

## Teacher Resource Bank

GCE History

Candidate Exemplar Work (June 2009):

- HIS2M: Life in Nazi Germany, 1933–1945



The following responses are not 'model' answers, nor are they indicative of specific overall grades, but are intended to illustrate the application of the mark scheme for this unit. These responses should be read in conjunction with the HIS2M Question Paper, Sources Booklet and Mark Scheme.

Copies of the paper and are available from e-AQA or the AQA History Department.

E-mail: [history@aqa.org.uk](mailto:history@aqa.org.uk)

## **AQA GCE History Teacher Resource Bank Commentaries on June 2009 AS answers**

### **General Introduction by the Chief Examiner**

The first June examination series for the new AS specification saw some excellent examples of well prepared candidates who were able to demonstrate their breadth of knowledge and depth of understanding by addressing the questions set directly and efficiently. Sadly, it also suggested that, whilst some candidates knew the material quite well, they struggled to apply it successfully to the questions asked. At the lowest end, there were, of course, some candidates whose knowledge let them down, but even these might have been able to achieve more highly had they thought more carefully about each question's demands.

The importance of timing for both Units needs to be stressed. In Unit 1 candidates should allow themselves approximately 12 minutes for the first part question and 25 minutes for the second. In Unit 2, they could spend 15 minutes on the first part question and 30 minutes on the second, but they are likely to need slightly longer for the source question. Good time keeping is essential in any examination. No matter how successful the answer to the first part question, an incomplete second part question will always mean a loss of marks (notes receive limited credit).

These commentaries are intended to help teachers and candidates to understand the demands of each question type and consequently to encourage students to perform at the highest level of which they are capable. Please note that errors relating to Quality of Written Communication (of spelling, syntax, etc.) have been reproduced without correction. Please note that the AQA convention for question numbering will be changing as from the June 2010 examination papers. Examples of the new format for question papers can be found elsewhere in the Teacher Resource Bank.

### **Unit 1**

The first part of each question in Unit 1 (those questions labelled 01, 03 and 05 in the new numbering style from June 2010) asks candidates to 'explain why' an event, issue or development came about. The best candidates answered this question, not only with a selection of reasons (and a minimum of three well-explained reasons was expected for Level 3/4), but also by showing how those reasons linked together. This is essential to meet Level 4 criteria and can be achieved by prioritising, differentiating between the long and short-term factors, or showing how different categories of reasons, such as political, social and religious inter-link. It is not, however, enough to simply assert that the links exist – they also needed explaining.

Candidates who only performed at Level 2 often wrote too descriptively, whilst many achieved a good Level 3 by offering a range of relevant and clearly explained reasons but failing to make any links between them. As the exemplars demonstrate, answers did not need to be long but they had to be effectively focused and directed to achieve good marks.

The second part of each question (those questions labelled 02, 04 and 06 in the new numbering style) asked for a response to a question beginning 'how far, how important or how successful'. Each question stem invited candidates to offer a balanced response and this was the key to an award at high Level 3, 4 or 5. Most answers which achieved only a Level 2 or a low/mid-Level 3 mark contained too much description, were excessively one-sided or lacked depth and precision in their use of examples. Some candidates also failed to address the full question set, often

by ignoring starting or finishing dates. To achieve the higher levels, candidates needed to balance one side against another. For example, a question asking how far 'X' contributed to 'Y' demanded a consideration of the importance of other factors which also contributed to 'Y'. Sometimes questions, particularly 'how important' questions (e.g. how important was 'X' in bringing about 'Y?'), could be balanced by considering the ways in which 'X' was important as opposed to the ways in which it was not, rather than introducing 'other factors'; either approach was equally legitimate. The crucial test of an answer was, therefore, the degree to which the candidate was able to argue the issue and how well that argument was supported by accurate and precise evidence. The best answers at Level 5 managed to sustain a focus and convey convincing individual judgement.

