

Examiners' Report
June 2018

GCSE German 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 2018

Publications Code 1HI0_31_1806_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright
© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

Introduction

Most candidates seemed well prepared for this option and they often took the opportunity to showcase an impressive knowledge of the social, political and economic factors at play in both the Weimar Republic and Nazi Germany. Candidates were generally well prepared for the question styles with a pleasing range of valid approaches to answering the interpretations questions a particular strength.

The Modern World Depth Studies are designed to allow students to understand the complexity of a society within a short coherent period and the question styles reflect this. Section B provides a single enquiry based on two interpretations and two contemporary sources with the focus in this paper being the challenges to the Weimar Republic in the period 1919-1923. The questions in this section form a coherent package leading to a final question in which candidates, having explored the utility of the provided sources, the different views presented in the interpretations and the reasons for those differences, are invited to judge the extent to which they agree with one of the interpretations. Because of the specific focus on Section B, the questions in Section A are designed to explore other areas of the specification which are not covered in B.

In **question 1**, candidates are asked to provide two supported inferences from Source A. No marks were available for candidates who either provided simple paraphrases of the source or ignored the specific focus of the question.

In **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 marks are unavailable to reward this evaluation, however strongly argued. Instead, the most successful candidates showed a consistent analytical focus throughout their answers and many were able to access Level 4 by doing so. 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. 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 the question being covered, although this does not mean candidates need to identify three different causes or events. It was pleasing to see that candidates had understood this expectation and most answers were clearly structured in paragraphs, making it easy for the examiner to identify the different aspects being covered.

All of 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).

In **question 3(a)**, candidates are expected to evaluate the content taking account of the provenance of the sources and apply contextual knowledge in making judgements about utility. These strands are interdependent and should be dealt with together, rather than in isolation. There is no need to compare the two sources although a few candidates took the unnecessary additional step of trying to determine which source was 'most useful' which is not the focus of the question and therefore is not rewardable.

Questions 3(b) and 3(c) examine the views expressed in the two provided interpretations. Candidates are expected to identify the main difference between the views in 3(b) and use the interpretations to support those claims. This question was generally well done and most candidates who were able to show how they differed could also support their answers. The focus in 3(c) is on why the interpretations might differ and this question was more challenging 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 number of candidates did attempt to do so without success. See specific information about 3(c) below.

Question 3 (d) carries the highest number of marks on the paper. Successful candidates will have already seen how the views in the interpretations are different, why this might be the case and, in completing 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 answers to 3(d), therefore, focused clearly on the interpretations themselves, reviewing the alternative views and coming to a substantiated judgement. Candidates who focused exclusively on the view provided in Interpretation 2, and used this as a basis for an essay based on their own knowledge, were less successful than those who considered the alternative views from both interpretations. 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 aspects of the topic which the candidate has revised but are not relevant to the enquiry. In addition, some of the strongest answers were able to show how the differences of view in the two interpretations were conveyed in reaching their overall judgements.

Examiners reported some impressive answers to 3(d) and many candidates were able to engage confidently with the interpretations, taking a range of approaches. However, even weaker candidates were able to access this challenging question and often provided evaluative responses leading to an overall conclusion. Candidates rarely seemed rushed and full answers were generally provided showing that timing wasn't generally an issue on this paper.

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

Spelling, punctuation and grammar were assessed on 3(d) and the most impressive aspect of this strand was the use of specialist terms which perhaps reflects the detailed understanding most candidates had of this depth study.

Question 1

In question 1, candidates are invited to make a valid inference about the success of the Olympic Games of 1936. There are two marks available for each inference – one for the inference itself and one for the supporting information. Most candidates seemed to understand how to make an inference although a disappointing number made inferences about matters which were not related to the specified enquiry i.e. the *success* of the Olympic Games. Such candidates made points about aspects of the source like the length of the closing ceremony without clearly relating this to the idea of ‘success.’ A disappointing number of candidates repeated or paraphrased the phrase ‘The Nazis have succeeded with their propaganda’ as their inference instead of using this as supporting information. However, those candidates who were able to provide an inference were almost invariably able to support it with a relevant quote, paraphrase or description of an aspect of the source.

Candidates used the table provided for the answers well and only those who also explained *why* their supporting information helped to support the inference (which is not required) had to use additional space for their answers.

A limited number of candidates attempted to use the provenance of the source to make inferences, but the target of this question is to make inferences from the content.

- 1 Give **two** things you can infer from Source A about the success of the Berlin Olympic Games in 1936.

Complete the table below to explain your answer.

