



**General Certificate of Education
June 2012**

History 1041

Unit HIS2N

Report on the Examination

Further copies of this Report on the Examination are available from: aqa.org.uk

Copyright © 2012 AQA and its licensors. All rights reserved.

Copyright

AQA retains the copyright on all its publications. However, registered schools/colleges 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 schools/colleges 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.

Unit HIS2N

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

General Comments

There were just over 2000 entries for the unit, showing considerable growth from last year. Question 1 on anti-Semitism in Weimar Germany (01) and the importance of the links the Nazis made between Jews and communism in Nazi Anti-Semitism (02) was compulsory. Question 2 (Nuremberg Laws and importance of anti-Semitic Films) and Question 3 (Intensification of policy in 1942 and the debate on German Peoples' responsibility for the Holocaust) were done by a reasonably equal numbers of students. There was however a marked difference in average performance between those who did Question 2 and those who did Question 3 with those doing Question 3 performing much more strongly. 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 05 and finally 03. A different pattern was seen when comparing the 24 mark responses, with 06 answered far more effectively than 02 or 04, with students having substantial problems on both of these questions in terms of accessing the very highest marks. 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.

Overall the paper was well-answered but knowledge seemed rather thin about the wartime anti-Semitic films, and examiners were surprised that many students struggled to find three reasons why the Nuremberg Laws were introduced. The marking team was most impressed with both the improvement of technique displayed by students in answering 01, for which there was a very noticeable increase in the mean mark. The level of knowledge and understanding displayed in answering 05 and 06 was also most pleasing

Question 1

- 01** There were some very good responses to this question and it was very noticeable that students are now aware they need to pick out similarities and differences between the views in the sources. Some good own knowledge was displayed by students but whilst some used it well to help answer the question, some simply stated lots of facts about anti-Semitism in Weimar Germany and lost focus on comparing the sources. The sources were different in that they expressed differing views on the importance of anti-Semitism in Weimar Germany. They also differ on the degree of anti-Semitism and the effectiveness of anti-Semitic propaganda. They do however share the views that some young Germans were anti-Semitic, many people linked Jews with communism and that anti-Semitic propaganda was widespread. Other similarities and differences were also credited. This question was very well answered but it is worth noting that for Level 4 students must give a developed comparison, including own knowledge, that concludes about how far the sources are similar or different.
- 02** This question proved to be comparatively difficult and there were a number of concerns raised about it by centres. These focused on the fact that the question is focused on Nazi Germany but the content of Sources A and B were on Weimar Germany. Concessions were made in the mark scheme to students who looked at reasons for Nazi anti-Semitism but concentrated solely on examples from the Weimar years. Such answers were

awarded marks up to top Level 3. The aim of the question was that students could use the different reasons for German anti-Semitism from the sources (and some own knowledge) and then from their own knowledge explain how anti-Semitism was put into practice, i.e. under the Nazis. Many students, for example, talked about Hitler's 'prophecy' in 1939 about the fate of the Jews if there was a World War, about the declaration of war on the USSR and the subsequent murder of the Soviet Jews by the *Einsatzgruppen*. It is important to note that the question does call for the use of the sources and **own knowledge**, therefore students should not be completely reliant on the source content. There was detail about the link made between Jews and Communism in both Sources A and B. Source C was useful in providing a range of reasons for German anti-Semitism and students should then know the actions taken by the Nazis based on these different strands of anti-Semitism. Having said that, the question did obviously cause some concern. AQA will, as always, monitor its question-setting procedures to ensure that questions do not 'catch out' students unexpectedly.

