



Examiners' Report June 2024

GCE History 9HI0 37

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 2024

Publications Code 9HI0_37_2406_ER

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2024

REPORT PAPER 37.1

Candidates were able to engage effectively with 9HI0 37.1 dealing with The changing nature of warfare, 1859-1991. The paper consists of three sections. Section A is based on a primary source which forms the basis for consideration of two enquiries. Section B requires an essay on a depth topic with a question based on a second order concept, e.g. change, which promotes informed debate. Section C is a breadth question which covers a 100 year period.

Most candidates managed their time effectively although there were cases where the section C response was not completed.

In section A the strongest answers were rooted in the source with a range of points identified relevant to the two enquiries. Candidates then deployed their contextual knowledge to develop these points. It was disappointing that in a small number of cases one of the enquiries was not addressed. There will always be material relevant to both enquiries in the source.

In section B, examiners were impressed by the number of responses that were shaped to meet the demands of the question. There were responses that only looked at one side of the question. Candidates must be aware of the need to develop a counter argument. It is also vital that candidates respect the chronological parameters of the question.

Section C requires candidates to answer a breadth question which covers at least a 100 years. Bullet point 2 of the mark schemes makes clear that to attain level 5 on that bullet point it is necessary to cover at least 75% of the timeframe. To reach level 4 on that bullet point 60% is required. It is crucial on this question to focus on the exact question that has been set.

REPORT ON INDIVIDUAL QUESTIONS

Q1. The question was based on a source written by Petain, a senior French commander, in a book about the Battle of Verdun in a book that he published after the First World War had ended.

Candidates worked on the source in order to identify points related to two enquiries : Petain's use of technology in the Verdun campaign and his qualities as a commander. The majority of candidates were able to make reasoned influences supported by references in the source and/or by making use of contextual knowledge. Candidates could then make substantial judgements about the value of the source in relation to both enquiries and also evaluate the source with particular reference to the attribution.

The majority of the candidates found the source accessible and overall the level of response was pleasing.

Q3 This was the most popular question in this section of the paper. The question required focus on the campaigns of 1917-18 when greater mobility became a feature of the conflict. The majority of candidates started by considering the nominated factor and , in virtually all responses , there was recognition of how the revolution in communications transformed the conduct of battles. Some very effective specific examples were cited, notably from the Amiens campaign.

Candidates also identified other factors, e.g. the contribution of aircraft, the greater flexibility of tactics employed by commanders, the situation in other theatres of war etc. Above all the majority of candidates were aware of the advent of All Arms Warfare.

Q4. This was the less popular question in this section of the paper. Candidates were aware of the development of Japanese military technology, e.g. fighter aircraft, communications and use of aircraft carriers. They also discussed other factors, notably the surprise nature of the assault. A significant number made the point that, although the US sustained significant losses their aircraft carriers were not present.

Q7. The two questions in this section were equally popular. Candidates were generally well versed in the significance of Hollywood films with key examples being cited from *Wings* in the 1930s, to *Mrs Miniver* in the Second World War and a range of films related to the Vietnam conflict. Some candidates also cited silent films from the First World War and newsreels from the Spanish Civil war and Korea.

The majority of candidates identified a range of other examples of remembrance, photographs from Mathew Brady and Gardner from the American Civil War, documentary/propaganda from the Spanish/American war and some of the classic novels, memoirs and journalism that had a huge impact.

The majority of candidates were very thorough in their coverage of the timeframe.

Q8. As with Q7, the majority of candidates were well versed re this topic. The impact of the telegraph was well known and there was much effective writing on the creation of the Associated Press etc. Coverage was generally very sound with reference to W H Russell in the American Civil War, the impact of the Hearst press in the Spanish American War, extensive reporting from the First World War.

Candidates balanced consideration of the nominated factor and considered other forms of reporting of 20th century conflicts with the advent of newsreels, radio and the Voice of America and Ed Murrow, the advent of television and, in particular CNN from more recent conflicts, e.g. the Gulf War. Very few candidates failed to mention the impact of Walter Cronkite at a crucial stage of the Vietnam conflict.

