

History A

Advanced GCE A2 H506

Advanced Subsidiary GCE AS H106

OCR Report to Centres

January 2013

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA) is a leading UK awarding body, providing a wide range of qualifications to meet the needs of candidates of all ages and abilities. OCR qualifications include AS/A Levels, Diplomas, GCSEs, Cambridge Nationals, Cambridge Technicals, Functional Skills, Key Skills, Entry Level qualifications, NVQs and vocational qualifications in areas such as IT, business, languages, teaching/training, administration and secretarial skills.

It is also responsible for developing new specifications to meet national requirements and the needs of students and teachers. OCR is a not-for-profit organisation; any surplus made is invested back into the establishment to help towards the development of qualifications and support, which keep pace with the changing needs of today's society.

This report on the examination provides information on the performance of candidates which it is hoped will be useful to teachers in their preparation of candidates for future examinations. It is intended to be constructive and informative and to promote better understanding of the specification content, of the operation of the scheme of assessment and of the application of assessment criteria.

Reports should be read in conjunction with the published question papers and mark schemes for the examination.

OCR will not enter into any discussion or correspondence in connection with this report.

© OCR 2013

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE History A (H506)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE History A (H106)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

Content	Page
F961-2 AS Period Studies – General Comments	1
F961/01 British History Period Studies – Medieval and Early modern	2
F961/02 British History Period studies	8
F962/01 Medieval and Early Modern	14
F962/02 European and World History Period Studies – Modern	19
F963 and F964 AS History Enquiries	27
F965 Historical Interpretations and Investigations	48
F966 Historical Themes	52
F966/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1066–1715	54
F966/02 Modern 1789–1997	58

F961-2 AS Period Studies – General Comments

Period Studies: General comments on Units F961 and F962

The overall standard of candidate's answers was sound, rather than outstanding, with examiners reporting that there were few excellent scripts. However, most candidates were able to explain some factors and attempted to answer the actual question set. As a result, the decline of the purely descriptive essay continues. But, at the top end, attempts at evaluation or judgements are often little more than assertions and Centres would do well to focus on this if they want candidates to reach Level II or above for AO1b. Candidates appear to understand what they have to do to reach these higher levels, but are unable to argue why a factor is more or less important than another or, if they make links, to fully explain them. A significant number of candidates use their opening paragraph to establish a thesis or line of argument and this often, but not always, ensures that they produce an analytical answer.

Despite these promising developments, there were two areas of concern. The level of factual support was very variable. There were a significant number of candidates who wrote only in broad generalisations and/or did not have a secure grasp of the chronology of events for the topics they were studying. Candidates should also be encouraged to read the question carefully, not only to pick up and focus on key words and phrases in the question, but also to ensure that they keep within the parameters of the question.

There were virtually no responses where candidates attempted only one question, but there were a number where the second answer was very brief and severely hindered the overall result.

F961/01 British History Period Studies – Medieval and Early Modern

There was a general impression among examiners of seeing very few really strong answers in this session. However, it was also clear that quite modest candidates were addressing questions well. It was usual to see, in an essay where knowledge was shown, a genuine attempt to analyse that knowledge. There were very few purely descriptive answers. On the whole knowledge was used well. There was also very little complete irrelevance. Most at least understood what the question was asking of them. More common were answers where there was very little concrete knowledge and candidates attempting to generalise and assert without having specific support to give weight to their comments.

There were hardly any rubric infringements, with the huge majority of scripts showing two essays on which about the same amount of time had been spent. If the first tended to be better, this was a reflection of the sound practice of candidates attempting their stronger question first.

It would help examiners if candidates filled in the questions they have attempted in the grid on the front page. Candidates should leave half a dozen lines before the start of their second answer/plan – this is needed by examiners to write their comments and marks at the end of the answer without having to resort to finding space at the top or bottom of the page.

Some centres post scripts without filling in the relevant boxes on the envelope. This makes identification more difficult and, while every effort is made to name packets, this must increase the likelihood of candidates' work going astray.

