



General Certificate of Education

History 1041

Specification

Unit HIS2N

Report on the Examination

2009 examination – June series

This Report on the Examination uses the [new numbering system](#)

Further copies of this Report 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.

Unit HIS2N

Unit 2N: Anti-semitism, Hitler and the German People, 1919–1945

General Comments

There were well over a thousand entries for the unit. Candidates had to do the compulsory question based on the sources and then had a free choice of Question 2 or 3. Question 1 on the level of knowledge and acceptance amongst the German people of Anti-semitic policy and the Holocaust was compulsory. Question 2 (Hitler's anti-Semitism 1919–1929 and anti-Semitism in Germany) was slightly more popular than Question 3 (emigration and violence in Germany 1933–1939). There were awards at all levels for each of the six sub-questions. Statistically Question 03 was answered most effectively of the first part of each question by the candidature, followed by Question 05 and finally Question 01. A different pattern was seen when comparing the second part responses, where Question 02 was the best answered by a small margin from Question 06, with Question 04 being statistically the least well-answered of the part (b) questions. When considering performance at whole question level, Question 3 had the highest mean mark followed by Question 1 with Question 2 having the lowest mean mark.

Question 01 asked candidates to compare two sources in relation to their view on a particular issue. Candidates that simply describe the source will receive Level 1 (1-2 marks); those who solely highlight differences or similarities will receive Level 2 (3-6 marks); those who do both will receive Level 3 (7-9 marks) and those who develop a full comparison looking at similarity and difference and using own knowledge will receive Level 4 (10-12)

Question 02 asked candidates to give an extended response using both the sources and their own knowledge to an issue. Narrative responses which show only an implicit understanding of the question will receive Level 1 or Level 2 depending on focus and level of detail. Responses which do not use the sources or any own knowledge are restricted to Level 2. Answer with good focus and effective use of sources and own knowledge will receive Level 3. For Level 4 these answers will have specific supporting material and balance. For Level 5 answers will have sustained judgement.

Questions 03 and 05 asked candidates to explain an event or issue, and responses need to cover a range of reasons 'why'. Three reasons, supported by evidence, will secure an award of Level 3 (7-9 marks). To achieve Level 4 (10-12 marks), candidates must offer links between the factors, for example, prioritising with an explanation, or appreciation of the inter-relationship of the factors.

Question 04 and 06 requires an extended response. Answers with some understanding of the question but a lack of evidence, or narrative which demonstrates an implicit understanding of the question will only gain marks within the lower two levels (Level 1, 1-6 and Level 2, 7-11 marks). Answers with focus and evidence will reach Level 3 (12-16 marks), though they may not consider alternative factors and therefore lack balance. At Level 4 (17-21 marks) answers will have balance and depth of evidence. Level 5 (22-24) answers will also demonstrate judgement.

It is also worth making clear to centres what is meant by the requirement for candidates to demonstrate understanding of different historical interpretations. Candidates demonstrate this skill by showing understanding of alternative explanations or challenging the explanation suggested in the question, in other words, by arguing in Question 06 that legislation was more significant than violence in Nazi Anti-semitic policy 1933–1939 or in 02 arguing that Nazis were not successful in gaining acceptance of all Germans of their anti-Semitic policy as demonstrated by the actions of Germans such as Oscar Schindler and the general shock and horror expressed by many Germans after Kristallnacht. Describing different historians' viewpoints is a demonstration of learnt knowledge rather than actual historical interpretation, as is citing a historian, rather than their evidence. Centres may have taught Unit 6 modules on the legacy which required detailed knowledge of historiography, this is not the case with this AS unit. Student knowledge of Goldhagen's views were accurate and often used effectively in answering 01 and 02 but please note that full credit was given to those who quoted the evidence he puts forward rather than simply his view. Equally some candidates effectively used the evidence produced in Browning's 'Battalion 101'. Less effective was the discussion by some students of the intentionalist/structuralist debate which did not actually fit the question (used in both 02 and 06 by some candidates). An apposite quote from a historian as the final part of an argument which has already been supported by evidence is an appropriate conclusion to an answer, but is not essential to demonstrate understanding at the highest levels.

Question 1

Question 01

There were some very good responses to this question but it is important that candidates are aware they need to pick out similarities and differences between the sources. The sources were fundamentally different in that Source A suggests that the German people were fully aware of what was going on in the death camps; whilst Source B suggests complete ignorance. There however some similarities, such as Source B admitting knowledge of concentration camps 'even before 1938'. Own knowledge must be used to help answer the question not simply add factual information for example candidates supported Source B with details of how camps were kept secret. To achieve Level 4 a developed comparison how far do the sources differ is required. This involves going beyond simply stating similarities and differences and deciding on the degree of difference/similarity. Discussion of provenance is valid but points must be valid. Many candidates simply dismissed Farmer as he was not there seemingly suggesting that historians guessed what happened. There were some who made valid comments on Source B representing only a small snapshot of German knowledge and the possibility of wanting to claim ignorance after the war. Some candidates misread the attribution and believed Source A was written by a farmer rather than A. Farmer.