(i) What I can infer:

The Olympic Games were successful in helping the Nazis spread their message.

Details in the source that tell me this:

"The Nazis have succeeded with their propoganda."

(ii) What I can infer:

The Games were very well run and showed the Nazis to be ~~organized and~~ powerful and good leaders.

Details in the source that tell me this:

"The Nazis have run the games on an extravagant scale never before experienced."



This candidate has made two inferences supported by direct quotations from the source so gains full marks.



Candidates should read the whole question to make sure that their inferences relate to the specific question – in this case the success of the Olympic Games.

- 1 Give **two** things you can infer from Source A about the **success** of the **Berlin Olympic Games** in 1936.

Complete the table below to explain your answer.

(i) What I can infer:

The Games were very new and modernised in Berlin, 1936.

Details in the source that tell me this:

"The Nazis have run the games on an extravagant scale never before experienced"

(ii) What I can infer:

The Nazis gave a good impression of Germany to the rest of the world.

Details in the source that tell me this:

"The Nazis have put on a good show for the general visitors"



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

The candidate has provided two inferences with direct support from the source so gains full marks.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

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

Question 2

Candidates performed well on this question and the topic of employment in Nazi Germany appeared to have been very well taught.

The majority of candidates were able to go beyond the stimulus points, with reference to three aspects of content and relate these to the question and it was noteworthy that even candidates with more limited knowledge of the content were often able to provide a clear structure in their answers, if not a clear analytical focus. The stimulus points are provided to help candidates to link the question they have been asked with the material they have studied and to provide a prompt to the analysis of the process of change. The majority of candidates used the stimulus points to aid their explanation of the reasons for the reduction of unemployment in Nazi Germany and many were able to add in at least one extra aspect of content. Knowledge was very strong in the area of rearmament with some high-performing candidates able to use Hitler's disregard for the terms of the Treaty of Versailles, and even failure of the international community to react to it, to explain why the Nazis were able to use rearmament to reduce unemployment. Most candidates were familiar with the autobahns as they are mentioned in the specification, although many candidates attempting to use specific knowledge about them often made wild estimates about the intended length of the new network or the numbers of men employed in their construction. Again, high level answers often explained why such public construction projects might have created the conditions for wider economic growth and, therefore, longer term reductions in unemployment.

Other popular topics were also those named in the specification such as the labour service and invisible unemployment and these were often well explained. However, those candidates who attempted to show that reductions in unemployment could be explained by recruitment to the SA and SS struggled to make a convincing case.

Candidates did not need to provide a conclusion to show a sustained line of reasoning and those who were most successful showed a sustained focus on the question in every paragraph. Candidates who only really attempted any analysis in a conclusion struggled to meet the AO2 requirements at the higher levels. Candidates are not expected to prioritise or link factors at Level 4 and few attempted to do so. In cases where candidates did prioritise factors, examiners were sometimes able to reward some aspects of the candidate's argument as showing a clear line of reasoning but it was not a strategy that automatically gained levels 3 and 4.

At Level 2, candidates often described the methods used to reduce unemployment which left links to the question too implicit to meet the AO2 focus on analysis. At Level 3 candidates were mainly focused on the conceptual focus of the question but sometimes lacked the wide-ranging knowledge required at Level 4. At Level 4 there were many sustained analytical responses supported by well-chosen examples which displayed clear understanding of the topic and these were often rewarded with full marks.

Overall, candidates were very comfortable with this style of question and produced a range of impressive answers.

2 Explain why the Nazis were able to reduce unemployment in Germany in the years 1933-39.

(12)

You may use the following in your answer:

- rearmament Invisible unemployment
- autobahns RAD.

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

There were three main ways the Nazis were able to reduce German unemployment: the public works projects, rearmament and also changing the way unemployment statistics were calculated.

One way the Nazis reduced unemployment was through huge public work projects such as the autobahns - the German motorways - These would stretch for thousands of kilometres, and thus the Nazis helped to boost employment in the construction industry. Furthermore, the existence of efficient transport routes enabled German goods to be moved around more quickly, which helped create further jobs in German trade and industry. As a result, these new growing work sectors helped reduce unemployment whilst boosting other sectors of the economy, creating more jobs. Therefore Hitler's autobahn projects helped reduce unemployment by providing plenty of new jobs that had not previously existed.

Another reason why the NSDAP were able to reduce unemployment was rearmament. Despite the Treaty of Versailles, which ~~limited~~ limited the German army to 100,000, Hitler introduced military conscription in order to make Germany's defences and image stronger.

