

ResultsPlus

Examiners' Report January 2010

GCSE History 5HA02 2A

ResultsPlus
look forward to better exam results
www.resultsplus.org.uk

Edexcel is one of the leading examining and awarding bodies in the UK and throughout the world. We provide a wide range of qualifications including academic, vocational, occupational and specific programmes for employers.

Through a network of UK and overseas offices, Edexcel's centres receive the support they need to help them deliver their education and training programmes to learners.

For further information, please call our GCE line on 0844 576 0025, our GCSE team on 0844 576 0027, or visit our website at www.edexcel.com. If you have any subject specific questions about the content of this Examiners' Report that require the help of a subject specialist, you may find our **Ask The Expert** email service helpful.

Ask The Expert can be accessed online at the following link:

<http://www.edexcel.com/Aboutus/contact-us/>

Alternatively, you can speak directly to a subject specialist at Edexcel on our dedicated History telephone line: 0844 576 0034



ResultsPlus is our unique performance improvement service for you and your students.

It helps you to:

- **Raise attainment** - by providing in-depth analysis of where your class did well and not so well, enabling you to identify areas to focus on/make improvements.
- **Spot performance trends** at a glance by accessing one-click reports. You can even choose to compare your cohort's performance against other schools throughout the UK.
- **Personalise your students' learning** by reviewing how each student performed, by question and paper you can use the detailed analysis to shape future learning.
- **Meet the needs of your students on results day** by having immediate visibility of their exam performance at your fingertips to advise on results.

To find out more about ResultsPlus and for a demonstration visit

<http://resultsplus.edexcel.org.uk/home>

January 2010

Publications Code US022896

All the material in this publication is copyright

© Edexcel Ltd 2010

GCSE History 5HA02 2A

General comments

It was pleasing to see a good standard of responses from candidates in this first session of the new modular examination. Whilst it is undoubtedly the case that, after just one term's study, candidates often wrote with less sophistication than they would have at the end of two years, it is also true that the more focussed assessment approach used in a modular course brought advantages. Although candidates may have written less well, there were fewer who knew little or could not answer some of the questions than in the old linear examination.

The paper requires candidates to answer six questions in 75 minutes. It was surprising that some candidates managed to write at considerable length in this time. However, often some of the material provided was not focussed on the question. Relevance rather than length is the key to high marks. Examiners want to see that candidates know the material and can organise it effectively to answer the question set. There is only so far 'saturation bombing' will take candidates.

Centres should note that the amount of space provided in the booklet for answers, is more than we would expect any answer to take, not a recommendation of the amount candidates should write.

Despite the length of some answers, there was little indication of candidates having insufficient time to answer all the questions, though a little evidence of 'rushing'. It seemed that some centres had recommended their candidates to begin with Q3 as it carries the largest number of marks. Since the questions are not chronological this is a perfectly valid approach. However, as exam technique on the new specification grows, centres may feel less need to give this advice.

The approach to individual questions is considered in the reports on the separate options. An example from a candidate's response in the examination is given for each question. Please note that part answers only are given as exemplification, not full answers. However, a general summary of areas for improvement in the approach to some of the question types (which are common across the three options) may prove of benefit to centres.

- In Question 1(a) candidates tended to write at too great a length. It is sufficient to make an inference, support it from the source and move on. The reliability of the source is not a relevant issue
- In Question 1(c) candidates need to remember that the question is on effects. They should not give an account of the event mentioned in the question, but confine themselves to its impact.
- Similarly, in Question 1(d) answers should limit themselves to causes, not a description of the event or policy.
- In Question 3, not all four given factors need be addressed, but for those factors which are considered, candidates will only score high marks if they explain how those factors brought about the stated outcome. Highest marks require candidates to prioritise factors, which cannot be done merely by asserting that one was more important than the others.

5HA02 2A Germany 1918-39

Question 1(a)

In this source-based question, candidates were asked to make inferences about the Nazi attitude to the Churches in Germany from a short secondary source. The most obvious inference from this source was that the Nazis were unhappy with the power of the Churches.

Inferences are judgements which can be made, but which the source does state directly. The key to answering this type of question is to make the inference and use the wording of the source only as support for an inference. An inference should not be made by using the words of the source, as that is likely to produce paraphrasing.