Introduction 37.2

Candidates were able to engage effectively with 9HI0 37.2 dealing with German History 1871-1990. The paper consists of three sections. Section A is based on a primary source which forms the basis for consideration of two enquiries. Section B requires an essay on a depth topic with a question based on a second order concept, eg change, which promotes informed debate. Section C is a breadth question which covers a 100 year period.

Most candidates managed their time effectively although there were cases where the section C response was not completed.

In section A the strongest answers were rooted in the source with a range of points identified relevant to the two enquiries. Candidates then deployed their contextual knowledge to develop these points. It was disappointing that in a small number of cases one of the enquiries was not addressed. There will always be material relevant to both enquiries in the source.

In section B, examiners were impressed by the number of responses that were shaped to meet the demands of the question. There were responses that only looked at one side of the question. Candidates must be aware of the need to develop a counter argument. It is also vital that candidates respect the chronological parameters of the question.

Section C requires candidates to answer a breadth question which covers at least 100 years. Bullet point 2 of the mark scheme makes clear that to attain level 5 on that bullet point it is necessary to cover at least 75% of the timeframe. To reach level 4 on that bullet point 60% is required. It is crucial on this question to focus on the exact question that has been set.

Question 2

The source, extracts from the 1871 Constitution itself, enabled candidates to identify key points relevant to the two enquiries and to develop reasoned inferences relevant to both. The majority of candidates engaged with the source and cited specific references related to both enquiries. There was also effective deployment of contextual knowledge to illustrate points made.

control over all major military decisions, something that would not change until the constitutional reforms made by Prince Max of Baden in 1917. Therefore, the federal system established ^{Source 2} gave the Kaiser ~~had~~ ^{with} complete control over the military and foreign relations. Furthermore, the Constitution declares that a Reichstag be made to ~~can~~ democratically represent the views of the people: 'The Reichstag will be elected by secret ballot... males over the age of 20 having the right to vote... cannot initiate legislation but any new legislation must have its approval.' This presents how some democratic changes were introduced through the extension of male suffrage and demonstrated how a new democratic institution would gain government to advise, approve and oppose on legislative changes. Overall, Source 2 is extremely revealing ~~for~~ ^{on} the new nature of the federalised government regarding the military and the Reichstag.

Nevertheless, Source 2 has limitations

regarding the nature of the federalised government that cannot be overlooked. For instance, the statement on the Kaiser's power over the military and foreign relations fails to acknowledge the Prussian sup priority in this decision: 'under the command of the Kaiser.' Perhaps due to the nature of the legal document that only stated changes and not their intentions, Source 2 fails to accurately portray how the Kaiser was the old Prussian King who's intentions when building the a federalised Germany were contradictory because he wanted ~~the union of the~~ to create a national identity while upholding Prussian superiority, hence why he took control of the military and foreign relations. Furthermore, the Reichstag's power is severely exaggerated as the text only lightly mentions: 'the Reichstag can be removed at any time, by the Kaiser.' Once again, Prussian superiority took precedence over democracy. However Furthermore, the legal document does not acknowledge that

a position in the Reichstag was unpaid and therefore unavailable to the lower classes; it also does not state that if they would easily be dissolved if they dared oppose legislation the Government wanted. Therefore, neither the legal document fails to portray a well-rounded picture of the position of the military and the Reichstag because it does not mention objectives, intention or many details.

On the other hand, Source 2 is extremely revealing about the ways in which the Constitution protected the interests of the Länder. For instance, it reflects how the Bundesrat will be created to provide states with their individual voices in government: 'will consist of representatives from all states... right to propose measures... right to veto measures.' Clearly, this portrays how the Bundesrat provided the Länder with proportional representation in government and even

gave them power over legislation that was far more secure than that of the Reichstag. Furthermore, the document presents how the Länders will be able to retain their individual constitutions: 'states will be responsible for educational, policing and health policies.' This allowed Länders to retain their own identities and made German unification a much quicker process. An example, while Bavaria was liberal, Schauer ~~was~~ did not have a Parliament until 1918. Clearly the legal document reveals ~~the~~ the ways in which the constitution protected the interests of the Länders through the Bundesrat and retaining of their own constitutions.