By the late 1930s 1 360 000 people were employed in the army, but 72,000 were also employed in ~~weapon and~~ aircraft construction industries, which came with the growing ~~a~~ military investment. Consequently, people who were previously unemployed were now employed as soldiers or factory workers, significantly reducing unemployment. Therefore Hitler's rearmament plans reduced unemployment by creating jobs in the army and the weapon construction industry.

The final reason why the Nazis could reduce unemployment was due to their adjustments to the way official statistics were calculated. For example, women, Jews, ~~and~~ political prisoners and anyone in concentration camps were not counted as unemployed, whilst people with part-time jobs were counted as fully employed. As a result, Germany had high levels of invisible unemployment, even though they reduced unemployment figures by 4 million. This made it seem like fewer people were unemployed and that the economy was benefitting from Nazi policies.

Therefore Nazi changes to how unemployment figures were calculated helped 'reduce' unemployment by ignoring certain groups of people who had been absent or removed from society.

In conclusion, Nazi public works helped create temporary jobs in the construction industry; military conscription boosted the number of people working for the army or related industries, and Nazi 'invisible unemployment' reduced the appearance and figures of unemployment in Germany.



The candidate has covered three areas of content (autobahns, rearmament and invisible unemployment) and has, therefore, satisfied the requirements for Level 4 answers to go beyond the stimulus points and to show wide-ranging knowledge. In addition, detail is used to support the analysis, which is evident in every paragraph, rather than being provided simply as information.



This candidate has provided a conclusion but it does not add to the marks awarded. Instead, Level 4 has been reached by the focus on the question which is evident in every paragraph.

2 Explain why the Nazis were able to reduce unemployment in Germany in the years 1933-39.

(12)

You may use the following in your answer:

- rearmament
- autobahns

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

The Nazi made many major promises to the German people. One of the most important promises on the agenda was to reduce unemployment. They did this through a few projects.

Firstly, after the Treaty of Versailles was signed the German army was reduced to 100,000 men and 6 battleships as well as demilitarizing the Rhineland. Upon Hitler's dictatorship he decided to go against the treaty and began to build up the German Army and many also got jobs in factories providing soldiers with weapons and tanks. Furthermore, remilitarizing left many men once considered Freikorps with their old jobs and they possessed skills to work efficiently.

Secondly, ~~that~~ Hitler found many men work in building the vision of the Third Reich.

Hitler had in mind. This included building new schools, factories, roads, government buildings and major sports stadiums. The largest sports stadium was built for the 1936 Olympic which held 110,000 people and provided more with jobs in construction. Furthermore, the autobahns were built which were large long motorways spanning across Germany and required thousands of men to build it.

Lastly, Hitler decided to make women and Jew not part of the numbers of the unemployed meaning they were not counted for. Furthermore women were banned from becoming lawyers, doctors and teachers so new job opportunities were opened up for unemployed men.

Women were given loans to stay and work at home, cooking, cleaning and raising children. Furthermore it was also known that Nazi officials tampered with national statistics

In conclusion, the Nazis provided many jobs in construction, the military and those previously aimed by women to reduce unemployment.



This candidate displays good knowledge of the topic with some aspects showing wide-ranging knowledge of the period. However, although the explanation is mainly directed at the focus of the question, there are sections which describe what was done rather than explaining how the Nazis were able to achieve reductions in unemployment.



Organising the answer into paragraphs makes it clear to the examiner that three aspects of content have been covered. A sentence at the end of each section showing how it helps to answer the question can help to raise the AO2 level in an answer.

Question 3 (a)

Candidates need to approach the utility question bearing in mind that judgements about utility should be based on the usefulness of the sources for the specified enquiry, in this case challenges to the Weimar Republic. It is important for candidates to remember that judging utility may involve some comments about reliability but answers which focus solely on this aspect tend to be extremely negative towards the source material.

Reliability can only ever be a small element of utility because an unreliable source can still be very useful. It is also important that in judging utility provenance is related to the content of the source. For example, the fact that the factory worker who was interviewed for Source C had actually experienced the traumatic events she is describing perhaps makes it more useful to understanding the challenges to the Weimar Republic. It might be true, as many candidates pointed out, that because she was interviewed 50 years after the events described she might have forgotten details. However, those same candidates often did not point out any areas in the source which displayed this forgetfulness. In addition, many candidates who had stated that the information in the source matched their own historical knowledge, often providing useful detail, then proceeded to describe the source as useless because of the time between the events and the interview.

