INTRODUCTION

This marking scheme was used by WJEC for the 2017 examination. It was finalised after detailed discussion at examiners' conferences by all the examiners involved in the assessment. The conference was held shortly after the paper was taken so that reference could be made to the full range of candidates' responses, with photocopied scripts forming the basis of discussion. The aim of the conference was to ensure that the marking scheme was interpreted and applied in the same way by all examiners.

It is hoped that this information will be of assistance to centres but it is recognised at the same time that, without the benefit of participation in the examiners' conference, teachers may have different views on certain matters of detail or interpretation.

WJEC regrets that it cannot enter into any discussion or correspondence about this marking scheme.

NOTE ON THE QUALITY OF WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

Examiners are required to credit the quality of written communication for each candidate's performance on particular questions. These are question 2(c) and question 3. There are no additional marks for the Quality of Written Communication, but examiners are expected to consider the following descriptions of performance when awarding levels to the work of candidates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level 1</th>
<th>the text is generally legible; aspects of spelling, punctuation and grammar are clear; some information is presented in a suitable manner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 2</td>
<td>most of the text is legible; spelling, punctuation and grammar are used to make the meaning clear; information is presented in a suitable format</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 3</td>
<td>the text is legible; spelling, punctuation and grammar are sufficiently accurate to make meaning clear; relevant information is presented in a suitable format; uses an appropriate structure and style of writing; uses some specialist vocabulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 4</td>
<td>the text is legible; spelling, punctuation and grammar are consistently accurate to make meaning clear; information is always presented in a suitable format; uses an appropriate structure and style of writing; uses specialist vocabulary accurately</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 1 (a)

**Target:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Understanding of source material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AO1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mark allocation:** 4

**Question:** What do Sources A and B suggest about the impact of the Great Depression on Germany? [4]

Use 0 for incorrect or irrelevant answers.

**LEVEL 1**

Generalised answer, paraphrasing or describing sources only. [1-2]

*Eg:* Source A shows that Germany was weak. There was unemployment. Source B shows people queuing for work. There are many there, it looks a depressed area.

**LEVEL 2**

Uses the content of both sources in their historical context. [3-4]

If answer is imbalanced in use of sources award 3 marks.

*Eg:* Source A gives reasons why many turned to the extremist parties. Germany was badly hit by the depression with 6 million unemployed and a rise in support for the Nazi and Communist parties.

The government was weak therefore many Germans decided that they needed a strong government. America had asked for its loans back. The Depression led to the Nazi party being the largest party by the 1932 election.

Source B is a picture showing many people waiting in line for work. It is in 1932 when the Depression was at its peak. There is graffiti / slogan on the wall in the background asking Germans to vote Nazi. It is a desperate scene.
Question 1 (b)

Use Source C and your own knowledge to explain why many Germans felt that the Treaty of Versailles was too harsh. [6]

Use 0 for incorrect or irrelevant answers.

LEVEL 1 Generalised answer; copies or paraphrases source material; uses content of source only. [1-2]

Eg: Many Germans protested against the Treaty. There were demonstrations. Germans felt the treaty was too harsh. It was forced upon them and many felt Germany had not lost the war. The Treaty caused many problems in the future. They had been stabbed in the back.

LEVEL 2 Understands content of the source with some background knowledge. [3-4]

Eg: The Treaty was considered to be far too harsh with many of the terms being forced upon them. There were many protests and revolts. These terms led to many problems in the future. The loss of the German Navy, Air Force, the reduction of the army to 100,000 and other military terms were considered a blow to German prestige and honour. Expect some discussion of the terms here. Germany was forced to accept the Treaty – they had no alternative. These politicians were blamed for the resulting problems e.g. the economic problems, the weakness of Weimar Democracy. Many ex-soldiers felt that they had been ‘stabbed in the back’ by these politicians in November 1918. Accepting war guilt was very unpopular, and the resulting reparations led to many problems in Germany. Territorial losses meant many Germans now lived in other countries.

