Mark scheme

Paper 3: Modern depth study (1HI0/31)

Option 31: Weimar and Nazi Germany, 1918–1939

Modern depth study: Weimar and Nazi Germany, 1918–1939

Question	
1	Give **two** things you can infer from Source A about the success of the Berlin Olympic Games in 1936. **Target**: Source analysis (making inferences). **AO3**: 4 marks.
Marking instructions	
Award 1 mark for each valid inference up to a maximum of two inferences. The second mark for each example should be awarded for supporting detail selected from the source. e.g. • The Nazis had created a good impression of their regime **(1)**. It says 'The Nazis have succeeded with their propaganda' **(1).** • The games were better than any previous Olympic Games **(1)**. 'the Nazis have run the games on an extravagant scale never before experienced' **(1).** • The games had helped the Nazis to gain favour with business owners **(1)**. 'the Nazis have put on a good show for the general visitors, especially those who are big businessmen' **(1).** Accept other appropriate alternatives.	

Question		
2		Explain why the Nazis were able to reduce unemployment in Germany in the years 1933–1939. You may use the following in your answer: • rearmament • autobahns You **must** also use information of your own. **Target:** Analysis of second order concepts: causation [AO2]; Knowledge and understanding of features and characteristics [AO1]. **AO2:** 6 marks. **AO1**: 6 marks.
Level	**Mark**	**Descriptor**
	0	No rewardable material.
1	**1–3**	• A simple or generalised answer is given, lacking development and organisation. [AO2] • Limited knowledge and understanding of the topic is shown. [AO1]
2	**4–6**	• An explanation is given, showing limited analysis and with implicit or unsustained links to the conceptual focus of the question. It shows some development and organisation of material, but a line of reasoning is not sustained. [AO2] • Accurate and relevant information is included, showing some knowledge and understanding of the period. [AO1] *Maximum 5 marks for Level 2 answers that do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.*
3	**7–9**	• An explanation is given, showing some analysis, which is mainly directed at the conceptual focus of the question. It shows a line of reasoning that is generally sustained, although some passages may lack coherence and organisation. [AO2] • Accurate and relevant information is included, showing good knowledge and understanding of the required features or characteristics of the period studied. [AO1] *Maximum 8 marks for Level 3 answers that do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.*
4	**10–12**	• An analytical explanation is given which is directed consistently at the conceptual focus of the question, showing a line of reasoning that is coherent, sustained and logically structured. [AO2] • Accurate and relevant information is precisely selected to address the question directly, showing wide-ranging knowledge and understanding of the required features or characteristics of the period studied. [AO1] *No access to Level 4 for answers which do not go beyond aspects prompted by the stimulus points.*

Marking instructions

Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance.

Performance in AO1 and AO2 is interdependent. An answer displaying **no** qualities of AO2 cannot be awarded more than the top of Level 1, no matter how strong performance is in AO1; markers should note that the expectation for AO1 is that candidates demonstrate both knowledge *and* understanding.

The middle mark in each level may be achieved by stronger performance in either AO1 or AO2.

Indicative content guidance

Answers must be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. While specific references are made in the indicative content below, this does not imply that these must be included; other relevant material must also be credited.

Relevant points may include:

- From 1935 German men aged 18-25 were expected to do two years of military service (conscription) so there was far less unemployment.
- Rearmament involved the manufacturing of military equipment such as planes, weapons and uniforms so many businesses needed to employ more people to keep up with demand.
- The building of autobahns and other public works was intended to reduce unemployment. 80,000 people were involved in building the autobahns.
- The labour service forced young unemployed men to work on public programmes such as tree planting so they were no longer unemployed.
- Unemployment was technically reduced because many people were no longer included in the figures, e.g. unemployed women, and Jews, who had lost their citizenship in 1935, were not counted.

Question		
3 (a)		How useful are Sources B and C for an enquiry into the challenges facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919–1923? **Target**: Analysis and evaluation of source utility. **AO3**: 8 marks.
Level	**Mark**	**Descriptor**
	0	No rewardable material.
1	**1–2**	• A simple judgement on utility is given, and supported by undeveloped comment on the content of the sources and/or their provenance[1]. Simple comprehension of the source material is shown by the extraction or paraphrase of some content. Limited contextual knowledge is deployed with links to the sources.
2	**3–5**	• Judgements on source utility for the specified enquiry are given, using valid criteria. Judgements are supported by developed comment related to the content of the sources and/or their provenance[1]. Comprehension and some analysis of the sources is shown by the selection and use of material to support comments on their utility. Contextual knowledge is used directly to support comments on the usefulness of the content of the sources and/or their provenance.
3	**6–8**	• Judgements on source utility for the specified enquiry are given, applying valid criteria with developed reasoning which takes into account how the provenance[1] affects the usefulness of the source content. The sources are analysed to support reasoning about their utility. Contextual knowledge is used in the process of interpreting the sources and applying criteria for judgements on their utility.

