

GCSE (9-1)

Examiners' report

HISTORY B

(SCHOOLS HISTORY PROJECT)

J411

For first teaching in 2016

J411/39 Summer 2023 series

Contents

Introduction	3
Paper 39 series overview	4
Section A overview	5
Question 1 (a)	5
Question 1 (b)	5
Question 1 (c)	6
Question 2	6
Question 3	8
Question 4*	9
Question 5*	10
Section B overview	11
Question 6	11
Question 7	13
Question 8*	17
Question 9*	18

Introduction

Our examiners' reports are produced to offer constructive feedback on candidates' performance in the examinations. They provide useful guidance for future candidates.

The reports will include a general commentary on candidates' performance, identify technical aspects examined in the questions and highlight good performance and where performance could be improved. A selection of candidate answers are also provided. The reports will also explain aspects which caused difficulty and why the difficulties arose, whether through a lack of knowledge, poor examination technique, or any other identifiable and explainable reason.

Where overall performance on a question/question part was considered good, with no particular areas to highlight, these questions have not been included in the report.

A full copy of the question paper and the mark scheme can be downloaded from OCR.

Would you prefer a Word version?

Did you know that you can save this PDF as a Word file using Acrobat Professional?

Simply click on **File > Export to** and select **Microsoft Word**

(If you have opened this PDF in your browser you will need to save it first. Simply right click anywhere on the page and select **Save as . . .** to save the PDF. Then open the PDF in Acrobat Professional.)

If you do not have access to Acrobat Professional there are a number of **free** applications available that will also convert PDF to Word (search for PDF to Word converter).

Paper 39 series overview

Following the changes to the assessment of this qualification in 2022, the 2023 examination season saw the two sections of this paper – ‘The Making of America, 1789-1900’ and ‘Living under Nazi Rule, 1933-45’ – returned to a singular two hour examination. Across the exam paper, all four of the Assessment Objectives are tested.

To perform effectively on Section A, candidates are required to select and deploy relevant historical knowledge and analyse (Question 2) or explain (Question 3, 4 and 5) this in an effective manner. One of the most important differentiators was how relevant and specific candidates' knowledge was to the date range of the question set (see table below).

To perform effectively on Section B, candidates – in addition to the demands of Section A – are required to make relevant inferences from three sources and one interpretation. The extent to which the sources and interpretation were the focus of candidates' answers to Questions 6 and 7 were the main driver of the overall level given (see table below).

Candidates performed very effectively on Questions 3, 8 and 9, with many making clear explanations supported by accurate, relevant knowledge. Less effective performance was seen on Question 5, where usually knowledge was less specific and more generalised.

Candidates who did well on this paper generally:	Candidates who did less well on this paper generally:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • recalled, selected and deployed material of specific relevance to the questions set in terms of topic and date range (especially in Section A) • made clear analytical links to the proposition in the questions for Questions 3, 4, 5, 8 and 9 • managed their time effectively, paying particular attention to the demands of each question in terms of structure and mark allocation • produced answers to Questions 6 and 7 (in Section B) that were driven by the sources rather than their contextual knowledge • supported inferences drawn from Sources A, B, C and Interpretation D with specific material from the source(s) or the interpretation • recognised the need to construct a balanced argument in answers to Questions 4, 5, 8 and 9. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • were less mindful of the date range specified in the questions, and so presented material that was irrelevant to the question set (especially in Questions 2 and 3) • produced narrative answers that either did not analyse a second order concept (Question 2) or make explanatory links to the question set (Questions 3, 4, 5, 8 and 9) • summarised material in Sources A, B, C and Interpretation D rather than making inferences from them • offered answers to Question 6 and 7 that relied heavily on contextual knowledge rather than considering the sources or interpretation as the focus on their answer • made ‘stock’ statements about the provenance of the sources or interpretation.

Section A overview

Section A focuses on AO1 and AO2, knowledge and understanding of key features of the period and the ability to analyse and explain this material. These AOs have equal weighting in this section. The specification is broken down into four chronological periods, and questions are framed around these.