So candidates who stated that '*the Nazis did not have the courage to destroy the Churches*' were copying the source, not making valid inferences and were marked at Level 1. Those who argued that the Nazis must have been worried about the Churches undermining the Nazi message because they harassed Catholic priests and set up '*a new Protestant Church*' were both making a valid inference and supporting it. So such answers were rewarded at Level 3.

On this question, many candidates brought in their own knowledge, either to make an inference or to provide a historical context. This is not a correct approach to the question. Both inferences and support must come from the source.

**ResultsPlus****Examiner Tip**

To gain high marks, you must support your inference from the source. The best way to show that you are doing this is make a direct quote. Why not say '*I know this because it says ...*'?

Source A tells us that the Nazis⁽⁴⁾ feared the churches of Germany "never quite had the courage to destroy the churches of Germany". This suggests that the churches of Germany were powerful and had a lot of support "with the opposition this might have caused". However this source also suggests that the Nazis still wanted the churches of Germany but on their side. A new protestant church was introduced and a strong Nazi supporter was put in charge.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This is a strong answer. An inference is made straight away ('feared the Churches') and is supported by the quote 'never quite had the courage to destroy the Churches'. An inference is then made about the Churches themselves and a final supported inference about Nazi attitudes in the last paragraph. (4)

Question 1(b)

This question provides the opportunity for candidates to show that they have a sound understanding of key facts around an important event in the specification. Marks are awarded for providing factual support for statements made, with two well-supported statements marked at the top end of Level Two. Consequently it is very good exam technique for candidates to ensure that examiners were aware that separate points were being made by using such terms as 'firstly' 'secondly', 'another way'.

In this question, candidates were asked to describe how the Treaty of Versailles limited German power. Many chose to describe the military terms; other included land losses and reparations. Where these terms were linked to limitations in power (For example reparations reduced the money available to rebuild the economy and Germany's strength) then high marks were readily awarded.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

The question asks about 'measures taken in the Treaty of Versailles to limit German power'. Why not go straight into the answer by using the words of the question? A very effective way to start would be 'One way in which the Treaty of Versailles limited German power was...'

The Treaty of Versailles (T of V) was the treaty that Germany had to agree with or else the allies would attack. The treaty stated a lot of things Germany had to accept but to limit German power, new things like: reduce her army to a 100,000 men, no airforce, very little naval fleet, which meant that Germany did not have a force big enough to invade anywhere and win successfully, it also meant if Germany tried anything it would easily be stopped.

The T of V also stated that Germany could never reunite with Austria ever again and took away all her colonies and took land away from Germany, making Germany lose 10% of her land and 12% of her people. This too weakened Germany alot as now she was smaller with no colonies all on her own, but there was one more thing.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

Although the candidate goes on to link reparations to reduced German power, two good points have already been explained and supported by the end of paragraph 3. Examiners particularly liked the references to why Germany was weaker. (6)

Question 1(c)

Part (c) questions test a candidate's knowledge of the effects or impact of a particular event or policy. They are not an opportunity to write about the particular event or policy in the question. So many candidates wasted their time on this question by describing what van der Lubbe was doing and what happened to him.

What examiners were looking for was not a description of the fire, but its effects – in other words, what it caused to happen. Almost all candidates were able to identify that the fire gave the Nazis the opportunity to take measures against the Communists and that Nazi power increased proportionately. Level 3 answers were those that were able to explain the significance of the effects, perhaps with an 'overview' or long-term perspective. Thus it was not unrealistic to argue that an effect of the fire was that Hitler was able to exploit the context of fear to begin establishing a totalitarian dictatorship in Germany. The outlawing of the Communist Party and the introduction of emergency measures led to the passing of the Enabling Act, which in time brought an end to democracy in Germany.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Tip

To avoid wasting time by providing irrelevant material, why not begin the answer with the statement 'A major effect of the Reichstag Fire was...' It is an excellent way to make sure answers are focussed on the question.

