

**GCSE (9-1)**

**Examiners' report**

# **HISTORY B**

## **(SCHOOLS HISTORY PROJECT)**

---

**J411**

For first teaching in 2016

**J411/33 Summer 2023 series**

# Contents

Introduction .....	3
Paper 33 series overview .....	4
Section A overview .....	5
Question 1 (a) .....	6
Question 1 (b) .....	6
Question 1 (c) .....	6
Question 2 .....	7
Question 3 .....	8
Question 4* .....	11
Question 5* .....	13
Section B overview .....	17
Question 6 .....	18
Question 7 .....	19
Question 8* .....	24
Question 9* .....	25

## 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 responses is 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 33 series overview

The J411 June 2023 series reverted back to the first pre-pandemic structure since 2019. Components 31–39 were therefore composed of the chosen Period Study alongside the selected World Depth Study. Paper J411/33 was Viking Expansion, c.750–c.1050 with Living Under Nazi Rule, 1933–1945.

## Section A overview

To do well on the Period Study, candidates needed to be able to:

- present a historical summary of an area of content they had learnt
- offer an explanation in response to a historical question (e.g. explaining the causes or consequences of something)
- recall and apply their knowledge to support and challenge a statement in an essay-style question.

It was clear from the majority of responses that most candidates had been well-prepared and were able to deploy their knowledge accurately on Question 2 and at least in part in the essay-style questions (particularly candidates who opted for Question 4).

However, on Question 3, many candidates misunderstood the terms 'settlement' and 'eastern Europe', which resulted in them writing about the wrong areas or actions, gaining little or no marks. Similarly, although most candidates who chose to response Question 5 were able to identify accurately areas of Viking activity and settlement in western Europe, fewer were able to successfully develop their responses with enough evidence to address the question of whether or not the Vikings 'transformed' these areas.

Candidates who did well on this paper generally:	Candidates who did less well on this paper generally:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• recalled at least two valid responses for Question 1</li> <li>• analysed the role of gods in Viking society by organising their response around a historical concept (most frequently, significance and consequence). They supported their response using specific examples (Question 2)</li> <li>• fully explained in Question 3 at least one impact of the settlement of the Volga Vikings in eastern Europe</li> <li>• effectively deployed a range of knowledge in the essay question, using precise evidence to support their responses (Question 4 and Question 5).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• did not produce a valid response to any part of Question 1</li> <li>• described Viking gods or beliefs but did not consider how to organise and present their response as a historical analysis <b>OR</b> did not support their response with a specific example (Question 2)</li> <li>• identified valid reason(s) in Question 3 but were unable to develop their response with precise evidence and/or use it to address the question <b>OR</b> provided responses rooted in the wrong place, and without considering the term 'settlement' (usually raiding Baghdad or joining the Varangian Guard in Constantinople)</li> <li>• made accurate but generalised points which they were unable to support with specific evidence in the essay question <b>OR</b> gave precise evidence but did not explain how it helped to address the question being asked (Question 4 and Question 5).</li> </ul>

## Question 1 (a)

### Viking Expansion, c.750–c.1050

- 1 (a) Identify **one** important trading town within the Viking homelands in c.750. [1]

There were many unsuccessful responses to this question. Most frequently, candidates offered towns in England, like Jorvik, or in eastern Europe, such as Kiev. Many named countries like Norway or modern cities in Scandinavia. However, there were frequent successful responses; the most common ones were Hedeby and Birka, with fewer candidates citing Kaupang and Ribe.

## Question 1 (b)

- (b) Identify **one** Anglo-Saxon kingdom that became part of the Danelaw. [1]

Again, although some candidates were familiar with Anglo-Saxon kingdoms which became part of the Danelaw (Mercia, Northumbria, Essex and East Anglia were all given marks), many did not produce a valid response here. Some candidates opted for kingdoms which did not become part of the Danelaw (with Wessex being the most common in this category). However, most simply named 'England' or 'Jorvik'.

## Question 1 (c)

- (c) Give **one** reason for Svein Forkbeard's attacks on England. [1]

The most frequently given correct response here was 'revenge for the St. Brice's Day Massacre'. Other correct responses included England having a weak or divided government, and previous Danish success in attacks/use of the Danegeld. However, many candidates offered overly vague responses, such as 'for land' or 'for power'. These were not accepted as valid responses. Some candidates said that Svein attacked because Ethelred was only 12 years old, which was not given marks, as Ethelred, although 12 on taking the throne, was in his mid-thirties by the time of the first attacks.