Questions 1 (a), (b) and (c) produced successful responses from a large number of candidates, although 1 (c) was by far the most challenging and some answers were rather long given what is expected of candidates for 1 mark.

Question 2 was effectively answered by many candidates given the latitude they have to select their own second order concept(s), although some material offered fell outside the scope of the question and was not given marks.

Question 3 faced a similar challenge in terms of the date range to Question 2 in that some candidates offered material that was outside the date range, although many candidates produced more successful responses that clearly explained why tensions occurred in this period.

Most candidates structured Question 4 very effectively and produced more successful responses, although the main differentiator here was whether a candidate was able to provide precise material about the railroads from the 1860s, without which candidates were restricted to marks in Level 4.

The least effectively answered question in this section – and least popular essay choice - was Question 5, as a fair number of candidates offered little material that was specific to big business in the US after 1877 and these answers were unable to move above Level 1.

Question 1 (a)

The Making of America, 1789–1900

1 (a) Identify **one** impact of mining on the areas where gold was found.

[1]

Most candidates offered a valid answer to this question, most commonly focused on either the rapid growth of these areas, or on the environmental damage caused, especially by the more aggressive mining in these areas that replaced the initial wave of individuals seeking a personal fortune. Very generalised answers (such as 'people found gold' or 'the areas were damaged') were not given marks as there was no sense of the candidate having studied the topic.

Question 1 (b)

(b) Give **one** example of how African Americans were discriminated against in the Union Army during the Civil War.

[1]

All valid material relating to the mistreatment of African Americans in the Union Army was given marks. Commonly these included unequal pay, lack of progression through the ranks, and more physical tasks. Some candidates' answers were based on African Americans not being allowed to join the army, and as this was incorrect it was not given a mark. Likewise, answers that were very generalised (such as 'segregation') or answers that confused the Union and Confederate armies also did not obtain a mark.

Question 1 (c)

- (c) Name **one** tribe involved in fighting wars with white settlers or the US government between 1861 and 1877. [1]

Of the three 'short answer' questions, this was the less effectively answered. While many candidates offered a valid tribe – commonly the Lakota Sioux ('Sioux' was given marks) or the Cheyenne – many others identified a tribe that was not active in fighting white settlers or the US government in this period. This was usually one of the so-called 'Five Civilised Tribes' which candidates look at in an earlier period of the course. Issues with chronology like this were also seen in Questions 2 and 3, and centres might wish to focus more fully on ensuring that candidates can 'pin' material to the four relevant chronological periods of the specification.

Misconception



A notable minority of candidates answered Questions 1 (a), (b) and (c) in relatively long answers; so-called 'full sentences' or even short paragraphs. Invariably, these candidates experienced timing issues later in the paper. It is perfectly acceptable to answer these 1 mark questions in short form. Likewise, some candidates offered multiple answers to each question, and this too is a misconception since examiners will only consider the candidates' first response to each.

Question 2

- 2 Write a clear and organised summary that analyses migration to places west of the Plains between 1839 and 1860.

Support your summary with examples.

[9]

Most candidates clearly understood that a successful answer to this question involves more than writing a narrative account and were able to build an answer that examiners could identify as addressing one or more 'second order concepts'. Commonly for this question, candidates structured their answers around causation (why migrants moved west of the Plains) or consequence (the dangers suffered by those who migrated). Candidates who could successfully analyse one example of a second order concept were given marks in Level 2, and those who could give two (or more) examples were given marks in Level 3.

There were some very thorough answers (such as the exemplar below) that demonstrated candidates' ability to deploy relevant knowledge and analyse it. Common material used effectively included reference to the Mormons, those encouraged west by the Pre-Emption Act and case studies of parties who migrated west; especially the Donner Party.

Less effective answers that merely gave a narrative without attempting to analyse a second order concept were restricted to Level 1. Candidates might find it helpful to specify their chosen second order concept at the start of their answer to increase their focus on it. It was hard for examiners to give any marks at all to answers that included material that was irrelevant to the question, such as migration to the Plains (rather than west of them) or migration outside of the date range in the question.