LEVEL 3 Clear use of the content of the source with accurate and detailed background knowledge used to explain the issue. [5-6]

Eg: The terms of the Treaty of Versailles was considered to be a Diktat, forced upon them. The Treaty was extremely unpopular in Germany and was very harsh. Article 231, the War Guilt clause was particularly unpopular. Many felt that they had not lost the war and were certainly not wholly responsible for its beginning. The resulting reparations led to political problems such as the French occupation of the Ruhr, and also economic problems such as unemployment and Hyperinflation. The Treaty became the focus of hate to many Nationalist parties, in particular the Nazi Party and led to many demonstrations and political revolts. The military terms led to Germany feeling harshly treated, in particular disarmament, with the League of Nations seen as an organisation that would maintain the interests of the Allies. Territorial losses resulted in millions of Germans living in other countries. The Polish Corridor split Germany in two.
Question 1 (c)

Target: Understand, analyse and evaluate source material: recall and deployment of own knowledge

Mark allocation: AO1 AO2 AO3

8 2 6

Question: How useful are Sources D and E to an historian studying the methods used by the Nazis to win votes? [8]

Use 0 for incorrect or irrelevant answers.

LEVEL 1 Comprehends content of the sources; little focus on utility. [1-2]

Eg: Source D says that many people went to listen to the Nazis speaking. Hitler seems a normal man. He appeals to the young and old. Source E is from a former Nazi SA member. He used violence to disrupt meetings. To create chaos.

LEVEL 2 Considers usefulness of the sources in terms of their content and/or authorship. [3-4]

Eg: Source D describes a Nazi Party meeting. It describes how the hall was packed with people of every age. It describes Hitler's style and the way his speech persuades Germans. He tells people what they want to hear. The author is an American. It was written at the time and he witnessed the meeting.

Source E is by an SA man and Nazi. He is remembering how they used to march on weekends. They would disrupt political meetings, in particular Communist meetings. Sometimes they would stop people from voting. They were violent. Although he is remembering events nearly 60 years after the event he is a witness to the use of violence and intimidation by the Nazi party.

LEVEL 3 Evaluates both sources in context with some imbalance; reaches conclusion regarding utility for the set enquiry. [5-6]

Eg: Source D describes a Nazi Party meeting. It describes how the hall was packed with people of every age, this was a Nazi tactic because a packed hall means success. It describes Hitler's style and the way his speech persuades Germans. Every person in the crowd listens carefully. Hitler gives them hope. He tells people what they want to hear.

As the source is by an American that was forced to leave Germany in the 1930s it is likely that he is critical of Hitler. He may be biased, however as someone who had been to a meeting he was well placed to describe what happened. He is writing when the Nazi Party is attempting to rise to power through elections.

Source E is by Wolfgang Teubert a former Nazi Storm Trooper. He is being interviewed for a book on the history of the Nazi Party. He discusses the chaos created by the SA during the Weimar Republic. The violence was planned and orchestrated to create chaos. As such the source is useful as it gives us insight into how the Nazi Party and Hitler used the SA to attack the Communist party and to convince people that only the Nazi Party could control the Communist threat. They also stopped people from voting. As a former Nazi he is clearly anti-Communist and he could be biased in his opinion. He was however a witness to these events.
LEVEL 4

Evaluates both sources regarding the specific historical context; reaches reasoned and substantiated judgement regarding their utility for the set enquiry.

Eg: Source D describes a Nazi Party meeting. The Hall was packed; this was a Nazi tactic as a busy meeting denotes success. It describes Hitler’s style and the way his speech persuades Germans. Every person in the crowd listens carefully. He gives them hope. He tells people what they want to hear. This is useful as Nazi party meetings were carefully orchestrated, planned in detail. Mowrer was a witness to this and is therefore useful.

It is by an American that was forced to leave Germany in the 1930s. He will have been a critic of Hitler and Nazi tactics. He may be biased, however he had been to a meeting and was an eye witness to events. It could be suggested that as an American he was impartial to what he was witnessing. He is writing when the Nazi Party is attempting to rise to power through elections.

