



General Certificate of Education

AS History 1041

Unit 2: HIS2M

Life in Nazi Germany, 1933–1945

Mark Scheme

2009 examination - June series

This mark scheme uses the [new numbering system](#) which is being introduced for examinations from June 2010

The specimen assessment materials are provided to give centres a reasonable idea of the general shape and character of the planned question papers and mark schemes in advance of the operational exams.

Further copies of this Mark Scheme are available to download from the AQA Website: www.aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2009 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

COPYRIGHT

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered centres for AQA are permitted to copy material from this booklet for their own internal use, with the following important exception: AQA cannot give permission to centres to photocopy any material that is acknowledged to a third party even for internal use within the centre.

Set and published by the Assessment and Qualifications Alliance.

Generic Introduction for AS

The AS History specification is based on the assessment objectives laid down in QCA's GCE History subject criteria and published in the AQA specification booklet. These cover the skills, knowledge and understanding which are expected of A Level candidates. Most questions address more than one objective since historical skills, which include knowledge and understanding, are usually deployed together. Consequently, the marking scheme which follows is a 'levels of response' scheme and assesses candidates' historical skills in the context of their knowledge and understanding of History.

The levels of response are a graduated recognition of how candidates have demonstrated their abilities in the Assessment Objectives. Candidates who predominantly address AO1(a) by writing narrative or description will perform at Level 1 or Level 2 depending on its relevance. Candidates who provide more explanation – (AO1(b), supported by the relevant selection of material, AO1(a)) – will perform at high Level 2 or low-mid Level 3 depending on how explicit they are in their response to the question. Candidates who provide explanation with evaluation, judgement and an awareness of historical interpretations will be addressing all 3 AOs (AO1(a); AO1(b); AO2(a) and (b) and will have access to the higher mark ranges. AO2(a) which requires the evaluation of source material is assessed in Unit 2.

Differentiation between Levels 3, 4 and 5 is judged according to the extent to which candidates meet this range of assessment objectives. At Level 3 the answers will show more characteristics of the AO1 objectives, although there should be elements of AO2. At Level 4, AO2 criteria, particularly an understanding of how the past has been interpreted, will be more in evidence and this will be even more dominant at Level 5. The demands on written communication, particularly the organisation of ideas and the use of specialist vocabulary also increase through the various levels so that a candidate performing at the highest AS level is already well prepared for the demands of A2.

CRITERIA FOR MARKING GCE HISTORY:

AS EXAMINATION PAPERS

General Guidance for Examiners (to accompany Level Descriptors)

Deciding on a level and the award of marks within a level

It is of vital importance that examiners familiarise themselves with the generic mark scheme and apply it consistently, as directed by the Principal Examiner, in order to facilitate comparability across options.

The indicative mark scheme for each paper is designed to illustrate some of the material that candidates might refer to (knowledge) and some of the approaches and ideas they might develop (skills). It is not, however, prescriptive and should only be used to exemplify the generic mark scheme.

When applying the generic mark scheme, examiners will constantly need to exercise judgement to decide which level fits an answer best. Few essays will display all the characteristics of a level, so deciding the most appropriate will always be the first task.

Each level has a range of marks and for an essay which has a strong correlation with the level descriptors the middle mark should be given. However, when an answer has some of the characteristics of the level above or below, or seems stronger or weaker on comparison with many other candidates' responses to the same question, the mark will need to be adjusted up or down.

When deciding on the mark within a level, the following criteria should be considered *in relation to the level descriptors*. Candidates should never be doubly penalised. If a candidate with poor communication skills has been placed in Level 2, he or she should not be moved to the bottom of the level on the basis of the poor quality of written communication. On the other hand, a candidate with similarly poor skills, whose work otherwise matched the criteria for Level 4 should be adjusted downwards within the level.

Criteria for deciding marks within a level:

- The accuracy of factual information
- The level of detail
- The depth and precision displayed
- The quality of links and arguments
- The quality of written communication (grammar, spelling, punctuation and legibility; an appropriate form and style of writing; clear and coherent organisation of ideas, including the use of specialist vocabulary)
- Appropriate references to historical interpretation and debate
- The conclusion

Specimen Mark Scheme for examinations in June 2010 onwards

GCE AS History Unit 2: Historical Issues: Periods of Change

HIS2M: Life in Nazi Germany, 1933–1945

Question 1

01 Use **Sources A** and **B** and your own knowledge.

Explain how far the views in **Source B** differ from those in **Source A** in relation to the attitudes of German people towards the Nazi regime. (12 marks)