Although, the limitations in Source 2 when regarding the ways in which the constitution protected the interests of the Länders are important to acknowledge: For instance, the limitations of the Bundesrat are

undermined: '14 opposing votes will constitute a veto.' The legal document does not explain the consequences of having 17 ~~more~~ ~~new~~ representatives from Prussia or how it continues to serve Prussian superiority and undermine democracy. Furthermore, the failure to mention how the voices of the Bundesrat could be silenced through Prussian superiority are clear:

- the Chancellor who is appointed by the (Prussian) Kaiser... will preside over the Bundesrat and have the deciding vote in the case of a tied vote.

Once again, the constitution does not explain because of its nature how these decisions in power over democratic institutions negate their purpose in the pursuit of Prussia's dominance. Clearly, the legal document fails to explain and ~~fully present~~ accurately present the limitations of ~~new institutions~~ the Bundesrat ways in which the constitution protected the interests of the Länders.

Overall, despite the limitations caused by the nature of the ~~legal document~~ source, a legal document that may not be reflective of the political situation or of the ~~aims of~~ ~~as a~~ government aspirations for Prussian dominance while undermining democracy, it is still extremely revealing in the nature of the federal government established by the German constitution of 1871, ~~as~~ and even more so in the ways in which the constitution protected the interests of the Länder



A sound level 5. A focused response which is rooted in the source and identifies a range of points relevant to both enquiries. There are examples of reasoned inferences which are supported by specific references in the source and the deployment of contextual knowledge.

Question 5

This was the less popular question in this section of the paper. The question required analysis of the roots of the crisis which developed in Germany in 1917 over the conduct of the First World War with the significance of Erzberger measured against a range of other factors. These factors included the economic and social conditions in Germany and the unrest they had caused and the events in the War itself and, in particular, the views of military leaders such as Hindenberg and Ludendorff. The majority of candidates identified and developed a range of points and developed an informed argument.

During 1917, Germany was mid-way through World War 1 and the sense of Burgfrieden that appeared at the beginning of the war in 1914 had very quickly dissipated. At this point, the war was going very badly and the country was in a state of anarchy, not least due to the food crisis occurring. Although Erzberger did have a substantial role to play in the 1917 crisis that developed over the conduct of the first world war, arguably more significant was the leadership of Hindenburg and Ludendorff, and the state of the country in entirety such as the Turnip Winter.

Erzberger did play a largely significant role in the 1917 crisis that developed in Germany over the conduct of the first world war. ~~as, due to~~ Due to the lack of discussion surrounding war aims in 1914, and instead, being in a countrywide state of Burgfrieden, by the point of 1917, Germany was in chaos with little understanding as to why the war was being fought. Erzberger's Peace Resolution suggested to the Reichstag that the only way they would survive WW1 was through 'peace without victory', challenging the previous governmental status of 'peace with

ictory' in which Germany would continue to fight the war until it was won. Erzberger severely challenged this idea and, when proposing his own, did get the majority vote. However, instead of securing ~~an~~ an understanding of loss across the country, it proceeded to create further divisions as different political parties sided with different war aims. Therefore, instead of managing to bring everyone together in a newly found state of *Burgfriede*, Erzberger's peace resolution added to the chaos, causing further crisis in 1917. This was not entirely of his own fault though, as the military lead of Hindenburg and Ludendorff challenged his position and proposition. This division within the country's leaders caused further panic across Germany, as there was no conclusion as to why the war was still being fought, due to the lack of revelation to the public about the actual war aims of the country. Therefore, Erzberger absolutely played a significant role in the crisis of 1917, as the lack of parliamentary coordination furthered the fear and chaos of the country, and his peace resolution did little to actually help the war effort. However, the blame cannot lie entirely at his feet, as the significant cause of the created chaos here in 1917 was down to the role of the military dictatorship of the country, as well as the natural disasters taking place.

