



Pearson

Examiner's Report Principal Examiner Feedback

Summer 2018

Pearson Edexcel International Advanced
Subsidiary

In History (WHI01) Paper 1C

Depth Study with Interpretations

Germany, 1918-45

Edexcel and BTEC Qualifications

Edexcel and BTEC qualifications are awarded by Pearson, the UK's largest awarding body. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers. For further information visit our qualifications websites at www.edexcel.com or www.btec.co.uk. Alternatively, you can get in touch with us using the details on our contact us page at www.edexcel.com/contactus.

Pearson: helping people progress, everywhere

Pearson aspires to be the world's leading learning company. Our aim is to help everyone progress in their lives through education. We believe in every kind of learning, for all kinds of people, wherever they are in the world. We've been involved in education for over 150 years, and by working across 70 countries, in 100 languages, we have built an international reputation for our commitment to high standards and raising achievement through innovation in education. Find out more about how we can help you and your students at: www.pearson.com/uk

Summer 2018

Publications Code WHI01_1C_pef_20180815

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Pearson Education Ltd 2018

It is important that centres take on board some generic comments which are based on the marking of this summer's cohort, and consider and apply these when preparing candidates for future examinations in these options.

- WHI01 is both a study in depth and a study of interpretations, and it is necessary for candidates to do both, at all levels in the mark scheme, in order to score marks. Ignoring the stated view in the question, and merely writing information that may be relevant to the general focus of the question does not fully meet the criteria for Level 1, and consequently none of the other levels. Even at Level 1 the mark scheme expects simple or generalised consideration of the stated view in the question. Some candidates paid very little attention to the stated view (ignoring it completely or sometimes only referring to it in the conclusion) and narrated or described other information that was either relevant or not to the actual question. This was particularly evident in question 2, as will be referenced below.
- Across all of the options, in candidate responses, there was very little evidence seen of planning. As the examination is two hours long, implying that candidates might divide that time equally between the two essays they choose, it would seem sensible to devote some time (possibly no more than 10 minutes per question) to planning the structure of the answer to each question. That would hopefully ensure that when the answer is written the stated view is considered (Level 2, 3 and 4 all require, to varying degrees, understanding, analysis and exploration of the given view) and then other factors/views can follow, which will then allow the candidate to establish some criteria by which they are able to consider the importance, or not, of the given view and make some judgements. Those candidates who planned (this appeared on their examination script before they answered the question) invariably scored better than candidates who had not planned. Planned answers tended to score at the top of Level 3 and into, and including the top of Level 4, whereas unplanned answers meandered and judgements tended to be stated, rather than supported by valid criteria, and often achieved marks at the Level 2 and Level 3 boundary or below.
- The need to stress to candidates that in examination situations they must read the question carefully, and not take the question as an opportunity to write all they know about the topic, or answer a question they would have preferred that is near to the actual question, but not the actual question.
- There was some evidence of candidates running out of time, but they were very few. Impressing the need to plan essays in the examination is surely the remedy to this problem.

Option 1C Germany 1918-45

- This paper had the largest number of candidate entries across all four WHI01 papers.
- Question 3 proved to be the most popular.
- While question 1 was popular it was answered in a variety of ways. Some candidates were very clear about what the Constitution was and the impact it had on the Republic in relation to stability, and they then judged that against other factors. Many candidates were well versed in the other factors that impacted on the Republic's stability but knew little about the Constitution and its impact. Some candidates confused the Constitution with the Treaty of Versailles. Reference to the Constitution is clearly made in the specification, and should be taught in relation to the Weimar Republic.
- In question 2 candidates either knew about the social reforms enacted by the Weimar Republic or they didn't. That would seem to suggest it is a teaching issue as it is clearly referenced in the specification. Many candidates suggested that social reform included the Locarno Pact and the Kellogg-Briand Pact. Some candidates saw social reform as cultural reform and while this was accounted for and rewarded to an extent, it was not exactly what had been anticipated. Some candidates ignored social reform completely and listed other achievements of the Weimar Republic. However, there were candidates who had clearly been taught about specific social reform under the Weimar, and they judged this against other achievements, with many suggesting that the Weimar was ahead of its time in relation to the social reform it did enact.
- In question 3 some candidates described what the Nazi did in regard to the economy without really getting to the heart of whether or not they were successful. However, there were many who were able to make judgments about success. The example below gained the highest mark in Level 4. The key issue is explored, sufficient knowledge is effectively deployed and valid criteria are established and used in making a judgement.

(This page is for your second answer)

According to official figures, Nazi economic policies appeared to have been successful. Propaganda suggested ~~an improved standard of living~~ ~~and a growing economy~~. However, in reality, the policies were unable to achieve a higher standard of living, economic growth, or German ~~self-sufficiency~~ self-sufficiency by 1939 to prepare for war, making them overall unsuccessful.