Target: AO2(a)

Levels Mark Scheme

	Nothing written worthy of credit.	0
L1:	Answers will either briefly paraphrase/describe the content of the two sources or identify simple comparison(s) between the sources. Skills of written communication will be weak.	1-2
L2:	Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources and identify some differences and/or similarities. There may be some limited own knowledge. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed.	3-6
L3:	Responses will compare the views expressed in the two sources, identifying differences and similarities and using own knowledge to explain and evaluate these. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed.	7-9
L4	Responses will make a developed comparison between the views expressed in the two sources and will apply own knowledge to evaluate and to demonstrate a good contextual understanding. Answers will, for the most part, show good skills of written communication.	10-12

Indicative content

Whilst both sources are similar in that:

- they relate to perceptions of people with small towns/villages backgrounds
- they comment on conformity and sacrifice, albeit one apparently willing and the other unwilling

there are clearly very strong differences in how German people felt about life under the Nazi regime. Source B is a personal reminiscence from 1933 and describes the fears and concerns some people had so early on in the Nazi period. It raises a negative tone towards the Nazis and uses the book burning incident of 1933 to highlight the developing nature of the regime – intimidation and terror. It ultimately claims that German people, even friends, were prepared to betray each other and report anyone who made anti-Nazi comments.

Source A is taken from a small village newspaper nearly three years into Hitler's rule and is subject to Nazi censorship. The source also uses a specific incident – the Day of National Solidarity – to highlight the range of support for the Nazis. The source is positive in tone and tries to suggest that there was a strong national community in Germany and people were keen to make 'willing' sacrifices. It differs fundamentally from Source B in that it suggests that the new Germany was full of National Socialist spirit, covered all groups in society and benefited from strong leadership. Of course, it is subject to propaganda.

Good candidates will find many phrases in the two sources to help them highlight differences. Likewise they should be able to bring in own knowledge to support their line of argument. An evaluation of the provenance of the two sources should produce high level answers. As usual literal evidence, merely adopting an uncritical, line-by-line approach, will limit candidates to Level 1. The most effective responses will not only assemble the relevant information, including own knowledge, but also apply it to support argued, comparative assessments.

Question 1

02 Use **Sources A, B** and **C** and your own knowledge.

How far had the Nazi regime succeeded in creating loyal Nazi citizens by 1939?

(24 marks)

Target: AO1(b), AO2(a), AO2(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

Nothing written worthy of credit.

0

L1: Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may comprise an undeveloped mixture of the two. They may contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or they may address only a part of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**

L2: Answers may be based on sources or on own knowledge alone, or they may contain a mixture of the two. They may be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the focus of the question. Alternatively, they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**

L3: Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question using evidence from **both** the sources **and** own knowledge. They will provide some assessment backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**

L4: Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, and a good understanding of historical

interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**

L5: Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence from the sources and own knowledge, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

The key requirement here is for candidates to assess how far society had conformed and/or supported the Nazi regime by 1939 and whether their support was through personal conviction, or, alternately, a basic lack of opposition. It is a central theme of this paper and candidates should be able to utilise all three sources and their own knowledge profitably to offer an evaluation. Source C could prove to be valuable as it offers a range of possibilities into the psychology of many Germans towards the Nazis.

It suggests a variety of points:

- there were many supporters, even if they were not believers
- there was broad approval for the regime
- these supporters found some of the Nazi ideology to their liking and gave support out of agreement, not fear
- was support based on a real ideological enthusiasm or simply self-interest?

This final point may be used by some candidates as a form of template to their answer, i.e. was support passive or active? (Stephen Lee's Chapter 4 on Support and Opposition in *Hitler and Nazi Germany* offers a very accessible analysis.)

Candidates should be prepared to examine a variety of key events and groups in society – different classes, women, the churches, the military, workers and peasants etc – and assess the level of support the regime received by 1939. When examining the different groups in society, candidates should be aware of stereotyping and ambiguity. Recent research has shown a shift in interpretation about the extent to which the regime was voluntarily supported by the German population. Greater emphasis is now on complicity and evidence suggests there was a considerable amount of Germans willing to denounce fellow Germans.

Key questions to examine might include:

- did the benefits of National Socialism outweigh the negative aspects?
- was German loyalty to the ideology of National Socialism or the personal popularity of Hitler?