## Unit 2

The first part of question 1 (labelled 01 in the new numbering style from June 2010) asks students how far the views in two given sources (A and B) differ, in relation to a given topic. Perhaps the most common error was to waste time writing a paragraph or more about the source content before addressing differences. Levels were awarded according to how well candidates identified and explained differences of **view**. This was not simply an exercise in source comprehension, so such answers received an award of only Level 1/2. Contrasting 'views' required students to go beyond the mere words of the sources or their omissions, and to assess 'how far' the sources differed required some awareness of the degree of **similarity** they contained. To meet the full demands of the question and obtain an award at high level 3/4, candidates also needed to introduce some contextual own knowledge to explain the differences and similarities identified – possibly (but not necessarily) referring to provenance when it helped the explanation, and, more often, explaining references in the sources and drawing on their contextual knowledge to account for differing views.

In the second part of question 1 (labelled 02 in the new numbering) candidates were asked to answer a question beginning 'how far, how important or how successful' with reference to the sources as well as their own knowledge. The best answers to these questions maintained a balanced argument (as explained for Unit 1 above) and the information given in the sources was used in support of that argument. Poorer answers tried to address the sources separately – at the beginning or end of the answer, or sometimes as an asterisked afterthought. Those who omitted them altogether could not obtain more than top Level 2. Whilst the main criteria for the higher levels was the degree of argument, the precision of the evidence and the judgement conveyed, in addition to these, good source use could ensure that students were placed higher in a level than those who used the sources in a perfunctory way. Source use needed to be explicit, and the best candidates appreciated that Source C was provided to give further ideas and/or information that was of direct relevance to this question.

In questions 2 and 3 (03/04 and 05/06 in the new numbering) candidates were asked to respond to an 'explain why' question – on which comments will be found under the Unit 1 commentary above – and a short, provocative quotation about which they were invited to explain why they agreed or disagreed. The demands here were similar to those for the second part of Unit 1 (b) questions. In adopting a view about the quotation, candidates were expected to examine the opposing arguments in order to reach a balanced judgement on the extent of their agreement/disagreement.

Sally Waller Chief Examiner December 2009

## GCE History HIS2M: Life in Nazi Germany, 1933–1945

### Responses to June 2009 Questions

#### Candidate 1

- 1 (a) Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to the attitudes of German people towards the Nazi regime. (12 marks)

Source B presents the view of someone who felt that the Nazi regime used terror to force people to conform. They do not feel that the German people actually believed in the Nazis, but that they all followed it out of fear. Evidence of Hitler's actions from this time may support this – the SS and, crucially, the Gestapo did police Germany aggressively and people were often imprisoned and killed for holding anti-Nazi views. This did create an atmosphere of fear in Germany. Source A, however, focuses on the national pride and solidarity created by the Nazi government – Hitler used nationalism to keep the support of the people, after the Treaty of Versailles and the failings of the Weimar Republic had left Germany ruined. Creating an atmosphere of pride in their country helped win him favour as well as enforce some of his anti-Semitic policies, and Hitler exploited it frequently. Rallies, marches, and celebrations such as Hitler's birthday and the 'Day of National Solidarity' were held often. The pride in Germany's 'strong and decisive leadership' and the feeling of 'solidarity' described in this article seem to form a contrast with the paranoia and fear described in Source B – after all, how could the German people support and feel pride for a system that kept them under control with threats and fear?

However, Source A is taken from a newspaper report in 1935, when the Nazis were beginning to take absolute power over Germany. It could be the very fear described in Source B (written some time after the Nazi regime) that made them write about community spirit (Hitler's Volksgemeinschaft) and solidarity, in an effort to appease their Nazi leaders.

#### **Principal Examiner's Comments**

*This answer shows a developed comparison between Sources A and B using own knowledge quite appropriately and it offers a good contextual understanding. For example, Source B uses the actions of the SS and Gestapo to get German people to conform through fear. Source A continues to use examples to highlight difference and shows good awareness, via lines 9 to 14, to indicate how Hitler and the Nazi government gained support. Towards the end of the large, main paragraph it directly contrasts 'solidarity' towards the end of the regime with 'paranoia'. The candidate had clearly highlighted the positive and negative contrast of the sources.*