Hindenburg and Ludendorff's 'silent dictatorship' is arguably the most significant cause of the crisis that developed in

Germany in 1917 over the conduct of the first world war. Hindenburg and Ludendorff had the war aims of gaining territory and expanding Germany's connections across Europe, which strongly opposed the public peace resolution of Enberger, instead, claiming "peace with victory" as they saw no other way to end the war. This was challenging as it had not been disclosed to the people of Germany but instead, remained a secret, contributing to the chaotic atmosphere of Germany as a home land in 1917, as the people didn't know why they continued to fight when they were significantly losing. Also contributing to the crisis of 1917 was the large role that Hindenburg and Ludendorff took over the country. Not only were they military leaders, but they were also successful in dictating the actions of Kaiser Wilhelm II and Chancellor Bethmann-Hollweg by threatening to resign whenever they didn't get their way. This led to their introduction of the Auxiliary Service Act in December 1917, where the government retained official control over all male labour from 17-60. This was significant in contributing to the crisis, as Germany then lacked not only leadership, but also significant amounts of manpower needed to survive, highlighting the contribution of Hindenburg and Ludendorff to the crisis in Germany in 1917. Alongside this, Hindenburg and Ludendorff introduced unrestricted use of submarine warfare, which led to America entering the

war and the subsequent downfall of Germany. Therefore, more significant than the role of Erzberger in the developing crisis of 1917 was the military dictatorship of Hindenburg and Ludendorff who retained power over Germany, as well as Kaiser and Chancellor, resulting in their abuse of the system and the upset of the country.

An underlying factor that heightened the development of the crisis in Germany in 1917 over the conduct of WWI was the general state of the country at the time. Between 1916 and 1917, Germany suffered the 'Turnip Winter', in which a mass of potatoes died, and the country had to rely on turnips as a substantial food source. This caused mass divisions between Germans, as the ~~urban~~ urban workers thought farmers were retaining food for themselves, and the rural workers thought that the Prussian Junkers were managing to buy food off the black market. This caused disarray and crisis within Germany in 1917, as the country had become divided through starvation. By the end of the war, 750,000 starvation related deaths occurred, highlighting the lack of manpower that was reaching the war effort due to bigger issues in Germany at this time. In order to retain more food, a mass pig slaughter occurred in order to release some of the country's grain, however, this resulted in a meat shortage. Alongside this, due to the lack of discussion from the government surrounding

war crisis, the country not only divided through starvation, but also through political division, with left and right wing Germans claiming different reasons as to why the war should continue or stop. This internal division throughout 1917 in Germany was a significant underlying factor as to the development of a crisis in Germany, and resulted in an opposition to Burgfriede, political togetherness, and instead, internal division. However, the governmental role was surely the cause of this internal division, therefore lying the blame of the 1917 crisis at the feet of Hindenburg and Ludendorff.

Therefore, although Erzberger did play a significant role in the crisis that developed in Germany in 1917 over the conduct of WWI, as his peace resolution resulted in further division of the country, he is not the most significant cause. Instead, Hindenburg and Ludendorff's military dictatorship is most to blame for the crisis due to their military misconduct and lack of effective leadership within the country, as opposed to their focusing of the front line itself. The general state of the country throughout the war period is significant in resulting in the 1917 crisis, however this, too lies at the feet of Hindenburg and Ludendorff and could have been better controlled through a stronger governmental power. Therefore, overall, the most significant factor is the role of Hindenburg and Ludendorff.



A clear level 5. A focused response which addresses the nominated factor and identifies, illustrates and explains a range of other points to promote informed debate. There is a well balanced argument with a clear structure.

Question 6

This was the most popular question in this section of the paper. The majority of candidates were able to address the nominated factor effectively and illustrate the failings of the political opposition, eg the poor leadership of Schumacher and Ollenhauer, and weigh this against the successes of the CDU, notably the feeling that Adenauer would promote stability, the economic policies of Erhard and the benefits that resulted from the movement towards European unity.