## Question 2

2 Write a clear and organised summary that analyses the role of gods in Viking society.

Support your summary with examples.

[9]

It was clear that most candidates were familiar with Viking gods and were able to include some relevant knowledge in their responses to this question, with many candidates focusing on their role within Viking society. Additionally, while there were some responses which contained disorganised descriptions, most candidates did approach their summary analytically, clearly organising their responses in a valid, historical way. Most frequently, candidates considered significance (the importance/centrality of the role of gods in Viking society); or consequence (the impact of Viking beliefs about their gods on Viking practices and behaviour). Fewer candidates made use of change (i.e. from a pagan society to a Christian society).

Responses which were marked at Level 1 either contained a lack of development or precise examples, or else were not clearly organised enough around a valid historical concept. Some responses described various gods without reference to their role in Viking society, or recounted Viking stories about the universe.

However, most responses did attain Level 2 or above. To move into Levels 2 and 3, responses needed to be both clearly organised in a valid historical way and contain precise examples. Typically, candidates drew on knowledge such as:

- the belief in Odin's Hall, *Valhalla*, meant Vikings wished to die bravely in battle, thus contributing to the warrior society (similar arguments were made using Thor and Tyr)
- as farmers, honouring Frey (or Freya, or Sif) was important to Vikings, as favourable weather was needed to ensure a good harvest
- belief in the gods affected what happened in Viking society at significant times, for example, they made offerings to the gods and called on them for help at important times (such as the birth of a baby, when women would call on Freya or after death, when beliefs affected the way Viking burials were carried out)
- the relationship with the gods was a transactional one, with people making offerings and sacrifices to the gods
- some historians have argued that the Viking belief in *Ragnarok* gave Vikings a fatalistic attitude to life, meaning they wanted to live adventurously and die fighting.

Only a very small minority of candidates were unfamiliar with any of the Viking gods or beliefs and offered incorrect assertions which received no marks.

## Question 3

### 3 What impact did the settlement of Volga Vikings have in eastern Europe?

Explain your answer.

[10]

This question was asking about the Volga Vikings in eastern Europe, and what the impact was of their settling in the area (for example, in places such as Staraya Lagoda, Kiev and Novgorod). There were a range of creditable responses here, such as:

- impact on religion and culture, such as Vladimir's spread of Orthodox Christianity and Byzantium culture as a result of his alliance with Byzantium
- increased trade/prosperity, with towns along the river routes developing as trading hubs for both Scandinavian and Arab goods, and as places to repair boats and replenish supplies
- impact on local population (e.g. enslavement of local people; Scandinavian elites taking tribute from local Slav population)
- Viking or 'Rus' power and control of the area (e.g. fortification of Novgorod and Oleg's heirs ruling over Kiev for hundreds of years to come) leading to wealth as well as power for the Rus
- the impact on the Volga Vikings themselves (e.g. gradually, they integrated into Slav population, adopted the Slavic way of living, and lost much of their Scandinavian heritage).

The majority of candidates were able to identify at least one action or impact of the Volga Vikings in this area. The most common valid response was the impact on trade. Some responses offered at least one full explanation, supported by precise evidence/examples, and these were given marks at Levels 4 and 5.

However, many candidates were unable to progress beyond Level 2 or Level 3. Often this was because they lacked specific detail or were unable to fully explain what changed as a result of the Volga Vikings' settlement. The most frequent reason, however, was that candidates misunderstood the question and instead of writing about Volga Viking **settlement** in **eastern Europe**, wrote about relationships with the Arab world and Constantinople. For example, there were a great number of responses about things such as: trade directly between the Arab world and Scandinavia; Viking raids on Constantinople and Baku and Viking activities in the Varangian Guard. Where these responses made no link to Viking settlement in eastern Europe, examiners could not give marks for them.

There were some responses which made valid but only very general assertions, such as 'The Volga Vikings developed the area.' These were given marks at Level 1 only. A very small minority of candidates misunderstood the term 'Volga Vikings' completely, as well as 'eastern Europe' and wrote about Viking raids and settlement in western European countries such as France and England. These were not given marks by examiners.