Exemplar 1

Between 1839 and 1860, migration to the west of the Plains was caused by a variety of factors. On one hand, push factors ~~prompted~~ prompted many in the east to become disillusioned with their lives there, ~~and~~ and as a result many migrants travelled west to escape the declining conditions. A recession ~~erupted~~ in 1837 meant that by 1839, women in northern industrial sites were receiving low wages, with some having been cut by as much as 60%. As a result this led them to seek other employment opportunities in the west, as they believed they had nothing left to lose. As well as this, competition in the east was high, and particularly between small scale farmers. In the Mississippi valley, farmers faced ruin as the price of wheat and corn collapsed. This led them to look towards other suitable locations which would be advantageous for their farming methods. ~~This~~ The competition they faced was only increased by the significant growth of towns in this period, and there began to be a sense of that the east was too overcrowded - the size of Alabama in particular was then tripled in this time. As a result of these push factors, migration to the west looked more favourable, and often pull factors were drawn.

This is a good example of a high Level 3 response. The second order concept – causation – is made clear in the first line, and the candidate then proceeds to identify reasons for economic migration which are then analysed into why they resulted in people moving west of the Plains. Level 3 was given five lines before the end of the paragraph, with the subsequent material developing the answer further, towards the top of the level.

Question 3

3 Why were there tensions in America between 1789 and 1838?

Explain your answer.

[10]

Question 3 requires candidates to explain one or more reasons for the subject of the question, in this case, tensions between 1789 and 1838. Candidates who were able to identify or describe reasons for tension were given marks in Level 2, and those who did both were moved into Level 3. Candidates who were then able to establish a clear explanatory link to the proposition in the question could then access Level 4 (for one explained point) and Level 5 (for two or more). Commonly, effective explanations revolved around the use of some of the language in the question ('tensions') and some very successful responses were seen.

Successful answers frequently made us of how the issue of slavery increased tensions between Northern and Southern states, with candidates who could explain economic and political tensions able to access Level 5. Tensions between the US government and the 'Five Civilised Tribes' were also explained effectively by many candidates.

Less effective responses described tensions but fell short of explaining them. As with Question 2, some candidates offered material that was outside the time frame of the question – for example directly referring to the causes of the Civil War, or of conflict on the Plains – and material such as this was not given marks.

Question 4*

4* 'From the 1860s onwards, the railroads were the most important reason for people settling on the Plains.'

How far do you agree?

Give reasons for your answer.

[18]

Candidates had the option of answering either Question 4 or Question 5, and the great majority of candidates chose to answer Question 4. Both questions – and Questions 8 and 9 on Section B - have the same rationale for applying marks. Candidates who offer specific material for either the stated factor or other reasons are given marks in Level 2, with candidates who can then explain why this material led to people settling on the Plains being able to access Level 3 and beyond. Level 3 is given to candidates who offer one explained reason for either side of the argument (railroads or other factors). Level 4 credits candidates who offer two explained reasons which again could be on either side of the argument, or for both. Level 5 credits candidates who offer three explanations providing there is some balance (e.g. two explained points for one side and one for the other) and Level 6 is reserved for candidates who offer four explained points across both sides of the argument. The final mark – 18 – is set aside for those candidates who in addition offer a 'clinching argument' that combines or interacts the factors in the answer to offer a supported judgement about whether the candidate agrees with the statement.

For the stated factor, candidates frequently used information about the Transcontinental Railroad and its impact on migration, but also the land incentives the US government gave railroad companies and how this spurred migration. Some candidates linked the growth of 'cow towns' and the cattle industry to railroads and others expressed this as a separate factor, and examiners were able to give marks for this on either side of the argument depending on how it was offered. The Homestead Act was commonly used as another factor spurring people to settle on the Plains.