After the conference of Yalta and Potsdam in 1945, the future of Germany had become unclear, and tensions rose between the Western powers and the Soviet Union. Trizonia had eventually developed, with the consent of France, Britain, and ~~the~~ the U.S. all pulling together their sectors of Germany and Berlin. The first election ⁽¹⁹⁴⁹⁾ was significant in determining the direction of the Federal German Republic ^(FRG), and while Adenauer had been a strong leader, leading division and developing Western integration, the spirit of Schuseller to reform the ideas of the Social Democratic Party (SPD) was certainly significant in both leading the first election, as well as leading to ~~take~~ ^{take} office until 1969. However, this essay will conclude that the ~~the~~ Christian Democratic Union Party (CDU) achieved its success due to the role played by the U.S., which had encouraged a Western pattern.

knows the FRG under the CDU's economic policies, as well as the fear of communist which pulled voters away from the SPD.

Firstly, it is clear that the SPD weakness had been a significant factor in contributing to the success of the CDU.

The party ~~was~~ failed to gain ~~significant~~ significant support votes for the 1949 election, and this was the consequence of a platform of socialism. Schumacher had stated that the FRG needed socialism, and as the leader of the SPD this gave it an image of being very anti-capitalist and even anti-Western. ~~What~~ ~~was~~ ~~his~~ ~~image~~

His refusal to compromise on his economic outlook was maintained even after the election, which would arguably have strengthened the dominance of the CDU, evident by its 11% increase in voter share at the next election in 1953. Schumacher had also failed to run a significant and active campaign due to suffering from illness for the first election, and this certainly had a valid weakness that contributed to CDU success, because the

main opposition party lacked a significant presence — this was not the case with Adenauer leading the CDU. As well as this, after Schöcher's death in 1952, the SPD continued to oppose free market capitalist policy despite its evidently improving the economy under the CDU. This doomed the party to failure to an extent, as it was opposing political change, and it was not until the policy shift under Willy Brandt in the 1960's that the SPD was able to secure a majority.

The party also arguably ~~to~~ caused CDU success with its pro-nazification policy, however, these criticisms are limited as the SPD had achieved only 2% of the vote from the CDU in 1949, rising to 29% to the CDU's 31%. Consequently, there was not a large difference in popularity between the parties, and ~~that~~ therefore the weakness of ~~the~~ SPD policy is only significant in terms of CDU success when evaluated in post-1949 context.

Therefore, the SPD had a wide platform of weaknesses which, possibly, cost them the first election, ~~as~~ although there was a minor difference between votes, however

the weakness and incoherence of the party did explain the success of the CDU after 1949. However, this was ultimately only because the CDU's policies under Adenauer had succeeded.

Adenauer's CDU was extremely significant and responsible for its own success to a great extent, with the party's main aim being to unite religious, cultural, and ideological differences. It represented a Catholic version of Christianity, attracting support from the over 40% Catholic population in the FRG, and endorsed the idea of social market economy. While the party did only marginally beat the SPD in 1949, the 1950's success certainly demonstrates the significance of Adenauer in consolidating support for his party. This is evident by the Western integration achieved into the Economic Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) in 1951, which was a trade agreement between the FRG and other Western states like France, Netherlands, Portugal, and others, demonstrating an improvement in international relations and helping to grow the economy. This economic success was further

reinforced by the FRG's entry into the European Economic Community (EEC) in which the FRG had been the largest exporter of all other nations, thus becoming the most significant economic player within the trade bloc. Consequently, Adorno's leadership improved industry, standard of living, as well as wages. - not to mention the vast improvement of international relations as a product of Western integration. The 'General Treaty' (1954) and 'Hallstein Doctrine' (1954) further established the FRG to be sovereign once again (as opposed to semi-sovereign under Western control post-WW2) and had established itself as a continuation of the Germany since 1871. Therefore, Adorno's achieved a vast array of economic and diplomatic successes, which consolidated support for the CDU due to its achievement of a high standard of living in West Germany, as well as its success in achieving economic growth through international relations. However, despite the plethora of successes from Adorno, the foundation of CDU success lies with the U.S. for its role in permitting and encouraging integration, as well as

promoting and supporting the CDU in the 1949 election and throughout Adenauer's time in office.

