

General Certificate of Education

History 1041

Specification

Unit HIS1N

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
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 HIS1N

Unit 1N: Totalitarian Ideology in Theory and Practice, c1848-c1941

General Comments

The entries for the unit were divided evenly between candidates entering the unit for the first time and candidates re-sitting the module. Candidates answered two of the three questions in all combinations. The USSR was the most popular question followed by Nazi Germany and also Fascist Italy with 168. The USSR-Nazi Germany therefore was the most popular combination of questions and Nazi Germany-Fascist Italy was the least popular. Question 1 on the USSR was the most effectively answered question, followed by Question 2 on Italy and Question 3 on Germany. There were marks given at all levels for each of the six sub-questions. Statistically Question 1(a) was by some margin the most effectively answered of the part (a) questions, with almost two-thirds of candidates achieving Level 3 or Level 4. In contrast, Question 3(a) was the least effectively answered question by candidates, for reasons explained below. Question 2(b) was the most effectively answered of the 24 mark questions, with almost no difference between Question 1(b) and Question 3(b).

Question (a) asks candidates to explain an event or issue, and their responses need to cover a range of reasons 'why'. Three reasons, supported by evidence, will secure Level 3 (7-9 marks). To achieve Level 4 (10-12 marks), candidates must offer links between the factors, for example, identification of short and long-term factors, prioritising with an explanation, or appreciation of the inter-relationship of the factors. Candidates need to provide reasons for explaining a specific event or issue, rather than commenting generally on the context, for example, of consolidation of power in Question 3(a).

Question (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, though this balance is not expected to be 50-50; in Question 1(b) some appreciation of the limits to Stalin's ability to crush opposition was required for the top levels, rather than extensive (and non-existent) balance. Level 5 (22-24) answers will also demonstrate judgement.

Question 1

(a) Candidates dealt with this question with great skill and a wide range of appropriate reasons to explain Trotsky's defeat in the power struggle. Many candidates were able to reach Level 3 by listing key reasons, including his personal weaknesses, his mistakes, and the opposition Trotsky faced from Zinoviev and Kamenev, as well as the role of Stalin.

Ideological explanations were well understood, especially the internationalism of worldwide revolution, which when linked to Trotsky's Menshevik past and his Jewish ancestry was often indicative of a Level 4 response. Another common route to Level 4 was by comparing Trotsky with Stalin, contrasting his lack of partisans because of his arrogance and diffidence with Stalin's control of the party machine. A minority of

candidates limited the effectiveness of their response by describing the power struggle or by focusing entirely on Stalin, with no reference to Trotsky.

(b) Stalin's success in crushing opposition was an invitation for candidates to consider evidence of success, for example, the purges, collectivisation and dekulakisation, control of industry and attacks on organised religion. Candidates who offered a range of relevant evidence, with some appreciation of the limitations to Stalin's success, for example, the inability to destroy the inherent faith of the Soviet peoples, or the inability to eradicate capitalism in either the countryside (private plots) or the cities (differentiated wage rates), were able to reach Level 4 by demonstrating some balance. Answers which recognised the changing levels of success, by reference to Stalin's inability to execute Ryutin in 1932 compared to his eradication of all members of Lenin's original government by 1940, demonstrated judgement for Level 5.

A significant minority of candidates focused on the intolerance of diversity rather than 'crushing opposition', and in many cases assessed the reasons for intolerance, which had been the question in June 2009. Such answers had some explicit understanding, though the extent of implicit understanding determined the award within Level 3. Unfortunately a very small number of candidates believed the question related to the 1920s and described the power struggle and such answers often contained little that could be rewarded.

Question 2

- (a) Most candidates were able to identify two reasons for the development of the cult of II Duce, most frequently commenting on Mussolini's personality and Fascist propaganda. Some answers attained only Level 2 though because they included extensive descriptions of propaganda and examples of the cult. The strongest answers were able to reach L3/4 through identification of further reasons, including the actions of Mussolini that won support from the Italian people, the historical context and the reaction against the weak leadership of Liberal Italy, and the importance of Fascist ideology, with reference to Nietzsche and the belief in the 'superman'.
- (b) As noted in the introduction to this report, this question (b) was answered most effectively. Mussolini's contribution to the Fascist movement was well known, with reference to his contribution to ideology and specifically the changes to the ideological base of fascism between 1919 and 1921, the unity of the movement and control of the Ras, and his twin strategies of violent acts to defend property from communism and the pursuit of legal power. Alternative reasons were clearly understood, with candidates covering the weaknesses of Liberal Italy, the impact of the First World War and the social and economic problems 1919–1922, the fear of communism, the mistakes of other politicians and the role of the King. Some candidates knew so much about these factors that they dismissed Mussolini's role almost out of hand and it is worth pointing out that whilst candidates should demonstrate judgement, they should explain why the factor identified in the question is not as responsible for the event as other factors, rather than simply ignore it.

Some candidates who knew so much about the background weaknesses of Liberal Italy started their responses in 1860 and struggled to get to the twentieth century before running out of time. Finally, candidates should always try to draw together answers on the rise to power of Mussolini by linking the factors that created the circumstances in which he could become prime minister with the specifics of October 1922.

Question 3

(a) This question was the least effectively answered on the paper for two reasons. Firstly, a large number of candidates answered the question by explaining why Hitler became chancellor, rather than Führer. Such responses occasionally had some general or implicit information that could be rewarded with one or two marks. However, even with such material credited, over a third of the responses were credited at Level 1. In addition, many answers that were focused on the period 30 January to August 1934 became general or inaccurate narratives of events in the Nazi consolidation of power, demonstrating implicit understanding and being credited at Level 2.

Answers that were able to show how the Enabling Act, the Law Against the Establishment of New Parties, the Concordat and the Night of the Long Knives created a context in which Hitler could become Führer once Hindenburg died were able to gain the full range of marks, depending on the depth of reasons and the links made. A small number of answers identified specific reasons including Nazi ideology, the national desire for a single leader, Hitler's personality and the opportunity Hindenburg's death brought.

(b) The Hitler Myth is one of the bullet points of content in the specification and understanding it is crucial to an understanding of totalitarian ideology in Nazi Germany. Candidates who had covered the full specification were able to develop the role of Goebbels, referring to his control of propaganda, including newspapers and radio, but more specifically his use of film to develop the Hitler myth. Candidates needed some appreciation of Goebbels role, balanced with some awareness of the other factors that contributed.

Nazi ideology and the Führerprinzip, the successes of Hitler in domestic and foreign policy in contrast to the failures of the Weimar Republic, the desire of the German people for strong leadership in contrast to the Weimar Chancellors and the contribution of other Nazis who worked towards the Führer all featured in candidates responses and received appropriate credit.

Some answers demonstrated explicit understanding through challenging the importance of Goebbels by reference to the importance of Leni Riefenstahl and Triumph of the Will. Weaker responses focused on Hitler's personality without any real knowledge beyond his skill as a public speaker, whilst a small minority focused on the use of terror. A small number of candidates identified the use of television as being the key to the development of the myth.

Mark Ranges and Award of Grades

Grade boundaries and cumulative percentage grades are available on the **Results statistics** page of the AQA Website.