*In the concluding paragraph some awareness of provenance is noted, regarding censorship of the press and some degree of similarity is commented on, albeit cursorily, regarding the role of fear. Overall the answer is borderline Level 3-4 and has been awarded a low Level 4 as it has gone beyond simple contrast, has shown reasonable evaluation and is fluently written. Level 4 – 10 marks.*

**Candidate 2**

- 1 (a) Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to the attitudes of German people towards the Nazi regime. (12 marks)

Source A and source B shows both similar and different attitudes towards the Nazi regime. Source B seems to feel much more terror and fear of the Nazi regime whereas source A seems to feel pride and admiration of the Nazi regime. Source A is in 1935 when Hitler was in power, whereas source B was written in 1933 after Hitler had first come into power. We could therefore say that source A is more reliable after experienced more of the Nazi dictatorship. Source A focuses more on what a 'strong and decisive leadership' that the Nazis led. Source B however focuses more on how the Gestapo were everywhere. Source B seems to show how terrifying the extent of the Nazi rule was and how even best friends would betray each other. Source B also shows how the Nazis had even infiltrated schools who seem to feel hostile towards the Nazi rule feeling that they were isolated and alone. Source A on the other hand seems not to show any hostility towards the Nazi rule describing the atmosphere within Germany under the Nazis as a 'National Community'. Source A shows how people are willing to sacrifice for others in Nazi Germany whereas source B doesn't in fear of the Nazis. Source B emphasises how the Nazi took total control over Germany even into matters such as schools and friendship.

**Principal Examiner's Comments**

*This answer fulfils the criteria of a solid Level 2 answer as throughout it simply compares the views expressed in Sources A and B and tries to identify differences – 'Source A says this; Source B says that'. It doesn't look at the 'how far' aspect of the question and does not offer any own knowledge.*

*Lines 4 and 5 refer to the time when the sources are written but does not then develop the possible significance of the two dates. Also the candidate wastes time by referring to 'reliability' but this is not the focus of the question. Despite suggesting that the start that the two sources show some similarity, there is no reference, or example, of this in the answer. It received a mark of 5 in Level 2, as it identifies rather than evaluates.*

**Candidate 3**

- 1 (b) How far had the Nazi regime succeeded in creating loyal Nazi citizens by 1939? (24 marks)

The Nazis aimed to make loyal Nazi citizens to complete their aim to build the 'Thousand Year Reich'. They had been successful to an extent but there were acts of resistance against conformity but they didn't face much opposition and therefore they did do extremely well to gain control and instill loyalty.

There are acts of dissident behaviour in Source B which provides evidence for the argument of limited success. "The case of a doctor at a party who entertained people by imitating Hitler's way speaking." This shows how some people did not entirely follow the regime's orders. There are other cases of dissidence and also resistance in various aspects on society, such as the youth who were anti-authority and chose to rebel and form the Edelweiss pirates. Although not all

of these groups were necessarily antipolitical they do show how citizens would reject part of their regime therefore not completely loyal. Some of the groups from this movement were politically motivated but most just enjoyed camping trips and passed times without being dictated how to enjoy them.

Source A shows how people did support the regime en masse through rallies and festivals, in this case the “Day of National Solidarity”. However there were many events like this one and by 1938 1,000,000 people went to the Nuremburg rallies which shows the regime’s popularity and loyalty of citizens. They were used as a key tool of propaganda as Goebbels especially recognised their importance in turning “a small worm into part of a dragon”. Then carefully placed the youth and women at the front of the marches to show the freshness and the support for Hitler. They therefore succeeded in creating loyalty using propaganda as it encouraged people to join in and become part of the movement. Also in source B it demonstrates people’s loyalty to the regime as people and the rest in this case “reported him to Nazi headquarters”. This demonstrates the extent of the regime’s loyalty as the Gestapo heavily relied on informers because they had limited numbers of around 40,000 but the rumours and terror made their threat seem huge.

In source C from a historian’s point of view it shows similarly to Source B the idea of reluctant loyalty and complying simply because it was easier than opposing which hence didn’t create genuinely loyal citizens. “Many people who became noisy supporters of a system they did not necessarily believe in.” This shows how people “found their own expectations and beliefs reflected to some degree in the dictatorship” and that’s why they complied. I agree with this as the Weimar Republic had left people sympathetic to the right wing. More specifically the Churches initially supported the Nazis because they shared traditional values such as family life being important. Bishop Galen in 1936 even congratulated Hitler on remilitarising the Rhineland. They were therefore successful in gaining their loyalty – however the source does also show how the extent of loyalty was questionable; “often with enthusiasm and devotion, or at least with general approval”.