One reason why Nazi economic policies seemed ~~successful~~ ^{effective} was the ostensible success of their job-creation schemes such as the construction of the Autobahn. Official statistics claimed that unemployment had dropped from ~6 million in 1933 to 0.1 million in 1939, suggesting improved standards of living. However, these figures were achieved through extreme manipulation of statistics, excluding women and Jews from those considered unemployed, whilst ~~not~~ recording temporary jobs as ~~full time~~ ^{full time} employment. Therefore despite ~~their~~ their ~~superficial~~ superficial success, hidden unemployment continued under the Nazis, at an estimated 5 million. On the other ~~hand~~ hand, the ~~Nazi~~ NSDAP was able to decrease

(This page is for your second answer)

unemployment to a lesser extent through rearmament and the introduction of conscription in the mid-1930s, which did lead to a limited increase in standards of living. However, this improvement was offset by the decrease in wages and ~~working conditions~~ longer working ~~hours~~ hours, therefore, Nazi economic policies were ~~ultimately~~ ultimately failed at improving standards of living and were therefore unsuccessful in that respect. Living standards were also negatively impacted by the New Plan.

Schacht's New Plan, introduced in 1934, ^{both} decreased living standards and weakened the economy, rendering it a failure. His attempt to decrease trade deficit by virtually banning imports caused shortages of food and other necessities, leading to lower standards of living. It also caused an increase in budget deficit as the government had to purchase the more expensive domestic alternatives, weakening the economy as the government had less money to invest in reducing unemployment or achieving self-sufficiency. Therefore the New Plan was a failure as it did not strengthen the economy or improve standards of living, ~~nor~~ meaning that it would be extremely inaccurate to claim Nazi policies were successful, especially as the New Plan's successor.

not similar ~~levels of success~~ failure.

Goering's 4-Year Plan aimed to achieve a German autarky by 1940 to prepare Germany for war. However, ~~for~~ Hitler never expected complete self-sufficiency as he ~~to~~ believed that they also needed Lebensraum to increase their resources. Even with that in mind, Germany failed to reach the plan's targets by the end of 1939, meaning that it was ~~unsuccessful~~ as it did not lead to self-sufficiency, which is ^{also} evidenced by the fact that most of Hitler's generals advised him against going to war in 1939 as they were not prepared. Therefore Nazi economic policies were unsuccessful to a great extent as they did not achieve self-sufficiency. However, the 4-Year Plan was successful in other respects. In order to achieve the targets, the government ~~to~~ began encouraging women to join the workforce in 1936, leading to ~~an~~ ^a ~~increase~~ ^{decrease} in unemployment as women's ~~replaced the~~ ~~con~~ role in the industry grew the more men were conscripted. This increase in unemployment contributed to ~~improve~~ somewhat improving standards of ~~the~~ living, therefore the policy was successful to a limited extent. Additionally, while they failed to reach the targets, German industrial output did increase ~~signifi~~ significantly as ~~it~~ in some cases, such as with

(This page is for your second answer)

the steel production, they were extremely close to reaching their goals. Therefore the policy ~~was~~ also experienced limited success in strengthening the economy as it increased industrial output. ↪

In terms of increasing self-sufficiency, the Nazis also experienced some success despite not reaching their targets as the 4-Year Plan led to increased investments in finding synthetic ~~alternatives~~ ^{alternatives} to raw materials unavailable in Germany. The government was extremely successful in some cases, such as ⁱⁿ the production of synthetic rubber, however these measures were evidently insufficient as even by the 1940s, Germany was still importing $\frac{1}{3}$ of ~~their~~ ^{their} raw materials and therefore their economic policies were ultimately unsuccessful as they ~~also~~ did not create ^{an} ~~one~~ autarky.

Overall, the Nazis' economic policies were ~~successful~~ ^{a failure}, as despite the appearance of ~~reducing~~ ^{reducing} rapidly reducing unemployment and increasing self-sufficiency, their policies ~~to~~ further weakened the ~~economy~~ economy by worsening the budget deficit and decreasing standards of living due to shortages and hidden unemployment. Any real successes were ~~not~~ ~~outweighed~~ ~~by~~ ~~the~~ ~~long~~ ~~term~~ ~~failure~~ ~~of~~ ~~any~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~measures~~ outweighed by the long term failure of any

(This page is for your second answer)

of their economic policies to create an autarky, economic growth, or ~~improve~~ ^{genuinely} improve living ~~stand~~ ~~and~~ standards. Therefore ~~it~~ it would be significantly accurate to say that Nazi economic policies were unsuccessful.

- Question 4 was not answered by many candidates and some chose to ignore the key issue of the conquest of Poland and focus on other reasons for the genocide of Jewish people. Higher scoring candidates did try to balance the impact of the conquest of Poland with other factors. It is important to note that the question date range was 1939-45, as some candidates went back to the 1920s and also referenced the early and middle years of the 1930s.