Centres are reminded of the importance of the attendance register: if these are not completed accurately considerable difficulty and uncertainty can be generated.

Q1 This question was not popular, and was not on the whole particularly well done. Few candidates seemed to have a secure grasp of the theme of Normanisation under Edward and at best applied a narrow understanding, focusing on his upbringing and Robert of Jumieges. Many focused their answers on how little changed in England and that this meant not much Norman influence. The Dover fracas was written about by most, but no one explored why there was anti-Norman feeling. Some who were prepared answered well in terms of content. Much of the expected content was identified and deployed. Problems however did arise with the command 'Assess', as weaker candidates tended to describe relevant incidents and found it hard to evaluate them relevantly to the question.

Q2 The answers to this question tended to ascribe William's success to a number of factors ranging from luck to meticulous planning with some discussion of Harold's rashness in offering battle at Hastings and his lack of control over the fyrd. There was some sound knowledge and some explanation of the military campaigns of 1066, and better candidates offered some discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of the rival claims of the two men. Many candidates dealt more successfully with William than they did with Harold. A lot wrote about Harold's failings as reasons for William's success, rather than dealing with Harold's claim as a separate issue and assessing the problems he had independent of William. This meant that many answers read as if they were addressing a different question: "why was William successful in securing the throne?" Examiners saw and credited a variety of interpretations of the question, with some focusing predominantly on 1066 and some taking a longer perspective. Whilst most students understood what was required, whatever the quality of their answer, some found difficulty with the phrase "securing his claim". For some this meant concentrating exclusively on a comparison of the strength of the claims to the throne of William and Harold which resulted in a very narrow

focus. More common were answers which interpreted “securing” as “consolidating” and wrote about everything that William did after the Battle of Hastings including the building of castles, crushing of rebellions, creation of the feudal system.

- Q3** Most of the explanations centred on the ruthlessness of William and the disjointed and haphazard nature of the rebellions against the Conqueror. Better answers dealt with the different approaches William used to different opponents, for example Exeter being treated less harshly than Yorkshire and Durham. Many candidates showed good depth of knowledge of a wide range of rebellions and appreciated the various reasons for lack of success. Answers tended to be well organised and highly focused. They were thus effectively written by those who had good knowledge of the actual events. There were two principal patterns of under-achievement. Too many answers lacked the evidence to support points which therefore remained assertions. This applied particularly to the issue of castles. Weaker candidates also struggled to assess, describing and analysing a list of factors but being unable to link, rank or assess them.
- Q4** It must be noted that all the material on the specification is liable to be examined, but no combination can be assured in any series. Although this was a popular question, it appeared a shock to some candidates not to see a question on Henry VI or Edward IV, so they tried to work in what they knew about Edward in an answer about Richard. This was not always successful: Richard’s loyalty to his brother did not automatically render him an able ruler in his own right, although several candidates tried to argue that. The weakest answers took the view that Richard was ‘unable’ because he was unpopular due to the Princes in the Tower and his ‘plan’ to marry his niece. Some answers argued that if Richard had been an able ruler the nobles would all have supported him against Henry Tudor, which has some merit but required more knowledge of Richard’s legal and financial measures than most candidates could offer. There were frequent claims that Richard favoured northern nobles and thus alienated southern nobles, but very few gave examples to support this view. Too many wrote a paragraph or more on nobles without a single name, and treatment of finance was often very generalised. Some took the line that if he had been really able he would have won at Bosworth.

It was disappointing to see some candidates so strongly supporting Richard that they were not prepared to offer any criticism of him. Any area where Richard could be criticised was simply not written about, whilst many wrote at length of his wonderful service to Edward IV. These patterns apart, answers to this question were generally quite good. Candidates identified the categories that they could discuss, and for these the differentiators were the detail in which the factors were treated and the quality if any of judgement.