## Exemplar 1

The Volga Vikings travelled to Eastern Europe, down the River Dnieper. In what is now Russia, they created small settlements down the rivers they were travelling. These settlements were brought together and Kiev was created. This soon became a large and powerful city, ruled by a long line of Vikings including Oleg and Vladimir. Vladimir ~~erect~~ built the Golden Gate of Kiev, establishing his and Kiev's power. Other towns they created include Staraya Ladoga and Novgorod. In these settlements, the Vikings ~~inter~~ inter-married ~~in~~ with the Slavic people, creating a new Viking-Slav society. This shows the impact the settlement of the Vikings had was on the people and ~~also~~ the impact lasted.

After the Vikings established settlements in North East Europe, they travelled south, towards the Black Sea. Here, the Vikings found Baghdad, a well civilised, circular city. It had many attractions for the Vikings, including the

bazaars (markets) it had, the circular city walls with four entrances and the goods they could acquire through trade. The Vikings traded walrus ivory, falcons and amber among other items for perfumes, silver and spices. In Baghdad, they mostly traded, but those who did settle were not liked by the Arabs who lived there. They saw the Vikings as dirty and sexually immoral. This shows the impact of the settlement of the Volga Vikings had was

a negative one, as the Arabs in Baghdad did not like them and impacted their lives by disrupting them.

The vikings then travelled to Constantinople which they named 'Miklagard' which means the great city. Here, the vikings traded and also raided in the late 780s, 800, and early 900s. A peace treaty was signed and meant the vikings could trade but no longer harm the city. Some of the vikings became a guard called the Varangian guard and protected Emperor Theophilus. This shows they impacted Eastern Europe by participating in trade, raiding Constantinople but also becoming close protectors and friends of the Emperor.

This response is a good example of a candidate who was able to describe correctly one action or impact of the Volga Vikings' settlement in eastern Europe at the beginning of their response – they created small settlements along the River Dnieper. This placed the response in Level 2. They then go on to give some detail about this, describing the creation and development of Kiev under Oleg and Vladimir, along with the integration with Slavs (Level 3). They finish off by explaining how all of this meant that the Volga Vikings had a lasting impact on the area, through the creation of a new Viking-Slav society. This explanation, which addresses the question, meant the response was placed in Level 4.

The next two paragraphs in this candidate's response were not given marks, as they describe Volga Viking activity in Baghdad and Constantinople, without relating these things back to their settlement in eastern Europe.

The response therefore stayed in Level 4. To move into Level 5 a further full explanation of another valid impact is required.

### Assessment for learning



Candidates need to be comfortable with the activities of the Volga Vikings in the areas which are now Russia and Ukraine, as well as their activities in the Arab and Byzantine worlds. They also need to make sure they pay close attention to key words in the question, such as 'settlement', which can often point them in the right direction.

## Question 4\*

4\* 'The Vikings were successful in attacking western Europe between 793 and 879 because of the quality of their ships.'

How far do you agree?

Give reasons for your answer.

[18]

This was a popular question that produced a range of responses of varying success. Most candidates understood the question, which was asking why the Vikings succeeded in their attacks on western Europe during this period. The 'quality of their ships' was the suggested factor, which could be compared against a range of other reasons for success. It was clear that most candidates were familiar with this topic and could identify reasons to support and/or challenge the statement.

A wide range of valid points was offered by candidates including:

In support of the statement:

- the speed of Viking ships under sails and oars meant that Viking raiders could attack their targets using the element of surprise, and then get away before a defence was organised
- the design of the longships meant they did not need a jetty, so could be pulled up onto a beach and easily pushed out again, escaping pursuers
- the shallow draught of the ships gave them the ability to go inland up navigable rivers and muddy estuaries, allowing the Vikings to target a wider variety of towns inland, as well as on the coast.

Challenging the statement:

- the weakness of western Europe (e.g. England's division into different kingdoms) meant there was less effective opposition to the attacks
- the choice of targets (e.g. defenceless monasteries) gave the Vikings a higher chance of success
- the use of over-wintering meant more raids could be carried out, from early spring onwards
- high-quality weapons and Viking tactics, such as the use of 'berserkers' and the shield wall, proved highly successful against their enemies.

At Level 3 and above, candidates were given marks for demonstrating specific historical evidence to support their points and using this evidence to address the question about success in attacking western Europe. Responses reaching Level 6 put forward four explained points, with at least one point on either side of the argument.

Candidates whose points were given marks at Level 2 usually had a lack of precise detail and/or did not show how their knowledge addressed the question. These included (sometimes lengthy) descriptions of Viking longships with no successful attempt at explaining their impact on attacks. Quite often, these descriptions veered away from the 'quality' of the ships and lapsed into describing things like their artwork.

