the analysis, rather than being provided purely as information.

Question 3

Some aspects of the package of sources and interpretations for Question 3 were found to be problematic. The information here is taken from our subject advisor Mark Battye's update of 26 June, and is reproduced in part to clarify the approach taken in the marking of scripts. Please also refer to the update of 15 August; both updates can be found via the History subject page on the Edexcel website: <https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/subjects/history.html>.

Source B

Source B refers to radio, sports and cinema, and whilst the provenance of Source B and its inclusion of cinema are clearly within the remit of the specification, radio and sport are not specifically mentioned in Key topic 1, from which this question is drawn. Radio was important in the wider period, particularly as a powerful propaganda tool used by the Nazis; students were not expected to have specific knowledge of the use of radio in Weimar culture, and valid contextual knowledge of the wider period, including Nazi use of radio, was rewardable.

Students could use knowledge to support inferences about cinema, which is specifically listed in the specification, or by referring more generally to the 'Golden Years' of economic recovery which meant people had more disposable income to spend on leisure and cultural activities.

Interpretation 1

Interpretation 1 refers to Weimar culture in the 1920s, but it also refers to the 1930s which is outside the date range included in the question. References to the 1930s encouraged students to bring the 1930s into their own answers, and any use of contextual knowledge from the 1930s to validate the interpretation was valid. This included Nazi use of radio during Nazi rule as a validation of the power of radio. However, since the question specifically targets the years 1924–29, students were not required to go beyond 1929.

Interpretation 1 suggests a positive view of changes in culture in the years 1924 – 29, stressing the developments in mass culture and especially the new developments of the cinema. Mass culture is not directly referenced in the specification; however, both cinema and art were media of mass culture during the Weimar Republic, and this is covered by the specification through developments in art and the cinema.

Analysing and evaluating the interpretations (AO4)

The sources and interpretations were selected to reflect different views of cultural change in the Weimar Republic with an emphasis on positive vs negative/disruptive influences. Students found valid different views, and most looked at it from this positive vs negative perspective. However, the assessment model for Question 3 assumes that there are different viewpoints that can be gained from the sources and interpretations and there is not only one viewpoint rewardable. Any valid viewpoints were rewardable and any analysis that was valid of culture and cultural change was rewarded in relation to the mark scheme.

Overall, student performance on Question 3 was comparable to that in Summer 2019. This supported the experiences of our senior examiners, who found during marking that many students were able to answer the question effectively in spite of the issues identified.

Question 3 (a)

All the sub-questions in Section B relate to either the two interpretations, Sources B and C, or both the sources and interpretations. 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). The enquiry for the 2023 examination was on cultural changes in the Weimar Republic in the years 1924–29. The issues with the package for this examination have been acknowledged in the introduction to this report. Candidates could use contextual knowledge of cultural changes in Weimar Germany in the years 1924–29 from Key Topic 1.4 of the specification or more generally about the recovery of the Republic in the years 1924–29. As the enquiry targeted the years 1924–29 examiners did not require candidates to go beyond 1929 but as explained in the Pearson Edexcel GCSE History Paper 3 Germany update No.2 valid contextual knowledge of the wider period, such as the Nazis' use of radio was also rewardable. It should also be reiterated that the assessment model for Question 3 assumes that different viewpoints can be gained from the interpretations and there is not only one specific viewpoint that is rewardable. Any valid viewpoints were rewardable in relation to the mark scheme.

In question 3(a) candidates are expected to evaluate the usefulness of the content, taking account of the provenance of the sources, and applying contextual knowledge in making judgements about the utility of the sources as evidence for the specific enquiry, in this examination being cultural changes in the Weimar Republic 1924–29. These strands are linked and should be dealt with together, rather than in isolation. There is no need to compare the two sources and, indeed, only a handful of candidates did attempt to do this.

Most candidates were able to engage purposefully with the sources and able to use their source evaluation skills and wider contextual knowledge of the Weimar Republic to good effect. However, as in previous examination series, there were still candidates who did not link content to provenance and contextual knowledge. Some candidates used generic assertions about the value of the sources. Some candidates also did not give a judgement on each source. Fewer candidates however are comparing sources and most understand that this is not a requirement.