At The U.S was the most significant factor in causing the success of the CDU, and this is because of its role in implementing the FRG. The start of the Cold war had seen an increasing spread of Communism in the West, which had already been present in Germany for decades. ~~France but excluded~~ The spread of Communism was exacerbated at the start of the Cold war, and this led to ^{the} FRG's citizens being deterred from the SPD as a socialist party. As well as that, the American endorsement of Social market economy led to West German beliefs that western integration was possible under the CDU, equally recognised by the CDU leader Adenauer. The U.S allowed for CDU economic success by providing Marshall aid before the election to stabilise the economy, to an extent, permitting the possibility of a free market capitalist economy, of which

would not be possible / effective without the financial support of the U.S. As well as this, they aided the consolidation of CDU support by allowing the General Treaty of 1954, giving the FRG control over her own foreign affairs, and also allowed it to have protection under NATO's rules to the FRG's entry ~~into~~ in 1955. Consequently, the economic success and national security was fundamentally caused by the U.S., and so the CDU's alignment with American policy is ultimately what led to its success. Without American support, it is highly likely the state would have failed to achieve Western integration, and the CDU would not have achieved its successes.

In addition, the SPD's weaknesses were significant as they failed to show progression in their party policy, however, the fact they lost the vote by 2% in 1949 and gained a higher percentage in the second election demonstrates they still had strong support. As well as this, Adenauer was crucial for CDU

Success, but this success was ultimately undermined by the alignment of U.S. interests with Adenauer's policy. The U.S. was instrumental to CDU success due to the paternalist role it had in helping the CDU achieve in its Capitalist ambitions.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

A clear level 5. A strong response which identifies and develops a comprehensive range of points and develops a balanced argument. Clearly expressed and well structured.

Question 9

This was the most popular question in this section of the paper. The question required consideration of the proposition that the most significant changes in the status of women in German society only happened after 1945.

The majority of candidates were able to consider the nominated factor, citing specific evidence such as the implementation of the Basic Law and the progress women were able to make in the professions and in Public Life, and weigh it against developments in earlier periods.

Coverage was rarely a weakness and there was some informed consideration of the initial progress made in the period 1871-1914, the impact of War and the changing attitudes during the Weimar period. Responses revealed sound knowledge of developments during the Nazi period with an interesting variety of opinions being expressed.

It could be argued that the most significant changes in the status of women in Germany society happened after 1945.

However, I think there was other significant times of improvement for women such as in the Kaiserreich, Weimar and Nazi Germany. I think the most significant change in the status of women happened in Weimar.

During the Kaiserreich, women did not hold a very good position in society. Women began to enter the workforce in areas such as food and textiles however because these were classed as unskilled jobs their official pay was of a low rate. Therefore women, weren't very well off economically during the Kaiserreich. Women's social position was also particularly low during the Kaiserreich because they were subject to the national civil code which meant men's authority over women was enshrined in law. Women also

did not maintain a good political position during the Kaiserreich because they were not allowed the vote and they did not have any representation in the Reichstag. However, a German Union of Feminist Organisations was set up which reached a membership of 900,000, however the government banned this group in 1886. Overall, women did not have a very good social, political or economic condition in the Reichstag therefore leading the Kaiserreich to be the least significant time period for changing the status of women in society.

In Weimar, women's position improved from the Kaiserreich. Women's social position improved because they were no longer regarded as weak due to their impact in WWI. They also began to push societal norms by dressing less conservatively, drinking and having liberal attitudes towards sex. Therefore, their social position had improved since the Kaiserreich. Women's economic position also began to improve because they took up men's jobs during WWI. The amount of women working in electrical

engineering increased by 8x. However, this led women to be viewed as a ~~doppelverdiener~~ ~~dopplerer~~ ~~deimer~~ because double income households became popular and they were taking jobs off single men. Women's political position also improved during Weimar because they got the vote, as universal suffrage was announced, and 9.6% of the Reichstag was women - however, this was still not a fair representation. Overall, women's social, political and economic ~~ness~~ position took a massive leap ~~for~~ compared to the Kaiserreich and therefore it is the most significant time period of change for women. This is because it lay the foundations for bringing women equality, for the time periods to come.