While candidates could achieve Level 4 for only one side of the argument, Level 5 requires some balance, and some candidates fell short of this as they offered only very generalised material about the railroads. Answers that were not clearly rooted in the period and lacked specific information about railroads from the 1860s were hard to give marks for, and such material was given Level 1. Other pitfalls seen by examiners included reference to the Mormons and Native American migration caused by the Indian Removal Act. These were both outside of the period specified in the question and received no marks. As with other questions in Section A, candidates are encouraged to develop a clear understanding of the four chronological periods of the course in order to minimise the prospect that they will offer material outside the scope of the question set.

Question 5*

5* 'The growth of big business had a positive impact on the USA and its people between 1877 and 1900.'

How far do you agree?

Give reasons for your answer.

[18]

Far fewer candidates chose to answer Question 5 and while some more successful responses were seen, in general this question produced more limited responses than Question 4.

More able candidates produced answers that explained reasons why they agreed and disagreed with the statement in the question, providing material that demonstrated positive and negative impacts of big business. The question was phrased to give candidates the widest possible latitude to assess 'impact', as they could structure this either around a specific group of people or of the USA generally. Most commonly, answers focused on the benefits of industrialisation arising from sectors like oil, steel and tobacco, with individuals like Rockefeller and Carnegie often cited. Bonanza farms featured in answers both for positive and negative impacts, and poor industrial relations were used to explain negative impacts on working class Americans. If these were clearly supported with material specific to big business in the US between 1877 and 1900, they were given marks fully. The strongest answers usually attempted a judgement about how only a minority of people gained from big business in this period.

More commonly, responses to this question were more limited. Many of the candidates who chose to answer this question did so in very general terms, and as with Question 4 if an examiner could not root the candidate's answer in the period of the question, it was difficult for the candidate to move out of Level 1. Such answers typically made reference to business in very general terms or wrote about problems faced by groups of people in society that could not readily be connected to the impact of big business.

Section B overview

Candidates are required to answer Questions 6, 7 and either Question 8 or Question 9. Across these questions, candidates are assessed against all four Assessment Objectives.

Question 6 assesses AOs 1 and 4, and while most candidates were able to make valid inferences from the source, many overlooked to need to focus on 'the Nazi government' when making these inferences and so were restricted to Level 1.

Question 7 assessed AOs 1, 3 and 4, and produced some very lengthy answers where candidates might have been more succinct. Some highly focused inferences were seen – especially from Source B – and many candidates accessed the top level, although others relied too heavily on using their contextual knowledge or used the surface features of the sources (or interpretation) rather than making inferences from them.

Questions 8 and 9 are very similar in structure to Questions 4 and 5 on Section A, but generally produced more successful answers as candidates were more focused in assessing the impact of resistance (Question 8) or methods of Nazi control (Question 9).

Question 6

Living under Nazi Rule, 1933–1945

6 What can **Source A** tell us about the Nazi government in March 1933?

Use the source and your own knowledge to support your answer.

[7]

This question, along with Question 7, is testing candidates' ability to use contemporary sources as real historians would do. In essence, this means thinking about what sources might reveal to historians about a particular issue. In Question 6, candidates are therefore rewarded at Level 1 for lifting relevant content, and at Levels 2 and 3 for making inferences *in relation to the question being asked*.

Source A was a speech made by Hitler to the Reichstag on 24 March 1933. Most candidates got to the heart of this source and were given marks in Level 2, through making at least one inference to answer the question. Most commonly, these were:

- the source tells us that the Nazi government was becoming more powerful/attempts to achieve more power at this point
- the source tells us about the methods used by the Nazi government to achieve more power/how they persuaded the Reichstag to pass the Enabling Act
- the source tells us how the Nazi government presented the Enabling Act as something positive, e.g. as a 'Law to Remedy the Distress of the People'.

Where candidates offered clear and relevant support for their inference(s) from the source, they were more successful.