At Level 3 many candidates showed an excellent contextual knowledge and understanding of the cultural changes in the Weimar Republic which they could use together with developed reasoning on the provenance of the sources to reach a judgement on utility. To interpret the sense of progress and popular support for cultural changes shown in Source B, candidates at this level used aspects of contextual knowledge, such as the 'Golden Years', which led to economic growth and a raise in living standards that allowed many to access leisure activities and new technological advances; the popularity of films such as *Metropolis*; the popularity of jazz music; and changing attitudes towards women. The content of Source B was used by candidates to make comments about the impact of the First World War on society, divisions between rich and poor, the changing status for women and how these changes were seen by some as challenging traditional values. In terms of provenance affecting the utility of the sources, at Level 3, candidates need to consider the effect of an aspect of the provenance on the usefulness of the source content. In this examination, candidates most frequently commented on Source B as a magazine focusing on cultural trends, meaning it was targeted at a specific audience, and for Source C that an artist living in Berlin would demonstrate life in the capital city rather than across Germany as a whole, or showing life in urban areas rather than reflecting the reality in more rural and traditional areas of the country. Many candidates also were able to comment on Otto Dix as a painter.

At Level 2, developed comments were frequently made about the content of the sources, with Source B showing the increasing range of entertainment and Source C showing the popularity of nightclubs together with the impact of war on Germany via the war veteran shown in the painting. This was often linked with developed comments on provenance, such as that the author of Source B shows the views of those interested in cultural changes, and for Source C they generally expanded on the caption provided with comments, such as the artist would be very aware of the changes occurring at the time. The contextual knowledge at this level frequently mentioned that the 1920s was a period of increasing prosperity for Germany following a period of difficult recovery after the First World War, or that the 1920s were a period of increasing freedom for many women. Candidates were also rewarded for referring to the man in the left section of the painting as either a war veteran or as someone homeless.

Level 1 responses tended to describe both sources and mainly focused on the popularity of radios for Source B and a description of the nightclub scene for Source C. Comments on provenance at Level 1 were very generic statements without explanation, such as 'the author is biased' or 'Otto Dix was there', and contextual knowledge relied on simple statements such as 'life was good for people in 1920s Germany'.

3 (a) Study Sources B and C.

How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into cultural changes in the Weimar Republic in the years 1924–29?

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

(8)

Source B is useful for an enquiry into cultural changes when it says "It might be the construction of a new sports arena or the introduction of films with sound in the cinema." This tells us that the ~~public~~ public were able to enjoy their lives and have things that were new. It is also useful when it says "a radio broadcast can be heard by 200 000 ~~listeners~~ listeners" this tells us that the radio was becoming a big part of their lives.

Source C is useful into an enquiry into cultural changes because it shows a ~~nightclub~~ nightclub on the right-hand side. This shows us that people ~~could~~ could go out more and women had more freedom to go out more. On the left of the picture it shows an army veteran

and some younger people dancing. This shows the change from living through/in war to the new, colourful nightlife.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Level 2. The response meets the criteria for Level 2. Comments are made about the content of Source B and for Source C there is material on both content and contextual knowledge is shown.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

For Level 3, responses should also include how the provenance affects the usefulness of the source.

3 (a) Study Sources B and C.

How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into cultural changes in the Weimar Republic in the years 1924–29?

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

(8)

Source B is very useful for an enquiry into cultural changes in the Weimar Republic in the years 1924–29 as it lists the forms of arts and entertainment new to Germany. For example, the source mentions 'the introduction of films' which suggests to historians that there were trending movies in Weimar during this period. In 1927, the film 'Metropolis' has been aired in cinemas across Germany, which became extremely popular due to its genre of science-fiction, being ahead of its time. Movies like this had not been introduced until the Golden Age, which made the Weimar Republic an exciting place to be during this time period. Despite the magazine being a German source with possibly biased views, it still is a really useful source ~~for~~ ^{for} an enquiry into cultural changes as it tells us what forms of entertainment were popular and drew attention in the years 1924–29 as this was written and published during that period. Therefore, the source is very useful.