- Q5** The quality of answers to this question was very mixed: there were some impressive considerations of the Pretenders along with the strength of the de la Pole claim in contrast to the weakness of Henry’s claim to the throne. The best answers were able to distinguish between the legal validity of the White Rose claim or to differentiate between the shaky nature of Henry’s regime in the first few years of his reign compared with the security he developed as he went on. A minority of candidates did not understand the term Pretender as a claimant. A few wrote about the Cornish and Yorkshire tax revolts, sometimes at length, as though they were Yorkist plots, which was not really convincing, though some tried to use them as evidence of Henry’s fragility as he tried to address the issue of Yorkism. Many candidates were able to write sensibly on Simnel and Warbeck without muddling the two or describing at length what they did. The De la Poles featured heavily, and there was some sensible handling of opposition in the very early days of the reign. Better candidates went further than Warbeck and Simnel and identified what made the plots ‘dangerous’ when making their conclusions.

- Q6** There were a few candidates who took the question to refer to rebellions and plots, but mercifully not many made this serious misjudgement. Many candidates accepted the hypothesis in the question and wrote generally descriptive answers to try to prove this. Better answers challenged the hypothesis, with some arguing that trade or international recognition or the security of the Tudor dynasty were Henry's main aims. Knowledge of this topic was generally good, although a few candidates were unclear whether Margaret Tudor married James III, IV or V of Scotland. A good proportion of the answers were well organised, focused and informed. The analysis was much better for this style of question than one that invites candidates to 'assess', generally. This question allowed for many links to be made and discussed too. There were some strong responses.
- Q7** There were some good answers to this question, featuring clear recognition of Henry's aims and the measures of success which could be applied to his policies. However, several answers suffered by simply giving rather vague aims and then resorting to extensive description. Most answers focused on foreign policy, with little attention to domestic matters: being different from Henry VII by executing Empson and Dudley was the extent of some candidates' recognition of possible domestic factors. Wolsey made fewer appearances than expected, mostly dealing with either organising the French campaigns and the Treaty of London or failing to attain the divorce – rarely both. Perhaps some weaker candidates expected a clearer steer from the question about whether it wanted a domestic or a foreign policy answer and couldn't easily cope with a question which left that decision to them. Some answers were narrowly focused on Foreign Policy, but many had a reasonable balance between domestic and foreign issues. A small minority wrote heavily about Wolsey and his aims and achievements with one candidate actually stating that as Henry was lazy everything was left to Wolsey, he was therefore going to write about Wolsey instead! The better responses saw students identifying Henry's aims and seeking to assess to what extent he achieved them, with stronger scripts showing a realisation that success/failure varied throughout the 20 year period and sought to balance their judgements accordingly.
- Q8** There were a few answers which simply outlined the Elton thesis and left it at that. Some wanted to discuss revolution in government and did not therefore fully address the question, writing about the issue as if they were expecting a different one. However, as with the previous question, the stronger answers began by identifying Cromwell's aims and then evaluated his success in the light of the aims. There were a number of strong answers which debated the nature and the longevity of the changes which Cromwell made, although establishing what Cromwell's aims might be was a struggle for some candidates. There were a few simply narrative accounts of the 1530s, and few looked beyond 1547 – or even 1540 – to judge whether the changes were long-lasting enough to claim that Cromwell's aims had been achieved, but most maintained a good focus on the question. A major discriminator was how far the candidates addressed the question set, and really focused on Cromwell's aims in Government.
- Q9** This question proved rather challenging for many candidates: several presented narrative accounts which featured little more than brief analysis bolted on at the end. Some just listed the bad points of their policies rather than actually addressing the question. The range of issues discussed in a significant number of responses was very narrow. Few candidates knew enough about the actual policies, let alone details, of Somerset and Northumberland to produce convincing responses. Part of the difficulty was that weaker candidates treated the two Protectors as essentially the same, although better answers did recognise that Somerset provoked more opposition than Northumberland and that he was less effective as a national leader: Northumberland's main failing, according to a number of candidates, was his attempt to remain in power by manipulating the succession. For some this was all they could say about him. A major discriminator was the degree of factual accuracy, especially over the rebellions in 1549 and particularly the causes of the Western Rebellion.