Many candidates made simplistic judgements about the reliability of the two sources which simply did not match with their wider analysis. For example, many candidates dismissed Source B as not being trustworthy because it appeared in a newspaper and newspapers are 'biased' or tend to exaggerate. More sophisticated answers looked at the significance of such a photograph being featured in a newspaper. These candidates offered suggestions about how the widespread publication of the source might have made it more useful for finding out about challenges to Weimar because it might have shaped public opinion about the Kapp Putsch i.e. it gives a useful insight into how the public saw the challenge to Weimar.

The provenance of the source was often dealt with on a generic level and this is only likely to gain marks at Level 1. Many candidates who offered otherwise quite interesting analysis of the content and applied excellent subject knowledge to the interpretation of the sources still had a tendency to fall back on simplistic judgements about provenance. Again, in the case of Source B, these comments tended to be restricted to such ideas as the photograph being staged without any analysis of how, why or to what end. Candidates often referred to such things as the photograph being 'a snapshot in time' or that the technology to manipulate photographs did not exist in the 1920s so it was trustworthy. Not only are these statements too basic to be considered analytical but they are also demonstrably untrue.

Many answers made good use of contextual knowledge but some well-prepared candidates spent too much time talking about the Kapp Putsch and hyperinflation without using that material to support reasoning about the sources' utility, becoming stuck in Level 2 at best for many of their points. In addition, it is not possible to gain credit for simply asserting that the candidate knows an aspect of the source to be true without using specific knowledge to demonstrate this. Knowledge of the numerous challenges to Weimar was quite strong although a small number of candidates confused the Kapp Putsch with the Munich Putsch. It is also worth noting that simple comprehension – 'it states', 'it shows' – based on the assumption that such information is useful, remains low level. Developed statements about the usefulness of the content can reach Level 2 but answers consisting solely of such comments are unlikely to progress beyond mid-Level 2, irrespective of the length of the answer, because the other strands of the Assessment Objective have not been addressed.

In attempting to analyse utility, many candidates have obviously been encouraged to describe what is missing from the source and this led to some answers which could only be marked at Level 1 for

this aspect of the mark scheme. The primary focus for all candidates should be to judge the utility of what is there rather than what is not there. For example, many candidates claimed that Source B was not useful because it did not show all the soldiers in Berlin at the time but this is not something that the photograph could be reasonably expected to show. Candidates should recognise that the sources were not written in order to be used by historians and they cannot cover every detail that might be useful in an investigation.

Answers reach Level 3 by assessing the usefulness of the content in the light of the provenance and the candidate's own knowledge; the criteria used to make the judgement could be its accuracy (this is not the same as reliability), the relevance of the source, the way it could be used by the historian, how representative the source is etc. An evaluation of a source's utility should be explicit about the criteria being used, for example an answer should be able to explain that while the language may be emotive, the facts included can be supported from the candidate's own knowledge so the source is very useful despite any loaded language. Similarly, the answer might show an awareness of the different uses of a source for this enquiry: an interview might be only an indication of one factory worker's experience but its usefulness might be found in indicating the attitude of the working classes towards the government.

Although a judgement should be reached on the overall usefulness of each source, there is no requirement to compare the sources or to use them in combination and no marks are available for this. Doing this wastes time that could be used to explain the judgement made with regard to utility.

3 (a) Study Sources B and C.

How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into the challenges facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919-23?

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

Source B shows me ^{the} ~~the~~ political challenges through a photograph of Freikorps soldiers in the streets of Berlin around a tank. I know this to be true because the Freikorps consisted of ex-soldiers who had access to military equipment. From my own knowledge, I know the Freikorps soldiers (led by Wolfgang Kapp) marched on Berlin claiming to be the new leaders of Germany. This source is useful because it ^{supports} ~~advances~~ my knowledge of the Kapp Putsch, however this source's provenance is a photograph. This reduces its usefulness because it could've been staged.

Source C shows me a woman's experience of hyperinflation and how you'd have to use your money as "next day your wages would only be worth half

as much as the day before". I know this is true because in 1923 the bread cost 200 million marks, the Government kept printing money to support rising prices but money ended up "literally not worth the paper it was printed on". The source is useful in showing the Weimar Republic's financial problems but the source comes 51 years after the event. This makes it less reliable as things can be forgotten or remembered differently.



At Level 2 candidates will make developed comments related to the content of the sources and/or their provenance. In this case the candidate has used their own knowledge effectively to assess the utility of the source content. Their attempts to analyse the provenance of the source are not convincing. Despite this, and some slight confusion about the type of military hardware on display, the criteria for Level 2 are still securely met.



Candidates using precise knowledge to support points about the specific aspects of the source will always perform better than those who just use this question to write about the topic.