Source E is from Wolfgang Teubert, in an interview for a history book on the rise of Hitler, and his appeal. As such this will be a useful source. Teubert is remembering events from over 60 years before the interview. As such there could be some exaggeration etc.

He discusses how the violence and disorder orchestrated by the Nazi Party was planned to create chaos. The SA looked strong and intimidating around Germany they showed authority, discipline and power. This was liked by many Germans as the sight of an organised, strong looking group of men was popular as the country had been mostly in chaos since the Treaty of Versailles. The SA also destroyed Hitler’s opposition particularly the Communists. The chaos made the Weimar Republic appear weak and made the Nazi Party all the more appealing to some Germans as the only party willing to stop the Communist threat.

Teubert is a witness to this violence and chaos therefore is useful; however as a former Nazi there may be some bias.
QUESTION 2

Question 2(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target: Recall and deployment of knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mark allocation: AO1 AO2 AO3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question: Describe the KdF (Strength Through Joy) organisation. [4]

Use 0 for incorrect or irrelevant answers.

LEVEL 1 Generalised answer with weak or implied points made. [1-2]

Eg: to provide workers with leisure activities; to provide them with things to do in their free time.

LEVEL 2 A more detailed and accurate description. [3-4]

Eg: designed to control leisure time; loyal workers would earn rewards & could take part in a wide range of leisure and cultural events: it was a part of the German Labour Front (DAF). It began in 1933. The KdF provided affordable leisure activities such as concerts, plays, libraries, day trips and holidays. Large ships were built specifically for KdF cruises. The people’s car the Volkswagen was set up for production of an affordable car, the ‘KdF-Wagen’. It made middle-class leisure activities available to all Germans, cruises were made of mixed classes, and passengers had to draw lots for allocation of cabins.
Question 2(b)

| Target: Understand and analyse source material; recall and deployment of knowledge |
|--------|--------|--------|
| Mark allocation: | AO1 | AO2 | AO3 |
| 6 | 2 | 4 |

Question: Why was Source F produced in 1937? [6]

Use 0 for incorrect or irrelevant answers.

**LEVEL 1** Comprehends content of the source; little focus on why it was produced. [1-2]

_Eg:_ The source was produced to show that healthy Germans were blonde, perfect Germans. If the parents are healthy then their children will also be healthy. The children are happy and good Germans.

**LEVEL 2** Considers the source in its historical context; suggests some reasons for its production. [3-4]

_Eg:_ The source was produced as part of a propaganda campaign to persuade Germans that race, and pure Germans were an essential part of creating a strong, healthy country. It was produced by the Nazi party. The source shows the perfect Nazi family. There are 4 children. They are all racially pure and healthy. They are wearing traditional German clothes and the boy is a member of the Hitler youth. The Nazis taught Germans that they were Aryan, racially pure and that parents had a duty to ensure that their children were also pure and healthy. Large families were important and the source clearly shows the importance of the family.

**LEVEL 3** Analyses the source in its historical context; gives detailed reasons regarding its production at the time. [5-6]

_Eg:_ Source F was typical of Nazi racial propaganda. It shows a perfect, racially pure German family. It implies that only pure, healthy Germans were tolerated in Nazi Germany. Any person that didn't conform to their racial and genetic stereotype was considered inferior. The picture shows a smiling, vital German family: husband and wife in perfect health, four children with the oldest son already enrolled in the Hitler Youth. The poster suggests more than a first glance might imply. Built into the poster is the strong influence of the Eugenics Movement and the opportunity to eliminate hereditary diseases and mental illness through proper breeding. These included Jews, gypsies, the disabled. It was meant to persuade Germans to take an interest in the racial health of the country. Children were taught eugenics in school. Genetics and racial stereotypes were perpetuated. The poster has a sinister message, that anyone considered inferior was not to be tolerated.
Question 2(c)

Target: Recognition and explanation of historical interpretations; analysis of key historical features; quality of written communication

Mark allocation: AO1 AO2 AO3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AO1</th>
<th>AO2</th>
<th>AO3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question: One interpretation is that not all German people benefited from Nazi policies between 1933 and 1939. How far do you agree with this interpretation? [10]

Use 0 for incorrect or irrelevant answers.

