



## **General Certificate of Education**

# **History 1041**

## *Specification*

### **Unit HIS2N**

# **Report on the Examination**

## *2010 examination – June 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.

---

## *Unit HIS2N*

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

#### **General Comments**

In this session's paper, Question 2 was slightly the less popular of the optional questions. There were awards at all levels for each of the six sub-questions. Statistically Question 01 was answered most effectively of the 12 mark questions by the candidature, followed by Question 03 and finally 05. A different pattern was seen when comparing the 24 mark responses, where Question 06 was the best answered by a small margin from Question 02, with Question 04 being statistically the least well-answered of the part (b) questions. When considering performance at whole question level, Question 1 had the highest mean mark followed by Question 3, with Question 2 having the lowest mean mark.

Question 1 (01) 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 or do one well in the context of their own knowledge receive Level 3 (7–9 marks) and those who develop a full comparison of the degree of difference looking at similarity and difference and using own knowledge will receive Level 4 (10–12)

Question 1 (02) 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 (03) and 3 (05) 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.

Question 2 (04) and 3 (06) require 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 judgment.

Overall the paper was well answered. Candidates appeared to understand key aspects of the course but chronological understanding was generally poor on the events of 1929–1932; some candidates struggled with the triggers of Kristalnach, whilst others understood Social Darwinism but struggled to link this to Nazi policy.

---

**Question 1**

- 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. These differences and similarities should be related to the views of the sources, not simply their factual content. The sources were fundamentally different in that Source A suggests that the Lithuanians working with the *Einsatzgruppen* shot the Jews freely without having to be compelled and got on well with the Germans; whilst Source B suggests they had no choice but to shoot, and ‘cursed’ the Germans for taking photos. There also some similarities, such as both sources being about Lithuanian views about the work of the *Einsatzgruppen* and both men did admit to carrying out the shootings. Some candidates also related the need from strong alcohol in Source A to the unwillingness to shoot in Source B. Own knowledge was generally good with many candidates recognising Source A from the ‘Nazis: a Warning From History’ they displayed good knowledge of the events in Lithuania and elsewhere on the Eastern front. Some candidates went on to discuss Goldhagen which was of limited relevance since the sources were both from Lithuanian not German men. 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, many candidates did this with effective conclusions. However, simple statements at the end such as ‘They disagree more than they agree’ was not sufficient to push marks into Level 4 unless they were backed up. Discussion of provenance was valid in this question as it gave an important similarity and many students used own knowledge effectively but other simply wrote facts about the *Einsatzgruppen* which did not necessarily help answer the question. There was some ambiguity with the statement ‘get in line with the others’ in Source B and the different interpretations were credited.
- 02** There were some excellent responses to this question and the use of sources generally quite good with students often able to find information for both success and failure. Some responses were excellent with detailed knowledge of the Madagascar Plan, the problems in the ‘General Government and the actions of the *Einsatzgruppen*. Students were generally knowledgeable about events but many struggled with the chronology and got events/policies in the wrong order which damaged the effectiveness of their answers. The timing of the Wannsee Conference in particular was often incorrectly stated, with many candidates placing it in January 1941. This led some candidates to lose focus on the time period of the question and instead focus on 1942–1945. The fact that many candidates answers related to the whole of the war rather than just 1939–1941 meant that they were not focused and lacked depth. Some students seemed to rely almost completely on their own knowledge with only passing reference to the sources. Sources A and B were often used together, which fine if they are quoted from or otherwise used to support a point. Many candidates failed to use Source C effectively suggesting maybe it was not fully accessible nor as useful as it could have been. To access Level 4, candidates needed to show balance by examining evidence of success and failure. Many candidates offered some good balance picking out both areas of success and areas of failure or limited success. Some students made valid points in judging success on the basis the policy changed in 1942. A reasonable number of candidates focused on the intentionalist/structuralist debate rather than on the question; although there were links this was not a fully effective approach.

---

**Question 2**

- 03** Many responses to this question were not fully focused on the years 1929–1932. Candidates were able to give multiple reasons for anti-Semitism in Weimar Germany but did not always successfully link these to 1929–1932, for example, they mentioned communism but linked this to events just after the First World War or they talked about the influence of Walter Rathenau who had been assassinated in 1922. The best answers focused on the changing economic situation of 1929 to 1932 and the connection Hitler and the Nazis made between the Jews and Germany's economic problems and other factors such as the growing envy of Jewish success and the fear of communism as the Communist Party gained more votes. To gain Level 4 candidates need to show prioritisation of factors and/or links between them. The focus of this question was 1929–1932, so discussion of Nazi actions when they were in power was not credited. Some candidates dismissed the premise of the question, although this is historically valid it did not match the requirements of the question.
- 04** Although there were some very good answers this question was not well answered by a number of candidates. Students struggled to argue the importance of Social Darwinism successfully as they did not link it to the policies of the Nazis but simply discussed the theory in basic outline or named some of the key theorists. There are several Nazi policies that good candidates picked up as being strongly linked to Social Darwinism such as 'The Law for the Protection of German Blood', Ghettoisation and 'The Final Solution'. Candidates generally had some good knowledge of possible origins of Hitler's anti-Semitism though some regarding his childhood were rather dubious. What many candidates failed to do however was relate the possible origins of Hitler's anti-Semitism to specific anti-Semitic policies/actions. The strength of most answers was factors other than Social Darwinism and many candidates showed understanding of the need for balance and there were some convincing judgements.

**Question 3**

- 05** This question was generally very well done by candidates. Most candidates could produce a list of reasons why *Kristallnacht* took place. Candidates need to avoid simply giving a narrative of what happened on *Kristallnacht* and concentrate on the causes. Examiners were surprised by the number of candidates that failed to discuss the short-term causes of *Kristallnacht* such as the assassination in Paris and Goebbels desire to get back into Hitler's good books. Candidates who gave the best answers separated reasons into short and long-term reasons, showing a clear understanding of both underlying factors and triggers that explained the exact timing of *Kristallnacht*. To achieve Level 4 a candidate needs to make links between factors and/or show prioritisation of factors.
- 06** There were some excellent responses showing a full understanding of the use of legislation in anti-Semitic policy and detailed comparison to the importance of violence (and in some cases also propaganda). Some candidates used what they saw as the greater importance of violence or propaganda or both to challenge the statement. Some candidates struggled with giving detail the chronology of anti-Semitic legislation apart from the Nuremberg Laws. Some candidates gave detailed answers but didn't directly address how important the different bits of legislation were. The best candidates consistently analysed the importance of each piece of legislation in the persecution of the Jews and also compared this to other methods. The level of balance in the answers to this question was generally impressive; however the degree of supporting material was variable.

Some weaker candidates simply wanted to describe policy/events 1933–1939 and this meant they would get Level 2 at most as they didn't address the degree of importance of the different pieces of legislation in terms of persecution of the Jews in Germany. The better candidates not only showed detail knowledge of legislation, violence and propaganda but also consistently analysed the significance of these in terms of their impact on Germany's Jews.

In general, candidates were well-prepared and showed improved exam technique compared to last year's entry. There were however, a substantial number of candidates whose answers were made less effective due to poor recall of the chronology. These candidates appeared to not know the dates of key events or what happened in specific periods meaning much of their answers lacked focus and relevance.

### **Mark Ranges and Award of Grades**

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