3 (a) Study Sources B and C.

How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into the challenges facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919-23?

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

(8)

Source B is a photograph of Freikorps soldiers taking part in the Kapp Putsch. We know that the Kapp Putsch failed as German workers went on strike thus not in support of the revolt the Kapp Putsch therefore was not successful. However this tells us that there were challenges to the ~~the~~ Weimar Republic because of the different ideologies held by ~~the~~ people. The Kapp Putsch ~~was~~ had a right wing ideologies. This source shows how the Freikorps are ~~unwieldy~~ actively this shows how ~~the~~ they have changed news as they were helping in the Spartacist uprising. The Freikorps is a threat as they had military experience and evidently the picture shows they still have their uniforms and equipment, this means that they were a potential danger to Weimar. Rather than helping defend Weimar like previously, they are now going against them. On the other hand this source was a photograph for the newspaper therefore intended for publication, therefore its ~~the~~ trustworthiness can be questioned as, if the Freikorps were aware of the picture being taken for publicity they would allow themselves to show they are succeeded to be presented as strong to the public. Therefore this source is useful to an extent.

Source C is an interview with a woman who recalls hyperinflation. From this source we can infer that money lost its worth and people were required money and as a result lost trust in Weimar Republic. We know that in 1922, Germany stopped paying reparations instalments ~~and~~ therefore in 1923, France and Belgium invaded the Ruhr, central to Germany's economy. ~~As~~ As a result workers were told to go on strike ~~and~~ in the Ruhr Germany had to print money to help pay off debts and workers on strike. The money printed however couldn't match their gold and had ~~no value~~ the money lost value. This led to hyperinflation where ~~money~~ for example bread cost 0.6 marks but rose to 20 billion marks. Therefore if Germans didn't support Weimar it was understandable, ~~and~~ this meant people were losing hope and trust to improve living standards. However this source is an interview in 1974, 51 years later. This could hinder the accuracy of the source as some information could have been forgotten or mistaken which limits the knowledge given on challenges to Weimar. However it does express ~~the~~ how the value of money dropped therefore this source is reliable but may not be accurate towards due to the time frame. In addition this source however is very useful as it is from a person who actually experienced life in Weimar Germany during hyperinflation, rather than being ~~as~~ ~~the~~ written by a historian or people doing research. It is a source ~~that~~ directly from a Weimar German.



This candidate applies valid criteria to the sources, such as accuracy, and makes some developed points about how the provenance might have an impact on the utility of the content of the source. For example, the potential 'staging' of the photograph is part of a well-developed point about the image the Freikorps might have been trying to present.



At Level 3 candidates will always have a clear focus on the utility of the source for the specific enquiry – in this example the candidate is focused on how useful the source is for an enquiry into the challenges facing the Weimar Republic.

Question 3 (b)

In this question candidates need to identify the difference between the views given in Interpretations 1 and 2 about the specified enquiry, in this case the challenges facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919-23. Candidates are expected to identify a difference and evidence this by selecting relevant points from the interpretations.

Responses which asserted differences without support, for example stating that Interpretation 1 was focused on challenges from the Left and Right whereas Interpretation 2 focused on the challenge of hyperinflation, stayed in Level 1. Some candidates gave differences of detail, for example, 'some democratic parties did support the Weimar Republic' but on the other hand 'people talked openly about removing the government.' Candidates who did this without also showing how these details convey a difference of view also stayed in Level 1.

Level 2 was achieved when the candidates indicated a clear difference of view and supported it with detail from the extracts. Most candidates were able to score full marks and those that didn't fell into one of the 2 categories mentioned above.

Candidates' success in question 3(d) is influenced by how well they identify the views given in the interpretations. Therefore, those who did identify the differences of view about the challenges facing the Weimar Republic in this question, 3(b), were able to build on this more successfully than those who failed to, when it came to answering 3(d).

Some candidates tried to use extra space in the booklet to write very full answers but in many cases these were simply lengthy paraphrases of the interpretations which did not identify the main difference between them and failed to gain additional marks.

(b) Study Interpretations 1 and 2. They give different views about the challenges facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919-23.

What is the main difference between these views?

Explain your answer, using details from both interpretations.

(4)

Interpretation 1 explains that powerful political groups ^{was} ~~were~~ the main ~~even~~ ~~fact~~ challenge the Weimar republic faced, whereas interpretation 2 explains that hyperinflation was the main challenge.



The candidate has clearly identified a major difference between the interpretations. However, without support from the interpretations the answer is limited to Level 1.