on the 27th February 1933 when the Reichstag Court fire a man was captured outside the ^{building} he was believed to be a member of the Communist Party. Hitler now the chancellor said the communists did this to get into power Hitler had many Communist Party members arrested and executed van der Lubbe admitted to starting the fire. Some people believe it was the Nazis who started the fire deliberately to gain popularity from the German citizens. The KPD described the Nazis as being liars and that it was them that started the fire but van der Lubbe had in the past been a member of the Communist Party and he said he set the Reichstag alight because he didn't like the Nazis. I think van der Lubbe could have set the Reichstag alight on behalf of the Communist Party I think they used him to their advantage because of his disabilities.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer shows a common error in answering this question. The candidate devotes much of the answer to details of what happened and whether van der Lubbe was to blame. There is some understanding of how Hitler used the event to increase his power, so a low Level 2 was awarded (3)

Question 1(d)

Part (d) questions test a candidate's understanding of causation. As in part 1 (c), it does not ask for an explanation of what happened, but requires an understanding of why it happened i.e. its causes.

In this question, the requirement was to explain why Hitler persecuted Jews and other minority groups. Although it was not necessary to write on both Jews and minority groups. It was disappointing to see that so many answers ignored the treatment of gypsies, Slavs and homosexuals. Answers tended to revolve around Hitler's racial theories and, in the case of the Jews, the political advantages of providing a scapegoat for Germany's problems. Others wrote, less convincingly, of the discrimination Hitler himself suffered at the hands of the Jews during his youth in Vienna.

High level answers explained how particular causes could be linked to particular events. For example, as Hitler decided that the Jews were of no value to Germany, there was a logic in depriving them of their citizenship in the Nuremberg Laws. Very best answers were able to see a link between the reasons.

The Reichstag ~~fire~~ was set alight in 1933 just after Hitler became Chancellor. ~~The~~ Communist supporter was found at the scene and blamed for arson. Hitler used this as an excuse to use his emergency powers and seek revenge on the Communists. ~~The~~ 4000 Communists were arrested & ~~sentenced~~ killed because of this. ~~and Hitler~~ then ~~banned~~ Hitler was highly criticized in the Reichstag because of this but he just said ~~it was~~ treason had been committed & ~~punished~~. the culprits had been punished. Hitler then banned the Communists from the Reichstag.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

This answer is very weak. It contains 2 undeveloped reasons (They were to blame for the downfall of Germany and they were not part of the Aryan race). The second paragraph is irrelevant. A Level 1 mark was awarded (2)

Question 2

Question 2 is a 'process' question. It asks how a particular development or change came about. In this case candidates were asked to write on either how Stresemann's measures brought about improvement in Germany or about how the position of young people changed under the Nazis. Most candidates chose to answer Question 2 (a) on Stresemann.

Many 2(a) answers adopted the approach of explaining 'why' improvement came about under Stresemann rather than 'how'. Since the support for the reasons included the details of how, marks were still awarded. The question was very much to the candidates' liking and there were some very good answers. Responses tended to centre around three main policies, dealing with hyperinflation, lessening the burden of reparations and improving Germany's relations with other members of the international community by signing agreements with other countries and taking Germany into the League of Nations.

Highest scoring answers came from candidates who were able to take an overview and link actions to policies. Such answers saw what Stresemann did as part of a general policy. For example *'Stresemann dealt with the economic problems by addressing the main cause of them, reparations. He did this by...'*

Question 2 (b) produced an unexpected interpretation of the question by some candidates. Examiners had expected answers which addressed how during the years 1933-39, there were changes in the position of young people in comparison to the years before 1933. Some candidates saw the question as asking what changes took place between 1933 and 1939. However, both approaches were valid and often resulted in the same material being presented.

Many answers described the measures taken by the Nazis in relation to young people in this period. So there were answers about Nazi education policy, the Hitler Youth and Nazi attitudes to girls. Level 3 was only reached where candidates were able to build on this information to show how things were different – or where general conclusions were made on which to 'hang' the material (e.g. *'During this period young people lost much of their freedom and came under Nazi control'*) Most answers at this level explained how Nazi children were seen as raw material to be shaped into Nazi adults.



