



## **General Certificate of Education**

# **History 1041**

## *Specification*

### **Unit HIS2N**

# **Report on the Examination**

## *2010 examination – January series*

Further copies of this Report are available to download from the AQA Website: [www.aqa.org.uk](http://www.aqa.org.uk)

Copyright © 2010 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.

The Assessment and Qualifications Alliance (AQA) is a company limited by guarantee registered in England and Wales (company number 3644723) and a registered charity (registered charity number 1073334). Registered address: AQA, Devas Street, Manchester M15 6EX  
*Dr Michael Cresswell Director General.*

---

## *Unit HIS2N*

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

#### **General Comments**

There were just over 300 entries for the unit. Candidates had to do the compulsory question based on the sources and then had a free choice of question two or three question. Question 1 on the level of acceptance amongst the German people of anti-Semitic violence (1933–1939) and success of Nazi propaganda (1933–1939) was compulsory. A fairly balanced number of candidates chose the different options with 142 candidates doing Question 2 and 161 doing Question 3. There were awards at all levels for each of the six sub-questions. Statistically Question 3(a) was answered most effectively of the part (a) questions by the candidature, followed by Question 2(a) and finally 1(a). A similar pattern was seen when comparing the part (b) responses, where Question 3(b) was the best answered by a small margin from Question 2(b), with Question 1(b) 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 2 with Question 1 having the lowest mean mark.

Question 1(a) asks 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). Candidates need to look for both similarities and differences (related to the focus of the question) and use contextual own knowledge. If candidates do two of these three then it is possible to achieve Level 3. All own knowledge must be used in a way that helps compare the sources.

Question 1(b) asks 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. Answers 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 2 and 3(a) ask 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.

Questions 2 and 3(b) 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.

---

**Question 1**

- (a) This question was statistically answered considerably less well than the other questions. Many candidates did not compare the sources in relation to anti-Jewish violence and instead focused on propaganda which was the focus of 1(b).

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 different in that Source A suggests that the German people accepted anti-Jewish violence was 'justified' and that 'the Jews were the enemies of the new Germany'; whilst Source B states 'Kristallnacht provoked revulsion' and 'I felt it was distasteful and repulsive'. There were, however, some similarities, such as Source B saying the violence was 'not necessarily immoral'. Own knowledge must be used to help answer the question not simply add factual information for example candidates supported Source B with details of negative reaction to anti-Jewish violence for example in relation to Kristallnacht or supported Source A with details of people joining in the attacks. 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 fine but points must be valid. Many candidates simply dismissed the sources as they were not written at the time.

- (b) There were some excellent responses to this question and the use of sources generally very good with students often able to find information for both success and failure. Students were generally knowledgeable about propaganda but some of the examples used such as the film *The Eternal Jew* were produced after the period (1933–1939) which the question was focused on. Some students seemed to rely almost completely on the sources. This at times still led to a good balance and discussion of the debate but own knowledge is required to get candidates into Level 3. Own knowledge was often limited or not included limiting candidates to Level 2. Candidates must be careful to use information from within the period stated in the question and not drift into later 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 or ignored calls for a boycott of Jewish businesses in 1933. Some students made valid points about the difficulty in judging acceptance with the role of terror. A few also pointed out the issues surrounding the reliability of German peoples' accounts about what they believed in the period 1933 to 1939. There were some glaring errors with many candidates suggesting TV was important in Nazi propaganda.

**Question 2**

- (a) There were many strong responses to this question. Candidates were able to give many reasons for Hitler blaming the Jews for Germany's humiliation in the Treaty of Versailles. These included the Jewish census of 1916, the role of Walter Rathenau, the 'stab in the back' myth and Hitler's anti-Semitic views gained in Austria and in the army. To gain Level 4 candidates need to show prioritisation of factors and/or links between them. The focus of this question was 1919 so information on Hitler's early life and his time in Vienna was credited in this instance and knowledge of it was generally very good. Detail on the impact of the end of the war was credited. It is important for candidates to remember that what Hitler believed and reality were often very different and they should report Hitler's views as opinion and not fact.

- (b) This question was well answered with factual knowledge of the period and evidence showing both assimilation and a lack of assimilation. Some candidates struggled to argue against the statement and simply agreed that there was an increase in assimilation. 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. Discussion of inter-marriage rates and falling numbers in Zionist groups were effective. Discussion of Jewish success was often very good but some candidates seemed to address success rather than assimilation. Some candidates connected success with a negative response by some sections of German society especially when the economy declined.

### **Question 3**

- (a) This question was generally done very well by candidates. Most candidates could produce a list of reasons why the Madagascar Plan was proposed with good knowledge of the events in the War and especially in the General Government. There was also knowledge of long term reasons, candidates should not ignore more obvious reasons such as the Nazis desire to rid German land of Jews. To achieve Level 4 a candidate needs to make links between factors (such as long or short-term) and show prioritisation of factors. Some candidates answered why the plan failed, this was not the focus of the question and so was not credited.
- (b) There were some excellent responses showing a full understanding of the events of 1941–1942 and also of the historical debate on this issue. There were some candidates although understanding the debate and the different historian's views did not have control of the chronology. Some candidates struggled with giving detail on when events such as the Wannsee Conference took place or when camps started operating. It is important that candidates know the chronology as some well thought out answers were undermined as they would state incorrectly the Wannsee Conference was in January 1941 rather than January 1942 leading to their argument not fully making sense. Some weaker candidates simply wanted to describe events 1939–1945 and this meant they would have got Level 2.

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.