Candidates should always try to offer a difference in the overall view presented by each interpretation rather than just focusing on differences of surface detail.

(b) **Study Interpretations 1 and 2. They give different views about the challenges facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919-23.**

What is the main difference between these views?

Explain your answer, using details from both interpretations.

(4)

Interpretation 1 talks about how the biggest challenge facing the Weimar Government was other political parties. This can be shown when it says "They were prepared to destroy it by force and replace it with their own government".

Where as Interpretation 2 talks about how the biggest challenge facing the Weimar Government was Hyperinflation. This can be shown when the interpretation says "the government could not find a solution and simply printed even more money off. This ruined the economy".



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

As well as identifying a main difference between the interpretations this candidate has provided quotations to support the points being made which means that this answer must be placed in Level 2.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

Once a difference has been identified, short quotations from the interpretations or a paraphrase of some of the points made will be enough to provide the support required for Level 2.

Question 3 (c)

Moving on from identifying the differences in view in question 3(b), candidates need to explain reasons for those differences in question 3(c). Only one reason, effectively substantiated, is required to get into Level 2. Successful candidates were able to show an understanding of why historians come to different conclusions, or have different emphases. This might be due to a variety of factors such as the weight given to different sources, in this case candidates might refer to the support given by Source B for Interpretation 1 and by Source C for Interpretation 2. Some candidates also discussed the different emphases of the interpretations, with Interpretation 1 concentrating on political challenges such as those from Left and Right and Interpretation 2 highlighting the economic problems caused by the occupation of the Ruhr. Very few candidates developed the possible explanation that these were partial extracts from longer works.

Successful candidates selected one of the above approaches and evidenced their reasoning with specific support from the Interpretations. Most candidates were able to do this, with most opting for explaining the differences in terms of the weight given to the selection of sources by the historians. Those who stayed in level 1 did not fully understand the nature of the question. Some gave a valid reason for the difference in view, but failed to support this reason, stating for example that the views differ because the historians have used different evidence, but not providing evidence for this.

A significant minority of candidates attempted to speculate as to the background motivations of the historians which is not a requirement of this question. Candidates who did this tried to use the date of the Interpretation, the title of the book from which it came, or the nature of the interpretation i.e. being a website, as the reason for the differences in view. Candidates who did this stayed in level 1 as they were unable to support their ideas with evidence from the Interpretations. There is no requirement in the specification to address the historiography and the views being presented are alternative views not directed towards a controversy or specific debate. Candidates should appreciate that historians legitimately have differences of view and come to different conclusions when they conduct their enquiries into the evidence. The question is rooted in the interpretations that have been provided and therefore speculation about possible reasons for differences cannot be rewarded here if it is based on the provenance or what else might or might not have been said; candidates must be able to support their comments with evidence from the provided interpretations. The interpretations are not being used as evidence and therefore need to be treated differently from the sources, and without reference to the provenance.

A troubling number of candidates gained no marks on this question as they merely repeated what had been said in question 3b. Some candidates also mistakenly believed that one of the interpretations was written during the Weimar period, or even by the Weimar government, which they then tried to use as an explanation for the different viewpoints.

(c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the challenges facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919-23.

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

(4)

interpretations 1 and 2 could be
different because they could
have been written but have
had different source
information. A or they could
have been written by people
with different views.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

This candidate has identified two possible reasons for the interpretations providing different views and they have gained marks at Level 1.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Tip

To move an answer from Level 1 to Level 2 candidates need to provide some form of substantiation. For example, this candidate could have used Sources B and C as examples when they talk about the writers using different source information.

(c) Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the challenges facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919-23.

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

(4)

Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the challenges facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919-23 as they take different focuses when looking at the Weimar Republic. This is seen in the fact that Interpretation 1 gives a more political historic perspective on the government's issues, while Interpretation 2 focuses on the economic and social effects of hyperinflation. This means that the Interpretations give weight to different events - ~~like~~ for example Source B's portrayal of the political unrest of the Kapp Putsch would suit Interpretation 1, yet the description of hyperinflation of Source C is better for Interpretation 2.



This candidate has gained full marks by explaining how the writers have used a different emphasis in writing their interpretations and the answer is substantiated by references to the sources.

Question 3 (d)

This was the most challenging question on the paper, requiring students to show how what they had identified in 3 (a), (b) and (c) could be effectively used to explain why they agreed and disagreed with Interpretation 2. Interpretations 1 and 2 provide alternative views about the challenges to the Weimar Republic. These views are not a controversy. This section is the only part of the qualification in which candidates will be tested on AO4: Analysis and evaluation of interpretations. Three elements were necessary for candidates to be successful: evaluation and judgement of the given interpretation, the analysis of the provided material, i.e. the 2 interpretations, and the deployment of contextual knowledge to support the evaluation.