ResultsPlus

Examiner Comments

If a question asks about 'change' a good way to make sure you are given a direct answer is to begin each paragraph with a statement about change. So you might begin your first paragraph with the statement. *'One important change for young people was in their schooling. This was now rigidly controlled. The Nazis ...'*

Stresemann sorted out political difficulties because he was foreign chancellor and had excellent negotiational skills. He signed Germany up to the Locarno Treaty in 1925 which

guaranteed Germany's frontiers. Germany was also signed to the League of Nations in 1926 and the Kellogg Briand pact. Now Germany was part of group and wasn't classed as the pariah anymore even though the Kellogg Briand pact was shallow words.

this stability was never going to last because Germany was depending to heavily on America. When the Wall Street crash happened in 1929 Germany was automatically in economic crisis. This led to a rise in extremists and riots through out Germany. Stresemann also died in 1929, which meant that Germany had no direction on what to do next.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

This answer began by explaining how Stresemann dealt with hyperinflation, and reduced reparations. The section printed here contains a number of evaluative comments on the impact of his policies. The end of the first paragraph makes the excellent point that Germany was no longer a pariah. The final paragraph also considers the strength of the stability under Stresemann. A clear Level 3 (7)

Question 3

This question requires candidates to reach a judgement based upon a number of factors given to them in the question (However, candidates should note that they do not have to consider all the factors, nor necessarily restrict themselves to the ones given. At Level 3 at least two factors must be considered and at Level 4 at least three factors.)

On both the Weimar Republic and the Nazi state, almost all candidates were able to provide factual information to expand on the factors provided. Better answers also explained the significance of the factors. Sometimes explanation was superficial, but where it was developed, high marks were awarded. (For example, it is not enough to say '*reparations made Germany difficult to govern because they made the country poor*'. What was required was an explanation of why that poverty made the country difficult to govern.)

Candidates often tried to consider relative importance by asserting that one factor '*was more important because...*' (and then explaining why that factor was important). What was needed to reach the highest levels was an explanation of why that factor's importance is more significant than another's. (So was the poverty and unrest created by reparations more significant than the economic and political consequences of the French occupation of the Ruhr in making Germany more difficult to govern? Was the impact of rising employment in Nazi Germany greater than the changing mindset brought about by constant exposure to Nazi propaganda?)

Very best answers were those that showed the links between the factors. For example, in Question 3(a) high marks were given when candidates explained that the weaknesses in the constitution made the government weak and that the impact of reparations made it weaker still and less able to resist attacks from Left and Right. In Question 3(b) best answers usually explained how the creation of a totalitarian police state enabled measures to be put in place to reduce unemployment, to exploit women and for propaganda campaigns to underpin the Nazi state.

Reparations were one of the main reasons the Weimar government struggled in 1919-24. The crippled economy led to depression, the blame towards the fragile government. But it was also poorly established; democracy was a new experience for Germany, and the system of the government caused more instability, causing more problems like radicalists. The reparations themselves were a main cause, but they also created a number of other problems which made it very difficult for the government of the Weimar Republic.

**ResultsPlus**

Examiner Comments

The first two pages of this answer have considered in some detail how reparations, radical groups, and proportional representation had all made it difficult for the Weimar Republic to operate effectively. At that point Level 3 had been achieved. The final paragraph, shown here, argues that one factor acting on its own cannot provide a satisfactory explanation. So the answer was marked at Level 4 (15)

Statistics

5HA02 2A Grade Boundaries

| Grade | Max.Mark | A* | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | U |
|------------------|----------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|
| Grade boundaries | 50 | 39 | 35 | 31 | 27 | 23 | 20 | 17 | 14 | 0 |
| UMS | 100 | 90 | 80 | 70 | 60 | 50 | 40 | 30 | 20 | 0 |

Further copies of this publication are available from
Edexcel Publications, Adamsway, Mansfield, Notts, NG18 4FN

Telephone 01623 467467

Fax 01623 450481

Email publications@linneydirect.com

Order Code US022896 January 2010

For more information on Edexcel qualifications, please visit
www.edexcel.com/quals

Edexcel Limited. Registered in England and Wales no.4496750
Registered Office: One90 High Holborn, London, WC1V 7BH

Ofqual




Llywodraeth Cynulliad Cymru
Welsh Assembly Government