Source B is also quite useful as it shows through visual imagery what life was like in the years 1924–29 in the Golden Age for art and entertainment. The right-hand side of the painting suggests to historians that nightclubs were enjoyable, with live

jazz music being played and women dressed up, joining men in the club, being a free and fun experience for everyone. During the years 1924 and 29, cabaret had been introduced in Weimar, where it was popular for women and men to dress up in bourgeois-like outfits and perform in nightclubs. Jazz and swing had also become extremely popular genres of music, which influenced the styles and taste of the Republic during this time. Women also had more rights under Article 109, where women had equal rights to men. Despite the painting possibly being an exaggeration of the night life in Germany, it successfully tells historians that this was in fact a Golden Age for the country and there was a drastic change in culture at the time, therefore being ^{a very} ~~an extremely~~ useful source.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Top Level 3. This response fulfils all the criteria for Level 3. Valid criteria are used to make comments on the usefulness of the sources which take into account how the provenance affects utility. Contextual knowledge is also used to interpret the sources and apply a judgement on utility.

Level 3 candidates need to consider the effect of an aspect of the provenance on the usefulness of the source content.

Question 3 (b)-(c)

In this question 3(b), candidates are asked to identify a difference in the overall view being offered in the interpretations; these do not necessarily contradict each other but they do provide alternative views. The responses should identify the key difference but also provide support from each interpretation to demonstrate that difference. Many responses recognised that the two interpretations offered different views about the cultural changes and could select detail from the two interpretations to support the explanation of that difference.

It is important for candidates to remember that the focus of this question is to identify a difference between the views rather than identifying a difference of surface detail, as the latter can only be awarded marks in Level 1. Responses which asserted differences without support, for example stating that Interpretation 1 emphasises positive developments in culture, whereas Interpretation 2 emphasises cultural changes that might have shocked some, stayed in Level 1. Other views identified by candidates included mass change versus more radical change, and unifying the nation versus divisions in Weimar society. Level 2 was achieved when the candidates indicated a clear difference of view and supported it with detail from the extracts. Many candidates were able to score full marks and there was a wide variety of relevant and valid differences identified.

For question 3(c) it is important that candidates recognise the relationship between questions 3(b) and 3(c). Having identified that the two interpretations offer different views, candidates are asked to suggest a reason why these different views have been reached. They should be able to support their answer with reference to the interpretations.

The focus here is on the process by which the historian produces their interpretation. Where responses suggested that when carrying out research, the authors had placed weight on different sources, many candidates scored the full 4 marks by linking details in the interpretations with details in Sources B and C. This was then 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'. Alternative explanations also recognise that the historian's emphasis may affect their research and conclusions, for example whether an historian has focused on different aspects of culture in Weimar Germany.

The most common low-scoring responses often wrote about an aspect of the provenance of the interpretation, such as that the historians had written their accounts in different years, or to discuss the political views of the historians, saying that one of the historians was a Nazi or supported the Nazis, or that one historian was left-wing and the other right-wing. These responses tended to call the historians 'biased' as a result. Other candidates repeated what was different about the interpretations rather than a reason why they were different. In a few responses, candidates attempted to use their own knowledge to explain the differences and believed that the historians had personally experienced the events of the 1920s. For instance, such responses would explain that the historians had different experiences and therefore opinions of hyperinflation, the Treaty of Versailles, and the greater cultural freedom of the 1920s.

It is clear that candidates have become more confident in answering this question, particularly those who understood that historians use sources as the building blocks to form views and interpretations. These candidates often used Sources B and C to exemplify this historical process.

In trying to explain a reason for the difference between interpretations some candidates were still attempting to use the provenance of the interpretations to provide this explanation, and this is unlikely to provide a valid basis for a response to this question. The full reasons for this are explained in the *Getting Started Guide* on pp 43–44: 'Candidates 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.' A significant minority of candidates tried to provide explanations for difference based on such factors as the titles of the books, their origin or date of production. Such approaches did not produce creditworthy responses.

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

They give different views about cultural changes in the Weimar Republic in the years 1924–29.

What is the main difference between these views?

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

(4)

Interpretation 1 says 'Mass culture grew significantly in the 1920s.' This shows that it was seen as a good time for the Weimar Republic. Interpretation 2 however states that 'crime, sex and drugs became major problems.' This tells us that the Weimar Republic wasn't a good place to be at all. Overall, Interpretation 1 shows the Weimar Republic to be a great, modern, innovative place whereas Interpretation 2 says it's a crime ridden bad place.

(c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about cultural changes in the Weimar Republic in the years 1924–29.