Effective answers may offer an alternative approach and suggest it is quite difficult to assess public opinion towards the Nazis, especially given the constraints of a totalitarian regime. Source B is helpful here as it highlights the dilemma and danger of speaking out. Statistics may be offered to show how little real, overt opposition there was but was loyalty given freely? The regime, via its 'legal revolution', clearly made any form of opposition appear disloyal. Candidates need to consider a range of possible approaches and credit will be given where recent research is taken into account.

Question 2

03 Explain why Hitler eliminated opposition in the Night of the Long Knives. (12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-2**
- L2:** Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **3-6**
- L3:** Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **7-9**
- L4:** Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. **10-12**

Indicative content

Candidates have to explain why Hitler decided to eliminate opposition in the Night of the Long Knives. They should be able to recognise that one of the key reasons for the destruction of the SA was motivated by the need to placate traditional vested interests. Hitler was determined to regulate the 'revolution from above' and, in doing so, avoid antagonising the powerful vested interests. There are many other reasons candidates may highlight:

- Hitler was able to settle old scores – Schleicher and Strasser are examples
- he wanted to stop Rohm's intention of integrating the army and SA into a people's militia, with Rohm as its commander
- he wished to consolidate his personal position and make it absolute. On 30 June 1934 he eliminated the SA as a political and military force once and for all
- he wanted the party to accept the realities of political compromise. He believed change should come from above not below. It was an attempt to put an end to revolution and move to the safer parameters of evolution
- he wanted to end the internal party conflict as some party activists were out of control. It clashed with the view of the party as a respectable party in power
- Hitler wanted to assume the presidency – with an ailing Hindenburg – without any opposition. He had to secure the army's unqualified backing to achieve this. He believed the support of the army was key to the Nazi regime's survival in the short-term and this would later allow him to fulfil his ambitions in foreign policy.

Overall, it secured Hitler's own personal political supremacy. It allowed him quickly – on Hindenburg's death – to adopt the title of Führer. This event stabilised the Nazi regime and completed the removal of any threat of a 'second revolution'. It is not expected that candidates will mention all points or offer extended explanations but the focus must highlight why Hitler chose this event to destroy opposition in June 1934.

Question 2

- 04** 'By the end of 1934, Germany had become a totalitarian state.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**
- L4:** Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**
- L5:** Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

The key requirement here is to evaluate the premise of the question and offer a critical assessment of the state of Germany by the end of 1934. Many candidates will probably try to define 'totalitarian' at some point in their essay, then examine the events in the period to assess

how true it would be to claim that Germany was totalitarian after two years of Nazi rule. Some may argue that, even if such a state was not in place by the end of 1934, many of the component parts were present. Layton, in his conclusion to Chapter 5, in *Germany: The Third Reich, 1933–1945*, suggests that to describe the Third Reich as ‘totalitarian’ is not inaccurate but that it may be criticised on two major fronts:

- although by the end of 1934 Germany was a one-party state, the Nazi Party did not have the organisation, unity or purpose to dominate affairs (as in the USSR)
- the Nazis never established a centralised command control over the economy.

Layton states that Germany was not the monolithic structure associated with totalitarianism. Also, Nazis were very conscious of public opinion throughout their time in power. This would suggest the regime was not totalitarian. Many historians now accept the view that the Third Reich’s power structure was an alliance of different blocs, prepared to work with each other as ‘partners in power’. Of course this overlooks the divisions and conflicts within the various groups. Williamson believes that when ‘a group of personal failures... grouped around a fanatical, charismatic and unstable leader took over the reins of one of the most sophisticated governmental structures in Europe, the consequences were bound to be chaotic and defy rational analysis’. This suggests the likelihood of a totalitarian state developing, based on a veneer of efficiency, was quite small.

Between 1933 and 1934 Hitler was heavily dependent upon the backing of the army and big business and he did not attempt to control them directly for fear of alienating them. As seen in 2(a), the Night of the Long Knives was actually designed to placate the vested interests. Where totalitarianism may start to apply more appropriately is between 1936–1938 but this lies outside the question.

Candidates may therefore suggest that early signs of a totalitarian state were being observed but a more accurate description of Germany at the end of 1934 would be a nascent dictatorship. Hitler, by the end of 1934 was a dictator but the state was not totalitarian. The Nazis between 1933 and 1934 had a certain amount of negative control but the traditional civil service retained much of its power and the ambiguity between party and state was never properly resolved. Of course in 1933 Hitler had no blueprint to construct a specifically Nazi state. It is even probable that without the steadying effect of Himmler and the SS, Hitler’s divided state might well have collapsed as a result of its own internal contradictions. 1941 may well have seen the SS state as a reality but not in 1934.