- Q10** There were few very good answers to this question: mostly there was a simple contrast between 1547 and 1553 with the view that because the two Protectors had both passed legislation which was Protestant then the hypothesis of the question was beyond dispute. Better answers showed awareness of the differences between the two Books of Common Prayer – and some had difficulty with the correct name for this – and the best answers questioned the strength of Protestantism in 1553 by reference to the speed with which Mary was able to restore Catholic worship in many areas. There was a minority of stronger answers which showed appreciation of the possible difference between the official government position and that of most people in the country as a whole. The restoration of Catholicism was the simplest way to support this, and was often used well. Some made too crude a distinction, postulating a Protestant government and a Catholic country. A few, however, were able to comment on the range of responses within the country to the changes and thus produce a rounded and developed answer.
- Q11** A few candidates answered strongly, appreciating the strengths and limitations of Protestantism and the hostility to it from religious conservatives and abroad, which created the tensions Elizabeth faced. On the whole, though, this was not very well done. There were very few candidates who could write in any depth about the strength of Protestantism and the role it played in influencing the religious settlement. Candidates listed other factors such as the foreign policy situation, the financial weakness of the Crown in 1558, Elizabeth's potentially weak status both as a woman and as the daughter of Henry VIII's questionable second marriage: this was promising. However, little was made of these factors in terms of genuine analysis. Instead Elizabeth choosing a middle way so as to avoid upsetting France and Spain was the general theme: there was a view that France and Spain would have the same attitude to a Protestant Queen in England, which suggests a weak grasp of the situation facing Elizabeth as she began to rule. Too often Catholic Europe is viewed as a homogenous unit, and one unified threat: showing poor background knowledge.
- Q12** This question was less popular. There were two common approaches in these few answers. One, that Elizabeth was effective in dealing with the Catholic threat since there was no serious danger to her at any point. Two, that Elizabeth was ineffective in dealing with the Catholic threat because she did not execute Mary, Queen of Scots earlier than 1587. The complexities of the situation got little attention – for example, it was apparent that too many of the candidates thought that the nature and severity of the Catholic threat remained the same for thirty years. Few answers showed a secure grasp of the facts. There was, however, a minority of strong, relevantly argued answers which demonstrated that the question could elicit a high scoring response.
- Q13** There was considerable variety in the quality of answers to this question. Weak answers either tended to accept the hypothesis with little sign of being aware that it could be challenged, or instead listed and then described the religious, diplomatic, administrative and political problems of 1558 with little attempt to advance relative judgement. On the other hand, this question was answered very well by many. Candidates produced focused answers and dealt with a good range of problems. Very few of the stronger candidates went too late into the reign for relevance. Better answers showed both sound factual knowledge and clear analysis of the different factors. Some candidates blandly stated that several factors were linked, for example religion and foreign policy, but not all explained how that link came about and how Elizabeth responded to the challenge. However, there were a number of candidates who displayed a weak grasp of the foreign situation in the period and missed the opportunity to link the foreign and religious issue. A few answers went beyond the first few years of Elizabeth's reign, but most concentrated on the period 1558 to 1560 or 1562.