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

(4)

Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about cultural changes because they looked at different evidence. Interpretation 1 may have looked at Source A or similar as the views agree with the evidence. Source A says 'radio has become a significant cultural factor' and Int. 1 says 'number of listeners increases.' Interpretation 2 is likely to have looked at Source B as they both have 'cabaret singers' in.



Top Level 2. For 3(b) this answer clearly states the main difference of view between the interpretations and supports this with extracts from the interpretations. For 3(c) this candidate has gained full marks by explaining how the writers may have different views as they have given weight to different pieces of evidence. They evidence that by referring to the interpretations and the sources and therefore achieve a mark in Level 2.



In part 3(a) the answer flags the difference between the interpretations using the word 'whereas'. Use of such a word indicates the candidate is invariably comparing the interpretations. For 3(c) there is no need to write lengthy responses. Full marks can be achieved by candidates with concise responses which evidence the links between the interpretations and the sources.

Question 3 (d)

The issues identified with question 3(d) have been commented on in the introduction to this report. Examiners almost universally commented on the extent to which candidates of all abilities were able to utilise the AO4 skills they had learnt and deploy contextual knowledge of Weimar Germany in relation to the set enquiry. At all levels of responses, candidates provided some interesting analysis of the interpretations, and at the higher levels there were some insightful responses that were a pleasure to read.

Question 3(d) carries the highest number of marks on the paper. Successful candidates will have already seen how the views in the interpretations have differences, why this might be the case and, in completing 3(a) have understood that there is likely to be evidence in support of both interpretations. They are now asked how far they agree with one of the interpretations. The strongest responses to 3(d), therefore, focused clearly on the interpretations themselves, reviewing the different views and coming to a substantiated judgement.

Candidates at the higher levels often analysed Interpretation 2 with precise details supporting valid views that can be made, for example, that cultural changes in Weimar Germany were a challenge to traditional society, showed divisions in society or were regarded as negative by many Germans. In contrast, Interpretation 1 was generally evaluated as portraying a positive view of the cultural changes, e.g., having a unifying effect on Germany and bringing results that the majority of the population were able to enjoy and benefit from. Some candidates compared the interpretations as showing technological changes affecting culture versus social changes, which for some in society were liberating and allowed more freedom of expression. Responses at lower levels referred vaguely to the differences of the interpretations with little or no supporting information, for example referring to positive and negative aspects of cultural changes.

The selection of contextual knowledge to support the evaluation was often a strong aspect of candidates' responses, with most candidates showing a good awareness of how to deploy their contextual knowledge. Fewer candidates focused primarily on providing contextual knowledge for its own sake. Most candidates showed an awareness of how to use their knowledge to help them decide on the validity of views selected from the interpretations.

At Levels 3 and 4, candidates were able to offer contextual knowledge for both interpretations regarding mid-to-late 1920s Weimar Germany, with frequent references to the impact of films such as *Metropolis*, or the effects of economic recovery on society, with improving living standards for many. There were also candidates at these levels who explained the extent to which cultural changes affected various groups in society differently. Very often candidates at these levels also made explicit links to Sources B and C. At Level 2, the contextual knowledge was much more general, such as 'Germany was getting richer in the 1920s' and 'women's lives were improving in Weimar Germany'. As explained elsewhere, contextual knowledge in the form of the Nazis' use of radio both in their rise to power and in government was rewardable. Some candidates in low Level 2 and in Level 1 offered unrewardable contextual knowledge after 1933, with references to changes in the lives of women and the impact of Nazi policies on living standards.

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 candidates, therefore, were able to display evidence of a clear understanding of all three strands:

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

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about cultural changes in the Weimar Republic in the years 1924–29?

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

(16)

I agree with interpretation two because I know that 1919/20 was a bad year, the years 1924-29 specifically towards the end was not very good as there was a lot of criminal activities going on such as "sex and drugs".



Low Level 1. The response fulfils the Level 1 requirements for a simple comment to agree with interpretation and with the inclusion of a direct quotation. There is no contextual knowledge included and therefore the response does not meet all the criteria to be awarded high Level 1.



Candidates are reminded that the use of contextual knowledge forms part of each of the four levels of the mark scheme for this question.

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about cultural changes in the Weimar Republic in the years 1924–29?

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

(16)

I mainly disagree with interpretation 2 because it only ~~the~~ portrays Germany in a negative light during the time 1924–29. Although some people may have suffered, especially the Weimar politicians since they were disliked after hyperinflation, many German citizens had a good experience in the period called "The Golden Age". I agree ~~it~~ with interpretation 1 more since it highlights the significant, positive changes.