In Nazi Germany, women's societal position was reduced from Weimar. This is because ~~women~~ Nazis wanted to push women in traditional roles, and emphasized Kinder, Küche, Kirche which highlighted women's roles as being in the kitchen, with children, and at church. Nazis also

pushed the mothers cross because they wanted to encourage women to have children to increase the truly German population. Therefore, women's social position reduced during Nazi Germany, because Nazis wanted to reemphasise women in traditional roles. Women's political position also reduced in Nazi Germany because they weren't allowed any representation in the Reichstag, and the Reichstag was removed by the enabling act in 1933, however, they still had the vote. Women's economic position didn't experience much change from Weimar to Nazi. However, in 1933 - 37% of women were employed and by 1939 - 33% were employed which shows their ~~social~~ economic position reducing. Although, their pay did increase at a faster rate to men for the women in work. Overall, women's economic position may not have rapidly declined in Nazi Germany, but their social position did compared to the freedoms they achieved in Weimar. Therefore, ~~the~~ Nazi period was less significant for changes in women than Weimar was. Although, it was more significant for changes than the

Kaiserreich because they already had some foundations laid out for women due to the Weimar period. This reemphasises that Weimar was the most significant change.

Post 1945, after WW2, women's status in society did improve compared to what it was like in Nazi Germany. This is because their social mobility and freedoms were more than all other time periods. Additionally, women's economic position improved due to the introduction of the Kindergeld which was where women were given extra financial support for having children. However, women's pay was also lower than men's. Women's political position improved post 1945 because the first female president of the Bundestag was elected. However, women were still not equally represented within politics. Although, they did still have the vote which shows that improvement maintained from the beginning of the Kaiserreich. However, I don't think this time period showed

the most important changes in the status of women because women's social position was lower than it had been in Weimar, due to the idea of a nuclear family being pushed, which shows that traditional roles were expected for women. Weimar was the only time period where women were able to move away from this stigma due to the national civil code being removed and them being able to push societal norms. Additionally, Weimar was the period where women were given the vote which shows more political change than what they got post 1945 as they only maintained the vote and didn't gain much more representation in government within this time period. Therefore, I think that Weimar showed more change in the social status of women than post 1945 did.

Overall, I disagree with the statement that significant changes for women 'only' happened after 1945. This is because Weimar set the foundations for change and so if Weimar had not done that, the position of women may not have been as it

was after 1945. Additionally, women also saw changes in their position in society in Nazi and Kaiserreich periods which leads to further disagreement with the statement that significant changes were 'only' after 1945.



ResultsPlus
Examiner Comments

Merits sound level 4. A clearly written and structured response which has sound overall coverage of the timeframe. It identifies a range of points with some effective illustration which could have been developed in some sections, eg the shift in attitude to female employment during the Second World War.

Question 10

This was the less popular question in this section of the paper. Candidates were generally well informed about the developments in the nominated factor period, 1871-1914. There was informed discussion of the impact of trading policies, focus on improving infrastructure, the encouragement of cartels and the economic stimulus provided by the military build up, especially in the Navy.

The majority of candidates went on to discuss a range of other periods across the timeframe. The issue of coverage was rarely an issue. A few candidates skirted over the Weimar period but there was much substantial coverage of the Nazi period and post 1945 policies culminating in the development of the EEC.

It was pleasing to see much informed debate and a variety of judgements.

economic development from 1871-1990 was indeed protectionism. The agricultural sector saw steady decline throughout 1871-1990, during the Nazi government, the state subsidies were given out not only to keep output but to strengthen the sector and preserve reserves. Equally the Nazis made use of 2800 artificial farms in an attempt to protect them from collapsing. The investment in sectors such as these helped the economy develop in areas it was previously lacking. It was ^{during} the 1930s, the government used protectionism through membership of the RTA in 1931 and CAP in 1935. These covered protective tariffs, a controlled market and common prices, this massively eased the German economy and provided the security for economic growth, for example by 1935/1940 to the RTA's post-war pre-war levels. Furthermore during the 1930s Germany's Chancellor Hermann Goering used protection through tariffs, and Chancellor Brüning secured such tariffs with Russia, Austria, and Belgium. These tariffs provided security and stability for economic growth.

by 1910 the GDP of the USA was around 44,000 million. Equally, cotton from 1871-1914 meant prices were controlled. This in this sense protectionism despite being part of the Kaiser's policy was not unique to the 1871-1914 governments. Thus, though this protection policy was aimed for economic development from 1871-1914.