Some candidates will probably examine the key events in the period in order to come to a conclusion. It is important for candidates, however, to use laws and events, such as the Enabling Act and the Night of the Long Knives/Hindenburg’s death to support their line of argument. Good candidates should examine the ‘legality’ of Hitler’s consolidation and assess whether doing away with parliamentary procedure and power is consistent with a totalitarian state. Perhaps more an arbitrary party and personal dictatorship.

By the end of 1934, had Gleichschaltung taken place in practice? Certainly much of Germany’s cultural, educational and social life was increasingly controlled. However, in mid 1933 it had failed to make any impression on the role and influence of Christian churches, the army and big business.

Good candidates may refer to the events of June 1934 and show that Hitler’s appeal had failed to have the desired effect. If anything, it confirmed the fears of many ordinary Germans that the leadership was prepared to dilute the radical ideology of National Socialism for simple political

expediency. The army was one organisation that could unseat Hitler and he was aware of this, despite an oath of allegiance.

In conclusion, on a superficial level, Germany by the end of 1934, was a different beast to January 1933. An open, liberal democracy had been rejected and replaced by an arbitrary dictatorship. However, Weimar had ceased to function well before Hitler came chancellor and strong anti-democratic forces were already at work.

Clearly, Germany had changed – the destruction of the autonomy of the federal states: intolerance shown to all opposition; the reduction of the Reichstag to impotence. In essence, a form of ‘political revolution’ had taken place. However, by Hindenburg’s death, major forces in Germany continued to exert an existence independent of the Nazi regime. The so-called ‘revolution’ was strictly limited in scope and involved political compromise and it refrained from fundamental social and economic change.

Question 3

05 Explain why the Nazis promoted membership of their youth organisations after 1933.

(12 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| Nothing written worthy of credit. | 0 |
| L1: Answers will contain either some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question or some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. | 1-2 |
| L2: Answers will demonstrate some knowledge and understanding of the demands of the question. They will either be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question or they will provide some explanations backed by evidence that is limited in range and/or depth. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. | 3-6 |
| L3: Answers will demonstrate good understanding of the demands of the question providing relevant explanations backed by appropriately selected information, although this may not be full or comprehensive. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. | 7-9 |
| L4: Answers will be well-focused, identifying a range of specific explanations, backed by precise evidence and demonstrating good understanding of the connections and links between events/issues. Answers will, for the most part, be well-written and organised. | 10-12 |

Indicative content

The key focus is to show why the Nazi regime valued German youth. As Noakes and Pridham show, the Nazi dictatorship appreciated the difficulty of indoctrinating the older generation which had already been socialised in accordance with the norms and values of a ‘decadent’ culture. They were therefore very determined to mould the new generation along Nazi lines.

Hans Schemm, leader of the Nazi Teachers' League, said: 'Those who have youth on their side, control the future.'

When the Nazis came to power Germany had many youth organisations – five to six million young people were organised in a variety of groups; some religious, some political, some sporting. There were also several which were independent. There was a long tradition of the involvement of youth. Therefore, if Hitler was able to indoctrinate German youth so completely in the principles and ethos of National Socialism, then the long-term survival of the so-called New Order would never be challenged. Hitler was prepared to use the traditional structure of the education system – a Nazified version – and the various youth movements to 'educate' youth into a National Socialist mindset; one which recognised the concept of renewal, the need to serve the nation and community.

Candidates should concentrate solely on the reasons why the Nazis wanted to use youth in order to shape the future. It is valid to highlight different groups which, when co-ordinated, made up the Hitler Youth and to show how education and its Nazi curriculum was deemed to be vital to the development of the 'New German'. However, candidates should not literally list the different groups or give a literal exposition of the new curriculum. Knowledge should always be applied to the reasons why and not how. Hence, Nazi educators wanted young Germans to acquire a strong racist and aggressive mode of thinking since loyalty, obedience and service to the state were the chief virtues of the new regime. Written simply it would be mass education for mass obedience. The aim of education was not to aid self-discovery but to indoctrinate young people to think like National Socialists.