LEVEL 1 Generalised answer; makes simple comments about the interpretation; will copy or paraphrase the given evidence. [1-2]

*Eg:* Evidence 1 says that women lost jobs and rights and that other groups were treated badly. Evidence 2 says that they were wonderful times. Evidence 3 shows a Nazi boycott of Jewish shops.

LEVEL 2 Identifies differences between ways in which the issue has been interpreted; will offer a basic judgement with some support from given evidence and/or own knowledge of the issue. [3-5]

*Eg:* Answers will show understanding that not all German people benefited from Nazi policies between 1933 and 1939. Expect basic contextual support to be given in terms of a judgement, such as Evidences 1 and 3 show that life didn’t improve for some Germans; women lost their rights. Jews were persecuted. Many women lost their jobs. Jews were persecuted and life became increasingly difficult. Evidence 2 however shows that for some Germans life improved between 1933 and 1939. There was order, work and they were good years. Germans were proud again.

LEVEL 3 Begins to recognise and comment on how and why this issue has been interpreted in different ways; will give a judgement regarding the given interpretation. [6-8]

*Eg:* Answers will address the question by offering comment on different interpretations of life in Nazi Germany. Answers will begin to demonstrate why different interpretations of this issue have been made, possibly with comments on the attitude of the authorities and the views of later historians. Evidence 1 is by a historian writing in an A level text book. His work will be well researched. Evidence 2 is from a German woman, remembering life in 1930s Germany. Although potentially biased, she will have first-hand evidence of the time. Evidence 3 is a picture of a Nazi boycott of Jewish stores and supports the view in evidence 1 that not all Germans benefitted from Nazi policies. Answers will be supported by a greater degree of contextual knowledge regarding this issue. Answers will begin to judge the worth of different interpretations by using their own knowledge and given evidence to comment on issues such as that the majority of Germans’ lives did get better and they reaped the benefits of being loyal German citizens; the unemployed got jobs; steady wages; improved economy; improved lifestyle; range of consumer goods; the bad times of the Depression had gone; BUT not all Germans did well such as Jews who lost their rights of citizenship; some women lost out on their careers.
LEVEL 4

Recognises and provides substantiated comments on how and why this issue has been interpreted in different ways; will give a clear judgement considering the given interpretation in the historical context. [9-10]

Eg: Answers will clearly state whether they agree with the given interpretation that not all German people benefited from Nazi policies between 1933 and 1939. In order to make this judgement, answers will discuss how the given interpretation has been arrived at and recognise that there are other valid interpretations of this issue.

Evidence 1 is by an historian writing in an A level text book. His work will be well researched. As it is for an A level textbook it may well be simplified. Evidence 2 is from a German woman, remembering life in 1930s Germany. Although potentially biased, she will have first-hand evidence of the time. As she is describing events many years later she still says that times were good. She describes these years as wonderful. She has no reason to lie as it is for a Television interview many years after the 1930s. Evidence 3 is a picture of a Nazi boycott of Jewish stores and supports the view in Evidence 1 that not all Germans benefitted from Nazi policies. The boycott was the beginning of Nazi persecution against the Jews.

Answers will demonstrate why it is possible to make different interpretations of this issue. There will be a considerable degree of historical support in the answer using both the given evidence and own knowledge.

Answers will test the value of the chosen interpretation by commenting on issues such as the experience of life in Germany during this period depended upon ethnic background and personal circumstances; Aryans generally did well and received benefits from organisations like the KdF such as subsidised leisure activities; many Germans now had a regular job and a steady income; the hardship of the Depression years had been replaced with a more affluent society; the RAD created public work schemes; changing the role and status of women was not welcomed by all females; other groups did not do well and experienced racial persecution and abuse – Jews, gypsies, Jehovah Witnesses, homosexuals; opening of the first concentration camp at Dachau; arrests of enemies of the state; fear of the SS and Gestapo.
Question 3

Question: To what extent did the German people experience hardship on the Home Front throughout the war? [12+3]

Use 0 for incorrect or irrelevant answers.