Furthermore, American ~~the~~ assistance throughout 1871-1914 played an equally vital role in ~~the~~ stimulating German economic development. The 1927 Dawes plan issued throughout the 1920's, under Weimar Germany, provided millions in loans to Germany, as a result the German economy saw production output by 1927, equally new techniques increased productivity drastically throughout the 1920's in which production increased by 170% ⁱⁿ by 1929 despite employment decreasing 33%. This demonstrates the significance of American aid. Equally, Marshall aid and impacted the 1940's economy immensely and provided the funding for growth and recovery. A total of 2 billion dollars was issued to the

FDR, this aid helped purchase many imports for the FDR and ~~was~~ assisted in the post war economic miracle.

The FDR's lending steadily increased by 66% by 1960 due to Marshall aid, which is a direct injection in economic development. Without it in 1929, following the Wall Street crash over 100 million was withdrawn by the US from German Germany and all short term loans were taken out. As a result unemployment and ~~economic~~ economic stagnation followed. This demonstrates the impact that not having American assistance had on the German economy. In this sense American aid throughout 1871-1990 was pivotal for the ~~of the~~ economic stimulation and development of Germany.

On the other hand, ^{key key} ~~applied~~ ~~network~~ did see economic development from 1871-1914 was the ship-building programme. In 1890 the Kaiser pushed a bill through the Reichstag for 17 ships, later bills throughout the 1890's saw another 34 ships being constructed. This placed a great

demand for steel and coal and ^{entire} the army industry. In the regard the ship building programme programme stimulated the German economy by increasing the need for heavy industry. For a further evidence this can be seen as by 1910 Germany produced $\frac{2}{3}$ Europe's steel and $\frac{1}{2}$ Europe's coal. Whilst the ~~overall~~ However whilst his announcement programme did stimulate the economy it was not unique to the government. 1871-1914, ^{the} This government also produced the 4 year ~~announcements~~ plan for ~~economic~~ ^{economic} into the German economy was ready. Like the ship programme the 4 year plan equally placed a heavy demand on heavy industry thus stimulating economic growth. In this ~~there~~ ~~there~~ ~~there~~ whilst this programme did economically stimulate Germany it was not unique to the government alone.

Therefore, the policies of the government in the years 1871-1914 were not the most significant in stimulating the German economic development in the years 1871-1914. Whilst the ship-building programme of the 1840's ~~and~~ witnessed economic growth

This policy was not unique to the Kaiser's
Kaiserlich government. American assistance
coupled with protectionism were not
considerably more significant in stimulating
economic growth. These policies provided
security for growth and the freedom to do
so. Therefore overall, the policies of the
1871-1914 government were not particularly
significant in stimulating the German
economy from 1871-1914.



Merits mid level 5. A thorough response with sound overall coverage of the timeframe. The nominated factor is considered with effective illustration and explanation. Its significance is weighed against later developments to promote informed debate.

Paper Summary

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

Section A

- Candidates should read the question carefully, so that they ensure that they are dealing with both enquiries
- Candidates should aim to go beyond comprehension and summary of the sources by developing reasoned inferences that are fully discussed
- Candidates should read the caption and make full use of it when evaluating the source
- Candidates should make use of relevant contextual knowledge to support inferences and evaluation. It is not the quantity of contextual knowledge that is key, but the use to which it is put.

Sections B and C

- Planning of essays will help candidates develop an analytical approach
- Candidates should read the question carefully to ensure that they are answering the question that has been set, both in terms of its focus and its chronological parameters Candidates should avoid a
- narrative/descriptive approach; this often undermines the analysis that is required for the higher levels Candidates should aim to range across the breadth of the chronology in Section C questions.
-

Grade boundaries

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

<https://qualifications.pearson.com/en/support/support-topics/results-certification/gradeboundaries.html>