One of the common misconceptions examiners came across in these responses was that a Viking army, with its warrior culture and belief in *Valhalla*, was always going to defeat an Anglo-Saxon army (or French, etc.), simply because they were more highly motivated. Many candidates also assumed that Viking warriors were better trained and somehow 'superior'. These kinds of responses were not given marks beyond Level 2.

At Level 1, responses tended to be valid but only made very general assertions such as 'the ships were strong/fast/large'. There was a small minority of responses which misunderstood the term 'attacking western Europe' and instead wrote about the activities of the Volga Vikings in the east, or about Viking settlements. These were not given marks.

## Question 5\*

5\* How far do you agree that Viking settlers transformed the places they settled in western Europe?

Give reasons for your answer.

[18]

Even though this was also a popular choice of question, many candidates found this essay a challenge. Most could identify areas of settlement in western Europe and describe some aspects of Viking activity there. However, not as many were able to fully grasp the 'transformation' aspect of this question.

A wide range of points in relation to England, Scotland and the islands, France, Ireland, Iceland and Greenland were given marks by examiners on both sides of the argument. Some of the most successful and frequently cited arguments were:

- England was 'transformed' as seen through the influence of Vikings in the Danelaw (e.g. changes to language and place names, the introduction of *things* which were later maintained in some form, and the development of trade and towns such as Jorvik)
- that, conversely, it could be argued that England was not 'transformed' as the Vikings were absorbed into the local population (becoming 'invisible Vikings'), adopting Anglo-Saxon customs as well as Christianity
- Normandy was not really 'transformed' because the Vikings quickly took on a French identity (e.g. conversion to Christianity, marriage into French families and adoption of French language and customs such as fighting on horseback)
- that in Iceland, the Vikings were the first people to settle the land on a large scale, with the majority of modern Icelandic residents being descended from first Viking settlers, recreating Norwegian society in Iceland (e.g. through the *Althing*), so this was clear evidence of 'transformation'
- Ireland was not 'transformed' because few Vikings moved to the interior and Viking identity was lost through conversion to Christianity, intermarriage and becoming Gaelic speakers, before eventually they were expelled.

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

Candidates whose points were given marks at Level 2 usually had a lack of precise detail and/or did not use their knowledge about Viking settlement to explain whether or not they 'transformed' the area(s).

Answers placed at Level 1 tended to name areas of Viking settlement accurately and/or give very general assertions about transformation, such as 'No, they didn't transform these areas because they fitted in well'. There were only a very few candidates who misunderstood this question entirely and wrote either about Viking raids, or about settlement in areas outside of western Europe, such as in Newfoundland or Kiev and Novgorod. These responses were not credited.

## Exemplar 2

When Vikings first began to settle in western Europe I agree that they transformed the areas. For example after the treaty of Wedmore and Danelaw was formed, England was transformed and changed massively. Most of the Earls were replaced by Viking puppets and England was split in two. New towns started to develop for example Jorvik which became the Danelaw capital and new vocabulary and place names started to appear. Such as the words knife, sky and husband and any places which end in 'ness' or 'by' such as Stegness and Whitby. This transformed England as the vocabulary the Vikings brought with them once they had settled is still used today.

Another way Viking settlers transformed the places they settled in ~~the~~ western Europe was up in the Shetland and Orkney islands. These islands were transformed into large farmlands and small villages as the Vikings at the time were in desperate need of extra space due to the infertile lands of Scandinavia. The local community of the Shetland islands was also influenced and transformed as they swiftly vanished leading to many to believe that they were all killed. This means that the Viking settlers did transform the place they settled in western Europe as they collapsed the local

Picts and used all the land for farming.

However an example of ~~most~~ <sup>where</sup> viking settlers did not transform places they settled in western Europe is Ireland. Due to tough Irish chieftans, vikings were never able to settle in Ireland as they were not accepted at all. Instead many viking settlers stuck to the east coast of Ireland and adopted the language of Gaelic. Traces ~~and~~ and example of minor trade has been discovered however the settlers were not able to influence the Irish and transform the lives of the population.

A final example of where viking settlers did not influence places they settled was France. Between Charles the simple and a viking Jarl named Rollo the warrior a deal was made where the vikings were given Normandy, Northern France. However in return the vikings had to convert to christianity and adopt the french language leading to many vikings becoming so called invisible vikings. This is because they married into french families and adopting their customs leaving no trace of them meaning that the vikings did not transform this place in western Europe once they had settled.