Question 2

- 03** This appeared to be a straightforward question but a number of students struggled to give a good range of reasons. Other students gave a number of reasons but did not reach the top level as they either lacked detail or failed to link the reasons together. A number of students gave very good answers discussing Racial theory, pressure from radicals, and the need for a big announcement at the rally, which tended to be well-explained. The best answers talked about the removal of restrictions on Hitler declining (e.g. death of Hindenburg in 1934) and made links to this taking place at the same time as pressure from grassroots increased. Some students effectively linked ideology and circumstantial reasons together. Overall however the standard of answers on this question was a little disappointing.
- 04** This question was generally answered poorly. The problems seemed to be twofold; firstly a fundamental lack of knowledge of key anti-Semitic films (*Jud Süß*, *The Eternal Jew* and *The Rothschilds*) and secondly, a failure to grasp the requirement to evaluate the 'spreading of hatred'. The main problem was a lack of specific knowledge about films, particularly *The Eternal Jew* and *Jud Süß*. There was a large number of students whose counter-arguments were often strong (specific details on radio and the press were generally very good) but who limited themselves to very general comments on film (e.g. it was a new medium, people attended the cinema a lot, Goebbels and Hitler disagreed on how to use film). As a result, many answers were given low Level 3. Some students were also hampered by unconvincing counter-arguments about the use of terror and legislation. While they made valid points about the existence of hatred, these points were very rarely linked to the spreading of hatred. Most such answers remained around the 10-13 level. Nevertheless, there was a minority of centres where students had been well prepared for this topic. In these centres, many students achieved Level 4 with relevant details of two or more films and their impact, along with detail and evaluation of other forms of propaganda. Other students managed to achieve mid to high Level 4 and even Level 5 with a good focus on impact, often comparing the differing impact of the films with that of other forms of propaganda. Some students made valid points about the difficulty in having complete certainty about the impact of individual elements of propaganda and talked about the cumulative impact of indoctrination. Evaluation of press and radio was often better than that of film.

Question 3

- 05** This question performed very well and the level of students' knowledge was very pleasing. There were some very good answers here; students also seemed to find it a little easier to achieve Level 4 than in 03. A good number of them made links between (for example) the problems of the *Einsatzgruppen* and the establishment of death camps, or the failure of Barbarossa and the Wannsee Conference. Many other answers were awarded Level 3; there was usually strong specific detail on Wannsee, the failure of other plans, and the establishment of camps. Points which were less well dealt with included the entry of the USA and the failure of Barbarossa/the Urals plan. These points were often vague and lacking in precise explanation. A minority of answers concentrated solely on events well before 1942 or just on 1944/5 (loss of the war and death marches) and missed out on Level 3 as a result. Overall the average mark for 05 was in line with 01 and much higher than 03.
- 06** This question was generally answered well, and was much better answered than its equivalent, 04. There were comparatively few answers in Level 2; those that were tended to have run out of time. The majority achieved Level 3, although a good number got into Level 4. In general, those that were given Level 3 tended to lack balance. These answers often had good detail on the role of Hitler, the Nazi leadership and the SS, but lacked evidence on the arguments implicating ordinary people. There were also a significant number of students who stayed in Level 3 owing to lack of specific detail. However, it was very pleasing to see the number of students who achieved mid to high Level 4, with excellent evidence on both sides of the debate; these answers often had good knowledge of the debate and an understanding of its sensitive nature. There was a good number of Level 4 answers with strong precise evidence of involvement of ordinary people, examples of opposition, working towards the Fuhrer, and the specific roles of Himmler and Heydrich. Centres would be well advised to push these students further in terms of a sustained argument from the introduction onwards in order to reach Level 5.

In general, students were well prepared and showed continued improved exam technique compared to last year's entry, especially on 01. There were several very well answered questions (01, 05 and 06) and none of the questions showed a statistical performance that was notably worse than the equivalent questions in earlier years. There was an issue with question 02 which was effectively dealt with by the re-working of the mark scheme. As always some gaps in students' knowledge were exposed, most notably on the reaction to the war time anti-Semitic films released in Germany. Overall, however, the students did a good job in addressing the questions set.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

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

UMS conversion calculator: www.aqa.org.uk/umsconversion