Question 3

- 06** 'Nazi policies towards women achieved their aims.'
Explain why you agree or disagree with this statement. (24 marks)

Target: AO1(a), AO1(b), AO2(b)

Levels Mark Scheme

- Nothing written worthy of credit. **0**
- L1:** Answers may **either** contain some descriptive material which is only loosely linked to the focus of the question **or** they may address only a limited part of the period of the question. Alternatively, there may be some explicit comment with little, if any, appropriate support. Answers are likely to be generalised and assertive. There will be little, if any, awareness of differing historical interpretations. The response will be limited in development and skills of written communication will be weak. **1-6**
- L2:** Answers will show some understanding of the demands of the question. They will **either** be almost entirely descriptive with few explicit links to the question **or** they may contain some explicit comment with relevant but limited support. They will display limited understanding of differing historical interpretations. Answers will be coherent but weakly expressed and/or poorly structured. **7-11**
- L3:** Answers will show a developed understanding of the demands of the question. They will provide some assessment, backed by relevant and appropriately selected evidence, but they will lack depth and/or balance. There will be some understanding of varying

historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, be clearly expressed and show some organisation in the presentation of material. **12-16**

L4: Answers will show explicit understanding of the demands of the question. They will develop a balanced argument backed by a good range of appropriately selected evidence and a good understanding of historical interpretations. Answers will, for the most part, show organisation and good skills of written communication. **17-21**

L5: Answers will be well-focused and closely argued. The arguments will be supported by precisely selected evidence leading to a relevant conclusion/judgement, incorporating well-developed understanding of historical interpretations and debate. Answers will, for the most part, be carefully organised and fluently written, using appropriate vocabulary. **22-24**

Indicative content

The key requirement here is to evaluate the premise of the question and to offer a balanced response. The ideology of National Socialism fundamentally opposed the social and economic emancipation of women; in effect, Nazi anti-feminism. In essence the Nazis viewed women as different rather than inferior. However, Nazi policy towards women was contradictory and incoherent.

In support of the premise:

- in theory National Socialism was clear – the women’s role was in the home and Nazi policy used measures to encourage women to leave the factories, to marry and produce children
- abortion was prohibited; birth control clinics were closed; access to contraception was restricted and greater welfare was provided for mothers
- Nazi attitudes to women were in most respects highly reactionary.

In opposition to the premise:

- the desire for ideological purity clashed with economic reality
- in 1933 almost 5 million women were in paid employment outside the home. By 1939 the figure had risen to 7.4 million
- labour shortages and rising wages drew many females into individual employment, despite the regime’s ideological goals
- many women did not have children or even got married and so were obliged to support themselves through employment.

In terms of opportunities between 1933 and 1939, the regime’s policies towards women were governed first by the labour market; secondly by consideration of public morale; and finally by Nazi ideology – which was not inflexible. Whilst wishing to encourage marriage and motherhood, the Nazis accepted women’s employment, as long as it fell under the heading ‘national occupations’. These included teaching and welfare services.

The years 1933 to 1939 can be split into two periods:

- between 1933 and 1936 women’s employment rose slowly from 4.85 million to 5.63 million. This was due to Nazi policies but the initial phase of economic recovery was largely restricted to the productive sector

- from 1936 onwards, as the rearmament boom began and the introduction of compulsory labour service and conscription (1935) began to be felt, the labour shortage meant that women filled the untapped source of labour. Although they were largely excluded from the law, women maintained or improved their positions in many other professions, particularly the caring ones after 1934.

This is the point where Nazi ideology became contradictory. This can be seen especially with middle-class women, who from 1936 were needed to fill the professional and technical skills vacancies. By 1939 female doctors had risen from 2814 – in 1934 – to 3650. Moreover 12% of all women doctors were married, of whom 70% were mothers. However, the one problem which held back some women was a combination of low wages, poor job prospects and poor working conditions. Nazi ideology remained publicly reactionary and anti-feminist. Ironically there is evidence to suggest that women actually approved of the regime's glorification of domesticity. In the political arena women were specifically excluded, apart from the various women's organisations and, as such, National Socialism held few opportunities for many women. But this was offset by the creation of new roles within party and public organisations, with which many women became actively involved. In this sense the Nazi regime actually brought further opportunities than under the Weimar Republic. This applied to those women with few formal qualifications but who wished to be involved in political activism. By 1935, 11 million women belonged to the Nazi Women's Movement and were willing to support the beliefs of Nazism. Not all of the women were subservient – for example, Sophie Rogge-Berne, and they challenged the official line of gender subordination. Recent research now accredits women with a more active role in Nazi Germany, although the emphasis is on complicity rather than compliance to the regime. Good candidates should assess the available information and make a considered evaluation. An awareness of differentiation between classes and over time may prove profitable.