Some candidates offered highly sophisticated inferences at Level 3, considering why this speech was being made, and came up with inferences such as:

- The source in fact tells us that the Nazi government had not yet secured total power by this point – hence the need to persuade the Reichstag to pass the Enabling Act. The Reichstag could not yet be completely ignored.
- The source tells us that the Nazi government wished to maintain the appearance legal rule or respectability, shown by the fact that they felt the need to go through the motions of getting this Enabling Act passed by the Reichstag.

At Level 1, more successful candidates picked out relevant detail from the source and used it clearly to address the question. For example, they explained that the source told us that the Nazis introduced an Enabling Act which would allow them to pass laws without the Reichstag. At the lower end of Level 1, candidates tended to describe what the source was (or what its purpose was) without answering the question about what it told us. Other answers made very general comments (usually about Hitler being 'manipulative') or lifted parts of it in isolation. For instance, some focused only on the comments about communism and drifted off into a narrative about the Reichstag Fire.

Finally, many candidates paid only brief attention to the source and simply used it as a springboard to write down what they knew about the Enabling Act, the Reichstag Fire or Nazi propaganda. This was not addressing the question asked and usually could not be given marks for.

Exemplar 2

Source A can tell us a few things about Nazi government in March 1933. Firstly, it shows how Hitler did not yet have absolute power in Germany because he still has to appeal to the Reichstag. However, it is clear that this is a turning point in the power of Nazi government because once the Enabling Act is passed then Hitler would gain lots of power. Secondly, it is clear that the Nazi government is was already planning radical ideas because they claim how current politicians were "weak" and "the cause of our decay". Finally, it is clear that they planned to crush the communists Communist party at this point because Hitler refers to communism as "evil".

This response is a good example both of Level 3 performance and how a succinct response can receive full marks. In fact, all examples of Level 3 performance are seen in the first three lines. The candidate's inference that Source A shows the Nazi government 'did not yet have absolute power' clearly meets the Level 3 criteria and the reference to Hitler's 'appeal to the Reichstag' constitutes support from the source and so received the second mark in Level 3. The remainder of the answer contains two Level 2-style inferences which taken on their own would have received full marks in Level 2, but for this candidate they were not necessary.

Question 7

7 How useful are **Sources B** and **C** and **Interpretation D** for a historian studying Nazi occupation in western Europe between 1940 and 1945?

In your answer, refer to the two sources and the interpretation as well as your own knowledge.

[15]

This question produced a range of answers of varying quality. Plenty of candidates got to grips with these sources and had few problems making sense of the material. The vast majority of candidates understood at least one of the sources and were able to use it in a valid way to address the question, either at the content or inference level. As with Question 6, candidates were given higher marks if they used the sources in a valid historical way, by explaining what a historian might work out from them about Nazi occupation in western Europe.

Examiners given marks a number of valid inferences which addressed the question. Most frequently, these were:

- Source B is useful for revealing how the Nazi occupiers relied on the local population (as military support)
- Source B is useful evidence of the nature of occupation in the west (i.e. it was perhaps less harsh than elsewhere), given that the source showed how the Nazis clearly saw the Dutch as their equals
- Source C, conversely, is useful for revealing the harsh nature of occupation, given the poor treatment of the Dutch at this point
- Source C is also useful evidence of organised resistance in the occupied Netherlands
- Interpretation D is useful for helping us understand the methods used by the Nazis to maintain control in the occupied territories
- Interpretation D also reveals evidence of collaboration in these territories, such as Belgium.

Where candidates supported their inference using relevant source detail, their response was marked in Level 4. Answers which made supported inferences from two or more sources were marked at Level 5. Answers which did not support their inferences with relevant source material were marked in Level 3.

At the higher end of Level 2, candidates lifted relevant source detail to answer the question. These answers used the sources in a valid way but did not get as far as making an inference about occupation in western Europe. For example, a good number said Source B was useful for showing the Dutch were recruited into the Waffen SS; or that Source C was useful because it showed that Dutch men were taken to Germany as forced labour.

At the lower end of Level 2, candidates tended to evaluate the sources in a very generic way rather than engaging with them on an individual basis. For instance, many dismissed Source B as not useful because it was 'propaganda' or embraced Interpretation D on the basis of it being written by a historian who had 'carried out research'.