LEVEL 1  Generalised answer; basic response which offers little support

Yes because their cities were bombed; food was rationed; hard to get certain items. Shortages. People died.

LEVEL 2  Answer begins to discuss the issue set in the question.

To distinguish between 4 and 6 marks apply the following:

For 4 marks: A one-sided answer with some contextual support OR a very weak two-sided answer with little contextual support.

For 5-6 marks: A developed one-sided answer with contextual support OR a weak two-sided answer with some contextual support. Award the higher mark for the degree of contextual support.

Eg: not to begin with but things did get harder as the war progressed; life relatively normal in the early years of the war but when Germany started to lose the war things changed; the situation got worse with the bombing of cities and industrial centres; for certain groups things did not change e.g. gypsies and Jews.

LEVEL 3  Answer is mainly a reasoned analysis of the issue set in the question.

To distinguish between 7 and 9 marks apply the following:

For 7 marks: A very good one-sided answer with contextual support OR an unbalanced two-sided response with contextual support.

For 8-9 marks: A reasoned and developed analysis of the issue but lacking some detail or balance. Award the higher mark for the degree of contextual support.

Eg: two sided answer which identifies two clear phases: on the one hand between 1939-1942 the war had only a limited impact; little bombing of Germany itself. However by 1942 the tide had turned, which then saw increasing hardship; bombing raids on cities caused high civilian deaths; increasing economic hardship as the war progressed. Different groups also had a very different experience of war. Jews were persecuted and the Final Solution led to the deaths of 6 million Jews.
LEVEL 4

Answer is a developed, reasoned and well-substantiated analysis of the issue set in the question. [10-12]

To distinguish between 10 and 12 marks apply the following:

For 10 marks: A developed, reasoned and well-substantiated analysis with good balance, using mostly accurate and relevant contextual support.

For 11-12 marks: A developed, reasoned and well-substantiated analysis with good balance, using fully accurate and relevant contextual support. Award the higher mark for the degree of contextual support. Answers will provide a reasoned evaluation covering a broad range of factors/examples.

Up to 1942 life on the Home Front was not that bad – only limited bombing/rationing; Germany used the conquered lands for their own economic gain, plundering goods from France, Poland etc. Workers were also taken from these countries to work in German factories. Germany was successful in the early years of the war.

Change came after 1942 – growing shortages/hardships, increase in bombing raids, harsher rationing. The RAF/USAF bombed Germany to ruin. Germany was losing the War. There was some opposition to the war from groups in Germany. Minority groups were also persecuted e.g. Jews, Gypsies, homosexuals.

Total war was declared by Goebbels and life became increasingly difficult for most Germans. Old Men and young boys were enlisted into the Volkssturm. By 1945 Germany was in ruins. The war ended with Germany occupied by the Allies and Hitler committing suicide. Different sections of society/groups had radically different experiences during the war. On the whole however life got increasingly harder for most Germans after 1942.

Examiners are expected to award marks for spelling, punctuation and the accurate use of grammar in this question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Performance descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0</strong></td>
<td>Candidates do not reach the threshold performance outlined in the performance description below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Threshold</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1 mark</strong></td>
<td>Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with reasonable accuracy in the context of the demands of the question. Any errors do not hinder meaning in the response. Where required, they use a limited range of specialist terms appropriately.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2 marks</strong></td>
<td>Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with considerable accuracy and general control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, they use a good range of specialist terms with facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>performance</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 marks</strong></td>
<td>Candidates spell, punctuate and use the rules of grammar with consistent accuracy and effective control of meaning in the context of the demands of the question. Where required, they use a wide range of specialist terms adeptly and with precision.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>