Overall I agree with the statement that viking settlers transformed places they settled in western Europe as their influence is still visible to the day for example the trial by jury court format which is commonly used in today's society.

This is an example of a response which was marked as a balanced argument containing four explained points (two points to support the statement and two to challenge it). The paragraphs on England, the Scottish islands, Ireland and France all:

- identify a valid area of transformation (the area, plus impact on language, local populations, etc)
- offer precise historical evidence to support their argument
- fully engage with the question by explaining why that meant the selected area was 'transformed' or not.

The response was placed at Level 6. For full marks, a 'clinging argument' is needed, which is more than just a summary (or an attempt to introduce new evidence, as this candidate has done). For instance, a good clinching argument for this question might analyse the nature of change or impact (was it only 'transformative' within a very limited area, perhaps, or was it 'influential' rather than completely 'transformative'?) or consider how long-lasting the impact was.

### Assessment for learning



Candidates who have precise historical evidence at their fingertips will reach the high levels on essay questions, but they must also be able to deploy that evidence effectively, explaining how it answers the question asked.

## Section B overview

To do well on the World Depth Study, candidates needed to be able to:

- make valid inferences from contemporary sources (and interpretations) to address a particular question
- recall and apply their knowledge to support and challenge a statement in an essay-style question.

It was clear from the majority of responses that most candidates had been well-prepared to expect sources and were able to use at least one in a valid way to respond to Question 7. However, there were some less successful responses to Question 6. Although clearly familiar with the Enabling Act, many candidates tended to make general comments about Hitler using isolated snippets from the source without showing clear understanding of what the source told us about the Nazi government in March 1933. Across both Questions 6 and 7, there were many responses which used the sources simply as a 'springboard' to tell us what they knew, rather than explain what the sources revealed.

In the essay-style questions, most candidates opted for Question 9 and were able to deploy accurately their knowledge about methods of control in Nazi Germany, at least in part. However, many responses (or parts of responses) were either too vague to be given marks at the explanation levels, or else did not explain how their evidence answered the question.

Candidates who did well on this paper generally:	Candidates who did less well on this paper generally:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• made a valid inference from Source A to explain what the source told us about the Nazi government in March 1933, most commonly, that it was gaining more power, or how it framed the Enabling Act as something positive in order to get it passed by the Reichstag (Question 6)</li> <li>• in Question 7, made a valid inference from at least one source to explain what it revealed about Nazi occupation in western Europe, supporting their inference using source detail</li> <li>• effectively deployed a range of knowledge in the essay question, using precise evidence to support their responses (Question 8 and Question 9).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• lifted parts of Source A in isolation without clearly getting across they understood it <b>OR</b> told us what they already knew about the Enabling Act (Question 6)</li> <li>• made generalised comments on the sources without identifying what they revealed about Nazi occupation in western Europe <b>OR</b> evaluated their usefulness in a 'stock' way <b>OR</b> used the sources as a 'springboard' to tell us what they already knew about Nazi occupation (Question 7)</li> <li>• made accurate but generalised points which they were unable to support with specific evidence in the essay question <b>OR</b> gave precise evidence but did not explain how it helped to address the question being asked (Question 8 and Question 9).</li> </ul>

## 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]

Question 6, along with Question 7, is assessing candidates' ability to use contemporary sources as real historians would. This means thinking about what sources might reveal to historians about a particular issue. In Question 6, candidates are therefore marked 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 placed in Level 2 by making at least one inference to respond to the question. Most commonly, these were:

- the source tells us that the Nazi government was becoming more powerful/attempting to achieve more power at this point
- the source tells us about the methods used by the Nazi government to achieve more power or 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 given higher marks.

Some candidates offered highly sophisticated inferences at Level 3, considering why this speech was being made, and produced 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 of 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 responses 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 did not warrant marks being given.

## 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 responses of varying quality. Plenty of candidates got to grips with these sources and had few problems making sense of the material. The 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 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 gave marks for 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 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 placed in Level 4. Responses which made supported inferences from two or more sources were rewarded at Level 5. Responses which did not support their inferences with relevant source material were placed into Level 3.

At the higher end of Level 2, candidates lifted relevant source detail to respond to the question. These responses 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 B was useful for showing that the Dutch were recruited into the Waffen SS, or that 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 generic way rather than engaging with them on an individual basis. For instance, many dismissed B as not useful because it was 'propaganda' or embraced D on the basis of it being written by a historian who had 'carried out research'.