A range of answers (or parts of answers) were marked in Level 1. This tended to be for similar reasons as in Question 6, i.e:

- making a comment on the source instead of saying how it was useful (e.g. *Source B is ... its purpose was ...*)
- writing about what the sources told us about things other than occupation (e.g. the war going badly for Nazi Germany).

Finally, there were again big chunks of answers where candidates simply wrote what they knew already about occupation in western Europe, instead of focussing on the question and the use of the sources. Very occasionally, this gained marks at Level 3 where it was being actively used to evaluate a source's reliability. However, most of the time, it was simply inserted and was not given any marks.

Exemplar 3

In Source B, the Nazis are aiming to gain the support of the Netherlands. This poster conveys that they should be honoured to fight for Germany. This source tells us that as the Dutch were Aryans, their treatment was better than other countries such as Poland. In the poster the Nazi policies are being forced onto the Netherlands. It says "take a stand against Communism". This shows that the Nazis are trying to unite the Dutch and Germans against ~~one~~ one common enemy - Communism. Overall this is useful in showing how the Nazis treated Aryan countries in western Europe.

In Source C, we can ^{read} see that the Dutch did not blindly obey Nazi propaganda. The fact that there is an "illegal newspaper" tells us that there is some resistance in western Europe at this time. In 1943, the Nazis were in full control and a serious threat. In this source it tells us that treatment of the Dutch worsened as war progressed into total war. It says ex-soldiers had to work as "forced labourers". This shows that their treatment had become harsh and they were sent to prison camps. Overall this is useful in presenting the resistance of western European countries in the war and how they view the Germans as an "enemy".

The response shown here reaches Level 5 in both permitted ways and so it useful for centres to consider. For Source B, the candidate clearly produces a Level 5 style inference about the nature of Nazi occupation in the West compared to the East, although the support from the source does not connect fully to that inference, placing the candidate at the bottom of Level 5 in that paragraph. The second paragraph provides a valid supported inference about the existence of resistance in Source C (Level 3) which is supported by material from the source (Level 4) but taken together with the inference in the first paragraph, this can be given further marks in Level 5.

Misconception



Although candidates' study of the period will allow them to make greater sense of the sources and interpretation, neither Question 6 nor Question 7 is driven by candidates' contextual knowledge. There were marks given in Question 6 for using contextual knowledge, and in Question 7 candidates testing their inferences against contextual knowledge is given marks in Level 3 only. A number of responses were seen that focused heavily on the candidate deploying what they knew about the topic rather than working with the sources (or interpretation) and this restricted the marks those candidates could be given.

Advice to centres

In Questions 6 and 7, candidates need to be able to handle the source material in front of them in relation to the particular question being asked. Although their knowledge plays an important role in helping them to make sense of the sources they deal with, their answers need to deal with what the sources can reveal to historians about the topic in question. Their supporting detail should come from the sources themselves.

Additionally, the best preparation for candidates, for these questions, is repeated exposure to lots of contemporary sources. This will allow them to practise using them as historians, to see what they can work out. Instructing candidates to use certain phrases such as '*The purpose of this source is ...*' or '*This is not surprising because ...*' may well be counter-productive and actually steer candidates towards mechanical answers and away from answering the question.

Question 8*

8* 'Between 1939 and 1945, wartime opposition to Hitler and the Nazis in Germany was small scale and insignificant.'

How far do you agree?

[18]

This appeared to be the less popular choice of the two essay questions and, on the whole, tended to be less well-answered than Question 9. Most candidates understood the question, which was about wartime opposition, with very few candidates writing about opposition clearly rooted in the pre-1939 period. The question was asking about the nature and effectiveness of wartime opposition, although it was left up to candidates to set their own parameters in relation to what might be considered 'small-scale' or 'insignificant'. Candidates came up with a variety of criteria, such as the impact of the opposition, the numbers of people involved, the risk taken, the nature of the opposition and how successfully it was dealt with by the regime.