Notes

1. Provenance = nature, origin, purpose.

Marking instructions

Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance.

No credit may be given for contextual knowledge unless it is linked to evaluation of the sources.

No credit may be given for generic comments on provenance which are not used to evaluate source content.

Indicative content guidance

Answers must be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. While specific references are made in the indicative content below, this does not imply that these must be included; other relevant material must also be credited. The grouping of points below does not imply that this is how candidates are expected to structure their answers.

Source B

The usefulness could be identified in terms of the following points which could be drawn from the source:

- The source shows that those who carried out the Kapp Putsch were clearly in control of the capital city, Berlin, as they appear to be quite relaxed and there is no fighting going on.
- It provides evidence of the weaponry available to the Freikorps who carried out the Kapp Putsch.
- The source shows the strength of the threat to the Weimar Republic in March 1920.

The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe usefulness to material drawn from it:

- The photograph is from a German newspaper so it might have been taken to reassure people how the situation in the capital was calm.
- The soldiers might be posing to show that they were apparently in control of the capital city.

Knowledge of the historical context should be deployed to support inferences and/or to assess the usefulness of information. Relevant points may include:

- In March 1920, 5,000 Freikorps soldiers seized power in Berlin and put Dr Wolfgang Kapp, a nationalist, in charge of the country.
- Although the Kapp Putsch succeeded in taking control of Berlin, it collapsed after a few days due to a general strike called by the Weimar government.

Source C

The usefulness could be identified in terms of the following points which could be drawn from the source:

- The source provides evidence that hyperinflation meant that people no longer trusted the government.
- It suggests that the Weimar government was powerless to do anything about hyperinflation.

The following points could be made about the authorship, nature or purpose of the source and applied to ascribe usefulness to material drawn from it:

- The author was a factory worker so her experience might have been different from that of people from other social classes.
- The author lived through these events so her experiences provide a valuable insight into how people felt about the Weimar government at the time.

Knowledge of the historical context should be deployed to support inferences and/or to assess the usefulness of information. Relevant points may include:

- Hyperinflation became extremely serious in 1923 although inflation had been a problem since the end of the war.
- The Weimar Government was responsible for the hyperinflation of 1923 because it was printing more money in order to pay the striking workers in the Ruhr.

Question		
3 (b)		Study Interpretations 1 and 2. They give different views about the challenges facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919-1923. What is the main difference between the views? Explain your answer, using details from both interpretations. **Target**: Analysis of interpretations (how they differ). **AO4**: 4 marks.
Level	**Mark**	**Descriptor**
	0	No rewardable material.
1	**1–2**	• Limited analysis of the interpretations is shown by the extraction or paraphrase of some content, but differences of surface detail only are given, or a difference of view is asserted without direct support.
2	**3–4**	• The interpretations are analysed and a key difference of view is identified and supported from them.

Marking instructions

Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance.

Indicative content guidance

Answers must be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive and other relevant material not suggested below must also be credited.

- A main difference is that Interpretation 1 suggests that the challenge to the existence of Weimar came from groups on the Left and Right that wanted to destroy it from the very start. On the other hand, Interpretation 2 suggests that it was the challenge of hyperinflation in 1923 which threatened the existence of the Republic.

Question		
3 (c)		Suggest **one** reason why Interpretations 1 and 2 give different views about the challenges facing the Weimar Republic in the years 1919–1923. You may use Sources B and C to help explain your answer. **Target**: Analysis of interpretations (why they differ). **AO4**: 4 marks.
Level	**Mark**	**Descriptor**
	0	No rewardable material.
1	**1–2**	• A simple valid explanation is offered but displaying only limited analysis. Support for the explanation is based on simple undeveloped comment or on the selection of details from the provided material or own knowledge, with only implied linkage to the explanation.
2	**3–4**	• An explanation of a reason for difference is given, analysing the interpretations. The explanation is substantiated effectively.

Marking instructions

Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance.

Indicative content guidance

Answers must be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. The indicative content below is not prescriptive. The examples below show different approaches to explaining difference, any one of which may be valid. Other valid material must be credited.

- The interpretations may differ because they have given weight to different sources. For example, Source B provides some support for Interpretation 1, which shows the dangerous threat from the Right. Source C provides some support for Interpretation 2, which emphasises the serious consequences of hyperinflation in undermining faith in the government.
- They may differ because the authors have chosen to place an emphasis on different details – Interpretation 1 is dealing with the threat from the Left and the Right from the start of the period 1919–23; Interpretation 2 deals with the consequences of hyperinflation in 1923.
- The interpretations may differ because they are written from different perspectives. Interpretation 1 looks at the political threats from the Left and Right. Interpretation 2 focuses on the economic dangers facing the Weimar Republic.