A range of responses (or parts of responses) were placed 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 responses where candidates simply wrote what they knew already about occupation in western Europe, instead of focusing on the question and the use of the sources. Very occasionally, this was marked 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 not rewardable.

### Exemplar 3

Source B is useful to learn about Nazi occupation in western Europe as it tells us about how the Nazis treated people who lived in the Netherlands. The ~~interpretation~~<sup>source</sup> shows a Dutch man in a powerful light, surrounded by ammunition, ~~and~~ planes and tanks, and the interpretation calls for Netherlands men to "take a stand against communism". This tells us that the Nazis viewed the Dutch as equals to Germans and wanted them to fight for the Nazis.

From my own knowledge, I know that the occupation of the Netherlands was more peaceful than other countries because the Nazis viewed them as 'ethnically similar' and allowed them to keep jobs and join the SS. Therefore, ~~source A is~~ ~~to~~ ~~B~~ is useful because it tells the historian that Nazis favoured the Dutch and ~~didn't~~ asked for their cooperation.

Source C is useful ~~because it tells us~~ ~~about~~ to learn about the responses to Nazi occupation in western Europe. The source is from "an illegal Dutch newspaper", which tells us that the Nazis met resistance and defiance even from those they treated fairly, and it ~~is~~ says "we must persevere with fierce anger" towards the Nazis.

This tells us that, although the Dutch were treated well, they still resisted the Nazis by making newspapers. The purpose of the source is to rally Dutch resistance to the Nazis, and from my own knowledge I know that this was successful because the Dutch organised strikes and protests after Jewish deportation. Therefore, ~~the~~ source C is useful to the historian because it tells them about the strong defiance and non-cooperative responses to the Nazis in western Europe.

Interpretation D is useful because it tells us about the cooperation some countries had with the Nazis. It tells us that some local groups "joined forces" with the Nazis and could "exploit the occupation to settle local scores". This ~~means that~~ shows that some countries, like Belgium, were welcoming and encouraged the Nazis when being occupied by them. From my own knowledge I know that Latvian citizens helped the Nazis to exterminate their Jewish population, taking advantage of the effective genocide that the Holocaust was. Therefore Interpretation D is useful because it tells the historian that not all countries resisted the Nazis, some were in agreement with them and sought to work with them.

In conclusion, the ~~three~~ two sources, Band C and Interpretation D are very useful as they show how the Nazis met resistance in some places and cooperation in others. They also tell us about attitudes the Nazis had towards these countries. Overall, all three are very useful to learn about Nazi occupation in western Europe.

This response is an example of a candidate who made a valid inference from each of the three sources/interpretations and supported their inferences using source detail. Therefore, they reached Level 5. It is also worth noting that at various points, the candidate drifted away from the question to add in information about what they already knew, and this was not given marks.

In the first paragraph, the candidate makes an inference from Source B about occupation and that the source reveals how the Nazis treated the Dutch as their 'equals'. They explain how they worked this out from the source. This takes the response into Level 4.

The next paragraph drifts away from the source and the candidate just recounts what they know on this topic. This does not progress the response any further.

The candidate then moves on to Source C. They tell us how the source is useful evidence about responses to occupation in western Europe because it reveals the existence of resistance from the population. The support is briefer here, but still relevant (the Dutch made newspapers and were telling others to 'persevere with fierce anger' against the Nazis). This takes the response into Level 5. The rest of that paragraph received no further marks as the candidate again moves away from the question and the source.

Finally, the response deals with Interpretation D. The candidate explains how this is useful evidence of co-operation within Nazi-occupied countries in western Europe, such as Belgium. Again, they support this briefly with source detail, which further cements their position in Level 5. Once more their contextual knowledge does not earn any further marks.

Overall, this was a very successful response which understood all three sources and used them well. However, the candidate may have used up less of their time here had they concentrated on the sources and the question alone.

### Assessment for learning



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 responses 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 responses 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]

Question 8 was the less popular choice of the two essay questions and, on the whole, tended to be less successfully 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 Kids
- 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 did not 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'. Responses reaching Level 6 put forward four explained points, with at least one point on either side of the argument.

Candidates whose points were given marks 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, responses tended to make valid but only very general assertions such as 'opposition was insignificant as people were too scared to oppose'.

A few candidates wrote about wartime opposition outside of Germany, such as the French resistance. A minority of responses misunderstood the term 'wartime opposition' and instead wrote about opposition from other countries such as the USA and Britain. Both of 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 under control 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 examples to argue that German people were controlled by 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, responses 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 responses 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 referenced 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.