There was a wide range of wartime opposition activities and groups discussed by candidates, such as:

- The White Rose
- The Edelweiss Pirates and the Swing Youth
- Opposition from individuals such as Cardinal Galen and Dietrich Bonhoeffer
- Assassination attempts on Hitler, especially the July Bomb Plot
- The postcards written by Otto and Elise Hampel
- Passive resistance from the German population at large

Different candidates often used examples of opposition in different ways. For example, some candidates argued that opposition from the Swing Kids was insignificant because it was cultural (swing clubs, listening to jazz, etc.) and didn't try to challenge the regime politically. However, others argued it was significant because the Nazis wouldn't tolerate such deviance and clamped down harshly on the group in 1941, with 300 ending up in concentration camps. As long as candidates made valid arguments, most examples could be used to support either side of the argument.

At Level 3 and above, candidates were given marks for demonstrating specific historical evidence about the opposition, and using this evidence to address the question about whether it was 'small-scale' or 'insignificant'. Answers reaching Level 6 put forward four explained points, with at least one point on either side of the argument.

Candidates whose points were marked at Level 2 usually demonstrated only basic outline knowledge about opposition and/or did not explain successfully why it could (or could not) be considered 'small-scale' or 'insignificant'. Quite often candidates would provide a description of a group's activities and then end with a phrase such as '... and therefore this was significant', without saying why.

At Level 1, answers tended to made valid but only very general assertions such as 'opposition was insignificant as people were too scared to oppose'.

There were a few candidates which wrote about wartime opposition outside of Germany, such as from the French resistance. A very a small minority of candidates misunderstood the term 'wartime opposition' and instead wrote about opposition from other countries such as the USA and Britain. These were not given marks.

Question 9*

9* 'Between 1933 and 1939, the main way the Nazis controlled the German people was by winning them over with popular policies.'

How far do you agree?

[18]

This was a broad question which allowed candidates to draw on knowledge from across different parts of the specification: Nazi policies which affected people's lives, and the means by which the regime controlled the German population. The question was asking whether people were kept in line because they had been 'won over' by the regime, or whether it was down to other means.

Most candidates understood what the question was asking and were able to put forward a range of valid points. To support the statement, candidates used a range of policies to argue that German people were controlled through being 'won over' by popular policies, such as:

- policies which tackled unemployment, such as the schemes to build the *autobahns*
- policies which supported farmers and small businesses, such as the Reich entailed Farm Law
- the DAF (as well as its Strength Through Joy and Beauty of Labour branches) which improved workplaces and leisure time for workers
- the popular aspects of the Hitler Youth
- the use of the marriage loan to support families financially.

To challenge the statement, candidates argued for alternative methods of control, most usually:

- the use of various forms of propaganda and censorship (such as radio, rallies, films and newspapers) to constantly feed positive information to the population.
- the use of terror (via organisations like the SS, SA, Gestapo and concentration camps), which kept people under control through fear of the consequences if they spoke out.
- indoctrination, especially of young people (through education and youth groups), which moulded them into supporters of the regime.

At Level 3 and above, candidates were given marks for demonstrating specific historical evidence to support their points and using this evidence to explain how the population were controlled. Again, answers reaching Level 6 put forward four explained points, with at least one point on either side of the argument.

As in Question 8, candidates whose points didn't progress further than Level 2 usually had a lack of precise detail and/or did not use their knowledge to address the question of popularity or control. Some answers described policies but then veered off into a discussion about how popular the regime was, which was not the focus of the question.

Answers at Level 1 tended to make valid but very general assertions (for instance, 'There were many policies which were popular with workers') or reference to Nazi promises rather than specific policies.

Supporting you

Teach Cambridge

Make sure you visit our secure website [Teach Cambridge](#) to find the full range of resources and support for the subjects you teach. This includes secure materials such as set assignments and exemplars, online and on-demand training.

Don't have access? If your school or college teaches any OCR qualifications, please contact your exams officer. You can [forward them this link](#) to help get you started.