In interpretation 2 it says that "paintings were full of violent images." I can see why traditional Germans were shocked since the Golden Age represented a change from old ideas and promoted expression. Some of the public may have viewed this art as wrong since it was something unexpected and different. However the interpretation 2 doesn't ~~deals~~ talk about the art that wasn't violent. For example schools ~~we~~ like Bramhaus were built, artists ~~and~~ were

encouraged to express themselves and experiment to try new methods. It is highly unlikely that all of the artwork during this time contained only violent images, for example, in Source C it is more colourful and vibrant than violent, therefore proving Interpretation 2's statement as biased and incorrect.

Interpretation 2 also talks about the "Films, plays and stories were written to shock people", during 1924 and 1929, directors and film makers started to explore the 'seedier' side of WWI and life in Germany. This meant that some films or stories included offensive material or making humorous content from serious matters. I partially agree that this shocked some people, after 10 long, hard years it may have angered people. However, ^{people also} ~~some~~ enjoyed it and it boosted morale since it was comedic and relatable. Overall the cultural changes were very controversial and I can understand why some viewed it as negative since ~~many~~ some poorer people were left behind and not given financial aid or help after the disastrous effects of hyperinflation and WWI.

I agree with Interpretation 1 since it explores the significant growth in culture and technology which benefitted the public. "Newspapers increased", showing the improvement in communication allowing political, leisurely news to be spread quickly and more widely. A new invention of the Radio began. ~~Also~~ By 1928 70% of Germans had a radio or access to radios. This increased and led to ^{the} cultural change of widespread knowledge and information. The increase of "10 000 in 1924 to over 4 million by 1932" shows the growth. Interpretation 1 highlights the positive effects, showing the changes helped the boost of morale ~~to~~ for the public. Furthermore, the cinema drastically improved. Germans watched films from other countries, such as the ~~modern~~ USA. ~~and~~ Films explored a range

of genres; from romantic to horror. ^{A couple} German actors and actresses became famous internationally, building up Germany's reputation in film.

"Germany made more films in the 1920s and early 1930s than all other European countries put together", this huge market for Germans was ~~best~~ booming the economy and Germans as a whole. Film also opened places for jobs, creating a demanding sector ^{and improvement to the economy}. This also suggests the huge success and popularity ~~to~~ the German citizens had for film and cinema. It was a leisure activity that ~~was~~ became a ~~way~~ of part ~~propaganda~~ asset of culture in Germany as well. In addition other cultural changes included the improvement in life for women. They were given the seats in state and could be elected as member of government, 18% of the government ~~became~~ ^{were made up of} women.

In conclusion ~~however~~ mainly disagree with Interpretation 2 since it conveys the writer's feelings of dislike for this period and ~~is~~ possibly is biased making the source less useful, so hard to agree with. I believe that ~~the~~ 1924-29 was a positive



High Level 4. This candidate reviews the alternative views presented in the interpretations impressively and comes to a substantiated conclusion. Good contextual knowledge is used to support the analysis and there is a clear line of reasoning throughout. Level 4 has been met for all three strands: judgement, analysis and contextual knowledge. They therefore achieved high Level 4.



Candidates who examine precise details from the interpretations and then use their own knowledge to support these points are more likely to gain the higher levels.

Paper Summary

Examiners commented that there were a number of impressive responses where candidates seemed well-prepared and excellent knowledge was deployed to support thoughtful analysis and evaluation.

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

- Candidates need to make an inference rather than paraphrasing the source in question 1.
- Candidates 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. This is particularly important when considering question 2. Responses need to focus on why, rather than how.
- Candidates should appreciate the difference between sources and interpretations and be aware that interpretations are constructed by historians 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 responses used specialist terms with confidence. Spelling, punctuation and grammar and the use of specialist terminology were assessed on 3(d) with most SPaG marks awarded 3 and 4. However, poor handwriting made a number of responses very difficult to read. The SPaG 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.

If extra paper is taken, candidates should state clearly in the answer space for the question that it has been continued and where the rest of the answer has been written; this should be on an additional sheet rather than elsewhere in the paper 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 candidates should be discouraged from assuming that lengthy responses will automatically score highly. Indeed, candidates taking extra paper often 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>