Question		
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. **Target**: Analysis and evaluation of interpretations. **AO4**: 16 marks. **Spelling, punctuation, grammar and the use of specialist terminology (SPaG)**: up to 4 additional marks.
Level	**Mark**	**Descriptor**
	0	No rewardable material.
1	**1–4**	• Answer offers simple valid comment to agree with or counter the interpretation. Limited analysis of one interpretation is shown by selection and inclusion of some detail in the form of simple paraphrase or direct quotation. Generalised contextual knowledge is included and linked to the evaluation.
2	**5–8**	• Answer offers valid evaluative comment to agree with or counter the interpretation. Some analysis is shown in selecting and including details from both interpretations to support this comment. Some relevant contextual knowledge is included and linked to the evaluation. An overall judgement is given but its justification is insecure or undeveloped and a line of reasoning is not sustained.
3	**9–12**	• Answer provides an explained evaluation, agreeing or disagreeing with the interpretation. Good analysis of the interpretations is shown indicating difference of view and deploying this to support the evaluation. Relevant contextual knowledge is used directly to support the evaluation. An overall judgement is given with some justification and a line of reasoning is generally sustained.
4	**13–16**	• Answer provides an explained evaluation reviewing the alternative views in coming to a substantiated judgement. Precise analysis of the interpretations is shown, indicating how the differences of view are conveyed and deploying this material to support the evaluation. Relevant contextual knowledge is precisely selected to support the evaluation. An overall judgment is justified and the line of reasoning is coherent, sustained and logically structured.
Marks for SPaG		
Performance	**Mark**	**Descriptor**
	0	• The learner writes nothing. • The learner's response does not relate to the question. • The learner's achievement in SPaG does not reach the threshold performance level, e.g. errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar severely hinder meaning.
Threshold	**1**	• Learners spell and punctuate with reasonable accuracy. • Learners use rules of grammar with some control of meaning and any errors do not significantly hinder meaning overall. • Learners use a limited range of specialist terms as appropriate.
Intermediate	**2–3**	• Learners spell and punctuate with considerable accuracy. • Learners use rules of grammar with general control of meaning overall. • Learners use a good range of specialist terms as appropriate.
High	**4**	• Learners spell and punctuate with consistent accuracy. • Learners use rules of grammar with effective control of meaning overall. • Learners use a wide range of specialist terms as appropriate.

Marking instructions

Markers must apply the descriptors above in line with the general marking guidance.

No credit may be given for contextual knowledge unless it is linked to evaluation of the interpretations.

In all levels, the second sentence relates to analysis and while the rest relate to evaluation. The following rules will apply:

- In Level 1, answers that meet the requirements only in relation to analysis without evidence of evaluation should be awarded 1 mark.
- In other levels, answers that meet the requirements only in relation to analysis (but that also fully meet the descriptors for evaluation of the level below) should be awarded no more than the bottom mark in the level.

Indicative content guidance

Answers must be credited according to candidates' deployment of material in relation to the qualities outlined in the mark scheme. While specific references are made in the indicative content below, this does not imply that these must be included; other relevant material must also be credited. The grouping of points below does not imply that this is how candidates are expected to structure their answers.

The interpretation to be evaluated suggests that the challenge of hyperinflation in 1923 threatened the existence of the Weimar Republic.

Relevant points from the provided material and own knowledge which support the claim made in the interpretation may include:

- Interpretation 2 shows that economic problems in the form of hyperinflation created a crisis that threatened the existence of the Weimar government.
- Interpretation 2 shows that hyperinflation caused a significant challenge to the Weimar Republic because it caused the population to lose faith in it.
- Hyperinflation had an impact on most classes in society – especially the middle classes and the workers – who started to lose faith in the Republic.
- Hyperinflation is generally considered to have been caused by the Weimar government itself because it attempted to solve the crisis caused by the French invasion of the Ruhr by printing money.
- Following the hyperinflation, in November 1923 the Nazis attempted to seize power in the Munich Putsch.

Relevant points from the provided material and own knowledge which counter the view may include:

- Interpretation 1 suggests that a challenge facing the Weimar Republic was the dangerous threat from the Left and Right.
- Interpretation 1 shows that many of these dangerous forces were determined to destroy the Weimar Republic from the beginning and were prepared to do so by force.
- The Kapp Putsch did force the government to leave Berlin for a few days in March 1920.
- There were uprisings from the Left and Right throughout the period that challenged the government, including the Spartacist Uprising (1919), the Kapp Putsch (1920) and the Munich Putsch (1923).
- All the uprisings in the period 1919–23 were defeated: the Spartacists were defeated by the Freikorps, the Kapp Putsch by a general strike in Berlin and the Munich Putsch by the Bavarian Police.