Reviews of marking

If any of your students' results are not as expected, you may wish to consider one of our post-results services. For full information about the options available visit the [OCR website](#).

Access to Scripts

For the June 2023 series, Exams Officers will be able to download copies of your candidates' completed papers or 'scripts' for all of our General Qualifications including Entry Level, GCSE and AS/A Level. Your centre can use these scripts to decide whether to request a review of marking and to support teaching and learning.

Our free, on-demand service, Access to Scripts is available via our single sign-on service, My Cambridge. Step-by-step instructions are on our [website](#).

Keep up-to-date

We send a monthly bulletin to tell you about important updates. You can also sign up for your subject specific updates. If you haven't already, [sign up here](#).

OCR Professional Development

Attend one of our popular CPD courses to hear directly from a senior assessor or drop in to a Q&A session. Most of our courses are delivered live via an online platform, so you can attend from any location.

Please find details for all our courses for your subject on **Teach Cambridge**. You'll also find links to our online courses on NEA marking and support.

Signed up for ExamBuilder?

ExamBuilder is the question builder platform for a range of our GCSE, A Level, Cambridge Nationals and Cambridge Technicals qualifications. [Find out more](#).

ExamBuilder is **free for all OCR centres** with an Interchange account and gives you unlimited users per centre. We need an [Interchange](#) username to validate the identity of your centre's first user account for ExamBuilder.

If you do not have an Interchange account please contact your centre administrator (usually the Exams Officer) to request a username, or nominate an existing Interchange user in your department.

Active Results

Review students' exam performance with our free online results analysis tool. It is available for all GCSEs, AS and A Levels and Cambridge Nationals.

[Find out more](#).

Need to get in touch?

If you ever have any questions about OCR qualifications or services (including administration, logistics and teaching) please feel free to get in touch with our customer support centre.

Call us on
01223 553998

Alternatively, you can email us on
support@ocr.org.uk

For more information visit

 **ocr.org.uk/qualifications/resource-finder**

 **ocr.org.uk**

 **facebook.com/ocrexams**

 **twitter.com/ocrexams**

 **instagram.com/ocrexaminations**

 **linkedin.com/company/ocr**

 **youtube.com/ocrexams**

We really value your feedback

Click to send us an autogenerated email about this resource. Add comments if you want to. Let us know how we can improve this resource or what else you need. Your email address will not be used or shared for any marketing purposes.



I like this



I dislike this

Please note – web links are correct at date of publication but other websites may change over time. If you have any problems with a link you may want to navigate to that organisation's website for a direct search.



OCR is part of Cambridge University Press & Assessment, a department of the University of Cambridge.

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored. © OCR 2023 Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations is a Company Limited by Guarantee. Registered in England. Registered office The Triangle Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge, CB2 8EA. Registered company number 3484466. OCR is an exempt charity.

OCR operates academic and vocational qualifications regulated by Ofqual, Qualifications Wales and CCEA as listed in their qualifications registers including A Levels, GCSEs, Cambridge Technicals and Cambridge Nationals.

OCR provides resources to help you deliver our qualifications. These resources do not represent any particular teaching method we expect you to use. We update our resources regularly and aim to make sure content is accurate but please check the OCR website so that you have the most up to date version. OCR cannot be held responsible for any errors or omissions in these resources.

Though we make every effort to check our resources, there may be contradictions between published support and the specification, so it is important that you always use information in the latest specification. We indicate any specification changes within the document itself, change the version number and provide a summary of the changes. If you do notice a discrepancy between the specification and a resource, please [contact us](#).

You can copy and distribute this resource freely if you keep the OCR logo and this small print intact and you acknowledge OCR as the originator of the resource.

OCR acknowledges the use of the following content: N/A

Whether you already offer OCR qualifications, are new to OCR or are thinking about switching, you can request more information using our [Expression of Interest form](#).

Please [get in touch](#) if you want to discuss the accessibility of resources we offer to support you in delivering our qualifications.