Question 02

There were some excellent responses to this question and the use of sources was generally very good, with students often able to find information for both success and failure. Some responses were excellent with detailed knowledge of the different responses to *Kristallnacht*, the protest at *Rosenstrasse*, the actions of the *Einsatzgruppen* etc. Students were generally knowledgeable about propaganda (e.g. The 'The Eternal Jew') but not all were able to evaluate its success. Some students seemed to rely almost completely on the sources. Other than *Kristallnacht* own knowledge was often limited or not included. Candidates must be careful to use information from within the period stated in the question and not drift into earlier periods. To access Level 4, candidates needed to show balance by examining evidence of success and failure. Many struggled to support the argument that the Nazis failed to gain acceptance, though others were able to point to lack of support for Kristallnacht, protests and the actions of those who helped Jews escape the Nazis such as Oscar Schindler. Some students made valid points about the difficulty in judging acceptance with the role of terror and level of secrecy

surrounding the final solution. A few also pointed out the issues surrounding the reliability of German peoples accounts after the war.

Question 2

Question 03

There were many strong responses to this question. Candidates were able to give multiple reasons for Hitler's anti-semitism. These included the impact of defeat in the First World War, the Treaty of Versailles, the influence of social Darwinism and racial theory, the connection Hitler made between Jews and communism, the links Hitler made between the Jews and Germany's economic problems in 1923 and 1929, and envy of Jewish success. To gain Level 4 candidates need to show prioritisation of factors and/or links between them. The focus of this question was 1919–1929 so information on Hitler's early life and his time in Vienna was not credited in this instance, though knowledge of it was generally very good. Detail on the impact of the end of the war was credited.

Question 04

This question was the least well answered question with often little factual knowledge of the period. Students struggled to argue against the statement and simply agreed that there was an increase in anti-semitism due to the economic crisis. There are several possible roots students could have taken to argue against this:

- Anti-Semitism didn't grow – people voted for Nazis as they promised economic solutions and so voted for them despite anti-Semitism or were apathetic to it. The failure of the boycott of Jewish shops in 1933 could be used to support this. Research has shown that very few Germans stated anti-semitism as a reason for voting Nazi. In fact in areas where anti-Semitism did not go down well it was played down by the Nazis.
- Anti-semitism already existed and did not notably increase. There were a number of anti-semitic papers and political parties in Germany in the 1920s. The writing of Houston Chamberlain and others who wrote highly anti-Semitic material were widely read in Germany. Candidates could also argue that economic issues could not necessarily be linked to raising anti-semitism, e.g. no real sign of increased anti-Semitism in 1923.
- Anti-semitism increased due to Nazi propaganda; candidates had to be careful on this approach, however, in ensuring they stayed within the set time frame.

Some candidates had good knowledge of how the Nazi vote increased and some had excellent knowledge of research carried out into why people voted Nazi and as anti-semitism (14%) was not a major reason.

Candidates it seemed chose Question 2 for the first question part (Question 03) but then struggled with the second question part (Question 04) this is supported by the mean marks of the questions.

Question 3

Question 05

This question was generally very well done by candidates. Most candidates could produce a list of reasons why some Jews chose to stay or found that they were unable to leave due to financial restraints and borders being shut to German Jews. Candidates need to avoid simply giving a narrative Nazi anti-semitic policies of policies and make sure they are directly addressing the question. Candidates should also avoid statements along lines of 'they would regret it' etc about those Jews who did not emigrate. To achieve Level 4 a candidate needs to make links between factors and show prioritisation of factors. Some candidates answered why did the Jews leave and therefore scored poorly.

Question 06

Some excellent responses showing a full understanding of the use of violence in anti-semitic policy and detailed comparison to the importance of legislation (and in some cases emigration). Some candidates used what they saw as the greater importance of legislation or emigration or both to challenge the statement. Some candidates struggled with giving detail on anti-semitic violence apart from Kristallnacht, some candidates stated this was the first instance of anti-semitic violence in Germany 1933–1939 which is simply untrue. It is important that they are able to discuss the anti-semitic violence in the early period of the Nazi regime and the degree to which the Nazi leadership were directing it. Some weaker candidates simply wanted to describe policy/events 1933–1939 and this meant they would get Level 2 at most. There was some confusion from candidates who discussed emigration and mentioned the Madagascar plan (1940) which some candidates dated to 1938.

An important issue that was raised in the marking of the exam is the need for candidates to be careful in how the phrase material regarding anti-semitic policy. At times candidates used the anti-semitic language of the Nazis without putting phrases in inverted commas. This at times made it appear the candidates believed in anti-semitic comments they were repeating.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the [Results statistics](#) page of the AQA Website.