In conclusion the Nazi regime did succeed in creating loyalty by 1939 – however there was dissident and resistant behaviour present as a minority. There was also reluctant loyalty, for example the Mittelstand who, although had been the biggest proportion of society voting for the Nazis before 1933, the importance of the big businesses and rearmament meant economic policies had a negative effect. However they remained reluctantly loyal which perhaps shows the Nazi’s success in indoctrination, propaganda and use of terror.

### **Principal Examiner’s Comments**

*This is a good answer which has chosen to examine each source for varying degrees of loyalty – ‘reluctant’ or ‘genuine’ – and has selected and incorporated a good amount of evidence and own knowledge to sustain the argument throughout. It lifts phrases and sentences from each source to support the answer and makes a lot of judgement on the reasons for and against loyalty to the regime. The context of Weimar is highlighted and how this benefitted the Nazi objective of gaining loyalty.*

*The start and conclusion are clearly laid out and there is a lot of balance to the answer running throughout each paragraph, where the candidate is able to add caveats to his/her comments. The evidence has range – the role of youth,*

*propaganda, women, Gestapo, churches, Mittlestand, big business – and uses narrative sparingly, allowing the argument to dominate. It is fluently written, understands the historical debate and has been awarded a middle Level 5 – 23 marks.*

#### **Candidate 4**

1 (b) How far had the Nazi regime succeeded in creating loyal Nazi citizens by 1939?  
(24 marks)

According to A, the Nazis didn't have loyal citizens by 1939, it had loyal citizens by 1935. Everyone wanted to come together and be part of their country and everyone was happy.

According to B, however, not everyone was happy. The Nazis probably had succeeded in creating loyal citizens by 1939, but only on the outside and out of fear and under the surface everyone was hating them.

According to C, people may have become supporters even though they didn't believe in it out of fear but most probably really did approve and agree with the Nazis on certain views. So it had created loyal citizens by 1939, but whether out of fear or genuine approval is debatable.

By 1939, it did seem like the Nazis had created a group of loyal citizens as they all seemed to agree with Hitler and, if there was something amiss, it was often reported to the Gestapo. However, this could have been done because they feared visits from the Gestapo themselves if they disagreed with Hitler or failed to report something. On the other hand, there were those that generally agreed with his views. So on the surface they had created loyal citizens, but underneath is more questionable.

#### **Principal Examiner's Comments**

*This answer is fairly basic in approach and has only used Sources B and C. It is highly assertive and generalised and doesn't offer any discrimination between sections of German society.*

*The introduction states that the Nazis had loyal citizens by 1935 but doesn't offer any evidence for this claim. The language used throughout is rather simplistic – in paragraph 2, 'not everyone was happy' and 'under the surface everyone was hating them'.*

*The candidate has not been able to recognise the variety of viewpoints expressed in paragraph 3, which could have been used as a template to open up the answer. The final paragraph is very sweeping – 'all seemed to agree with Hitler' – but it does hint at the end that loyalty was questionable. Unfortunately, this point contradicts the introduction. This answer does have explicit comment, with some slight, relevant support but it lacks depth and range and was awarded a Level 2 – 8 marks.*

**Candidate 5**

- 3 (a) Explain why the Nazis promoted membership of their youth organisation after 1933. (12 marks)

The Nazis promoted membership of their youth organisations after 1933 because to make the thousand year reich last they would have to rely on future generations. To do this they would have to turn young people into full Nazis as they are more suggestable then and what they learn at a young age they will believe it for the rest of their lives. So they created the youth movements for young boys and girls. The boys groups were more of PE lessons and sports because they were training to go in the army and defend their country in case of a war. Whereas the girl groups were more cooking lessons and home tech as they needed to learn to care for young people and family as they would be giving birth to the future Nazis. By 1939 the youth movements were compulsory and there would be punishments for parents and children who wouldnt allow them to go. They made it compulsory as by 1939 war was on the look of outbreaking and they needed to train people for the army even more to boost army numbers. So in conclusion the Nazis promoted membership of the youth organisations to make the thousand year reich last into future generations.