The second strand of A04 required an analysis of the Interpretations. In order to be successful, candidates needed to correctly identify what Interpretation 2 was saying - in this case that the challenge facing the Weimar Republic was an economic one in the form of hyperinflation. Pleasingly, most candidates were able to do this, identifying the gist of the interpretation clearly. Less successful candidates showed an awareness of the gist but did not analyse the interpretation effectively. Successful candidates were able not only to identify the gist but also to pick apart the details of the interpretation and show how these details were valid using their own knowledge, for example candidates might support the point given in Interpretation 2 about the actions of the government 'ruining the economy' by providing supporting detail in the form of accurate descriptions of the problems facing ordinary people. Impressively, some candidates were able to counter this claim by demonstrating how the swift actions of Stresemann at the end of 1923 brought about a rapid recovery, thus showing that hyperinflation was not such an overwhelming challenge after all.

Candidates were also expected to use Interpretation 1 to provide a challenge to the view given in Interpretation 2. In this case, Interpretation 1 suggests it was the political challenges from the Left and Right which threatened Weimar. Again, successful candidates provided good analysis of the interpretation and provided contextual knowledge in support of the points made.

A significant minority of candidates were less successful in terms of answering this question because they failed to use Interpretation 1. From level 2 upwards, this is a requirement of the mark scheme in terms of analysis of the provided material. Sadly, a small number of eloquent and analytical responses were unable to be awarded highly due to their failure to use Interpretation 1.

A very small number of candidates failed to use either interpretation and proceeded to approach the question as if it were simply asking about the reasons why the Weimar Republic failed, ignoring even the basic fact that the republic survived this period. Others wrote a general answer about the challenges to Weimar. Candidates who did not engage with either interpretation, no matter what the quality of their contextual knowledge, failed to get out of Level 2. The target AO for this question is AO4, not AOs 1 and 2.

Most candidates were able to provide a degree of contextual knowledge to help answer the question. The most successful candidates used precise evidence to support both interpretations, including other aspects of content that may not have been specifically mentioned, for example the Munich Putsch was sometimes used to show the fragile nature of the challenge from the Right. Candidates who used more generalised details were not as successful as candidates who used precise and well selected details to support their evaluation. A few candidates did not display any contextual knowledge, preferring to repeat bits of the Interpretations to support assertions made. 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.

Most candidates were able to at least assert whether they agreed or disagreed with the view given

in the interpretation. Many were able to justify their evaluation by explaining how their contextual knowledge supported this. An encouraging number of candidates were also able to provide a line of reasoning that was coherent and logically structured which led to a supported judgement. However, only a handful of candidates were able to successfully address the strand of level 4 which requires candidates to 'indicate how the difference of view are conveyed', beyond the selection of information. These differences may be conveyed through, for example, language and tone or points of emphasis. 'Best-fit' marking means that candidates can get into level 4 even if they are not able to show how differences of view are conveyed. It is worth remembering that this is the only part of the qualification which focuses on AO4 which requires candidates to analyse and evaluate interpretations, explaining how and why they differ. These differences may be conveyed in a variety of different ways, including language and tone, selection of information and points of emphasis, dependent upon the specific interpretations provided. Further information may be found in *Getting Started* p 43, 45, 47-9.

Some candidates considered how the writer exaggerates their view of the failings of the Weimar government in Interpretation 2 by stating how they 'simply' printed more money. In the case of Interpretation 1 a few candidates questioned the somewhat excessive use of 'powerful' in describing the political groups threatening Weimar.

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 3.

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the challenges facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919-23?

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

(16)

I do not agree with the approach taken by interpretation 2 about the challenges facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919-23. The words "forced" and "could not find" used by the writer convey the ideas that the Weimar had no other choice^{than to print more money} and that the hyperinflation wasn't their fault. To a certain extent I agree that the French in Ruhr posed a threat on the stability of Germany, however I don't believe that the Weimar government were helpless in this situation. When Stresemann, in 1923, changed the currency to a temporary Rentenmark, resolved the problem of hyperinflation. ~~re~~ This information juxtaposes the interpreter's idea that "the government could not find a solution". The use of Stresemann, who was appointed Chancellor and foreign minister in 1923, allowed a more stable Germany immediately.