***Principal Examiner's Comments***

*This answer is better than simply a description of reasons why the Nazis promoted the membership of their youth organisations but overall it lacks some development.*

*It identifies 3 aspects:*

- *As a vehicle to use youth as the 'future' in order to build a 1,000 Year Reich*
- *gender roles – boys as soldiers, girls as mothers*
- *the need of the army.*

*However, there is an element of description and narrative running through the answer, especially on gender, and it tends to repeat the 'army' aspect in the final section.*

*This answer lacks development and the minks need to be much greater. Hence it was awarded a borderline Level 2/3 – 7 marks.*

**Candidate 6**

- 3 (b) 'Nazi policies towards women achieved their aims.'  
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (24 marks)

I do not fully agree with this statement since the Nazis were successful in achieving their aims for women before the War started as the Birth rate went up. However the war meant an increase in workers and encouging women to work which contradicted Nazi ideology.

Before 1939 (before the war), the Nazis did achieve their aims for women. By pressuring women to stay at home, with the traditional german saying "Ruche

Kirche Kirtch” meaning kitchen, children, church. The Nazis achieved their aims for recreating the mothers traditional position of being at home and serving their husband by increasing the prestige of women by the “mothers cross” which was awarded to women who had very large families. The Birth rate increased from 1933; however marriage rate decreased after 1935 which could question whether the Nazis fully achieved their aims for women.

Nevertheless the Nazis achieved their aims towards women by not allowing women to be in high professional jobs such as the civil service and medicine. Furthermore women weren’t allowed to be judges or lawyers. This suggests the Nazis achieved their aims. However the Nazis limited only 10% of women to be allowed to go to university. Therefore pressure women to stay at home which suggests the Nazis achieved their aims.

On the other hand once the war began in 1939, and the economy had significantly grown there was a shortage of workers. So the Nazis now had to encourage women to work, this totally contradicted Nazi ideology as for the previous six years they had been encouraged to stay at home. Therefore this shows perhaps the Nazis didn’t achieve their aims towards women because women were taken out of the traditional role and encouraged to work.

Despite this, although it could be argued that due to the war the Nazi didn’t achieve their aims for women. There is evidence to show that women felt discouraged to take paid employment because of tax allowances for children and the availability of welfare loans. This can argue that despite the war and the Nazis contradicting their ideology women were discouraged to work and wanted to stay at home, which suggests perhaps the Nazis did achieve their ultimate aims.

Overall I do not fully agree with this statement because although the Nazis were very successful of achieving their aims for women before the war. For example birth rates increased after the Nazis consolidation of power it did in fact decrease by 1939 (when the war started) and never reached the level which it did in the Weimar republic. As \*\*\*\*\* marriage rates increased from 1933 due to political pressure which suggests the Nazis were successful in their aims for women, however marriage rates declined by 1935. This suggests that the Nazi policies women only achieved their aims in the first few years of their dictatorship, but perhaps there influence levelled off on people. The war was a major factor with the Nazis not achieving their aims for women, since the growth of the economy encouraged women to work which was not what the Nazi ideology intended women to do which suggests the Nazis in fact didn’t achieve their aims for women.

### **Principal Examiner's Comments**

*There is a conciseness and focus to this answer. It has a fair amount of balance and comment and judgement is present throughout, if in need of further amplification. The main criticism is that it lacks some range and there is a slight tendency towards repetition.*

*The introduction is direct and tries to query the premise of the question by suggesting that there was a contradiction pre and post 1939 in the carrying out of Nazi aims. The rest of the essay balances achievements against failures, predicating much on the impact of the war. There could have been even greater depth and range of examples at this point although the information provided supports the developing argument quite well. There is a decent conclusion, which confirms explicit understanding. The essay is well organised and fluently*

*presented. Because there is some lack of range, this essay is deemed worthy of a low Level 4 – 18 marks.*