I do think, however, that the events that interpretation 1 covers are much more valid in the problems Weimar faced and closer to the truth. "powerful political groups" did refuse to accept the Weimar government straight away, and so did the general public, branding them as the November criminals.

due to the Dolchstoß belief. This belief is also known as the 'Stab in the Back' theory as was the belief that the new government had ~~made~~ made a mistake by ending World War I. This belief ~~represents~~ conveys the idea that the general public and the "powerful political groups" were unwillingly to accept Weimar government, an idea which is conveyed in interpretation 1 and not in 2 as much. Interpretation 2 does hint at it in the last paragraph, when talking about the "people" who "openly" wanted to remove the government "by a population revolution or a military putsch", however not into as much detail as interpretation 2.

Furthermore, interpretation 2 states that the hyperinflation ~~of~~ of 1923 "ruined the economy". While it did momentarily, in the worst case \$1 ~~is~~ 4200000000 marks, it was only a temporary issue that the Weimar faced and the "revolution" or the "military putsch" were more constant issues that the Weimar government faced, as there were several rebellions, one being the Spartacist uprising in January 1919 by Rosa Luxemburg and others. Uprising like this were a more constant threat and in my opinion, a more accurate interpretation would focus on the rebellions rather than the printing of more money due to the strike. Also, even if the interpreter of 2 wanted to focus on hyperinflation, it would be more useful for an enquiry about the struggles

faced by the Weimar government in 1919-23 to focus on the effects of hyperinflation, rather than the effects of "printing more paper money." To reiterate, I believe the word "ruined" is not a correct representation of the challenges faced by the Weimar Republic in 1919-23 on the economy side.

To recapitulate, I do not agree with interpretation 2 about the challenges faced by the Weimar Republic in 1919-23. I believe that interpretation 1 focuses more on the bigger issues they faced, although hyperinflation was a massive issue, the rebellions were a consistent problem from 1919-23. Also I don't agree with the perspective that the writer of interpretation 2 takes, as it makes the government sound helpless and that this issue was a long-drawn out process when in fact it was solved by Stresemann in the same year.



This candidate reviews the alternative views presented in the interpretations and comes to a substantiated conclusion. Contextual knowledge is used to support the analysis and there is a clear line of reasoning throughout. All aspects of Level 4 are met and the analysis of the interpretations is very precise – even to the extent of analysing the language used to convey the points in each interpretation. This answer is clearly a high Level 4.



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

(d) How far do you agree with Interpretation 2 about the challenges facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919-23?

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

(16)

I would strongly agree with Interpretation 2 about the challenges facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919-23. This is because hyperinflation was a key turning point in the downfall of the Weimar Republic. This is because it says "this ruined the economy" which then shows that the hyperinflation was the one that caused the German economy to collapse, which then was not liked by the German people. This then led to a huge problem of maintaining supporters of the Weimar Republic.

I would slightly disagree with Interpretation 2 about the challenges facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919-23. This is then because in Interpretation 1, it says that the democratic parties had supported them but the political extremists had shown a complete hatred towards the existence of the Weimar Republic. This is shown by "they took action against the Republic". This then clearly shows that the uprisings of the political extremists had caused a huge problem for the stability of the Weimar Republic.

I would strongly agree with Interpretation 2 about the challenges facing the Weimar Republic. This is because we get to hear the point of view of the German workers, these people were the

key to the parties gaining support. If the workers did not like the Weimar Republic, then this had shown a serious threat to the stability in the government. This then can be said that the main challenge that was facing the Weimar was hyperinflation.

In conclusion to this, I think that I would agree with Interpretation 2 about the challenges facing the Weimar Republic. Hyperinflation was a key thing that was a huge threat to the government.



The candidate does provide an explained evaluation with some good analysis of interpretations shown which suggests an answer in Level 3. However, the use of contextual knowledge is more limited and the final judgement isn't fully justified. However, this would still reach the bottom of Level 3.



A conclusion is useful in this question because it helps to show that the overall judgement is justified.

Paper Summary

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

- When asked to make inferences in question 1, make sure that the inferences are relevant to the specified enquiry
- In question 3(a) focus on linking the provenance to the content of the sources
- When analysing the reasons for the different views in the interpretations focus on their content – candidates should not be concerned with the book title, the author or the type of publication
- In question 3(d) candidates must review the alternative views in both interpretations as well as using specific knowledge to support the points made
- All the sub-questions in question 3 should be seen as part of the same enquiry with each question guiding candidates towards the final analysis in 3(d)

Grade Boundaries

Grade boundaries for this, and all other papers, can be found on the website on this link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/iwantto/Pages/grade-boundaries.aspx>