- Q14** There were few strong answers to this question, which was significantly less popular than the others. Few candidates grasped the concept of parliamentary privilege confidently, although several did raise the question of monopolies in the last few years of Elizabeth's reign as an alternative choice to be the most important cause of problems. There were some who offered alternatives such as marriage or finance, but were unable to link these issue to the question of privilege. A pattern of error emerges, as a proportion of the candidates confused government and parliament, which made it difficult for them to argue cogently whenever a question involving parliament or government or the Privy Council is mentioned. Some also struggled with the word privilege, and again were therefore unable to produce a developed or focused response.
- Q15** Those candidates who recognised the extent of what could be discussed in response to the question tended to do well: there were some strong answers which recognised that that the question of marriage posed problems for a female ruler in the patriarchal society of the sixteenth century; that Mary, Queen of Scots had a legitimate claim to the English throne and that Catholics could well consider it a stronger claim than Elizabeth's own; and that as she approached the end of her life there was genuine concern about who would succeed, to the extent that her Privy Councillors were making secret approaches to James VI. Weaker answers merely listed some of these aspects without seeking to make a judgement about which reason might be strongest, or indicating that the candidate was aware that the reasons might have changed in importance depending on what stage of Elizabeth's reign was being considered. A small number tied themselves up in knots, suggesting that they had difficulties with the wording of the question. Some candidates dedicated their answer to writing about Mary, Queen of Scots. Some discussed Elizabeth's own succession to the throne as well as issues with her successor. There were some good responses from candidates that had selected knowledge from a wider range of areas.
- Q16** Although there were some strong answers to this question, indicating a clear understanding of the complex religious situation in England and the relationship between religion, foreign policy and the claims of Parliament to be involved in fashioning policy, especially in the 1621 and 1624 Parliaments, there were also some disappointingly vague answers: in particular, a significant number of candidates wrote about nothing more than the Millenary Petition, the Hampton Court Conference and the Gunpowder Plot. Even some good answers failed to make the link between the claims of Parliament and the issues surrounding the early years of the Thirty Years War, with profound implications for James' aim of being *Rex Pacificus*. Several answers showed a weak grasp of the Spanish Match, thinking that it was confined to the last few years of James' life. A worryingly large proportion of the answers considered James to have no particular religious attitude as long as the four separate religions – Catholic, Protestant, Puritan and Arminian – lived quietly together. Many wrote about Protestants when they really meant Puritans and a surprising number completely dismissed the notion of Catholic opposition to James: trying to blow up the monarch is clearly not that big a deal! The most successful candidates tended to split up the three sources of religious opposition and then analyse each one or broke the reign down into three parts and assessed the extent to which he faced opposition in each period. Most concluded that he did not face serious opposition, sometimes making a brief comparison with Charles I, and gave good reasons to support this. Knowledge was good and candidates seemed to have a good understanding of demands, although some fell down in making a judgement about the 'what extent' part of the question.
- Q17** There were some very competent answers to this question, displaying awareness of the ways in which religion, finance and the style of government gradually made the Caroline regime unpopular. Few, however, tried to argue that Personal Rule was largely accepted with little resistance before 1637, although this would have been a worthwhile approach. Ship Money was the most frequent example of an unpopular financial policy, followed by forest fines: these were generally understood quite well. Most candidates made a reasonable case for the unpopularity of Laud's reforms, appearing too close to Catholicism

for comfort: it was, however, a surprise to read in one answer that Laud was a personal friend of the Pope! Some candidates wrote about Wentworth in Ireland and the religious resistance in Scotland, but not all managed to link these to England, as the question required. There were a significant number of candidates who made references to Buckingham, and some also considered the Five Knights Case and the Petition of Right, as a minority ignored the dates in the question.

A small number of candidates were caught out and wrote at length about Ireland and Scotland: quite clearly, again, they had not read the question carefully enough. On the whole, however, answers were well-focused with a good level of detail shown. It was pleasing to see how many candidates did focus so well on 'in England' and brought it back to effects in England even when mentioning 'Thorough' in Ireland. On the whole, therefore, this was well-answered and gave candidates the opportunity to make some sound judgements.

- Q18** Although traditionally this question brings out long expositions on the Personal Rule which contribute little to the actual issue, there were very few such answers this time.

This question was on the whole answered well. Candidates seem to have taken on board the idea of the importance of 1640–42 and were able to write knowledgeably. Very few candidates were sidetracked into describing the years of personal rule and the problems it brought. Candidates had revised well, generally, and had good understanding of the demands of the question. Strong answers convincingly covered the actions of Pym and also the actions of the King in a balanced and controlled manner, whereas a number of weaker candidates resorted to narrative with little analysis. The Triennial Act, the Grand Remonstrance and the Nineteen Propositions were mentioned with varying degrees of supporting detail and understanding, with weaker candidates frequently confusing them. The growth of support for the King in the months before fighting actually broke out was not always explained with conviction. The best answers actively sought to compare the degree of responsibility which can reasonably be assigned to Pym and his supporters with the extent of the King's culpability in the developing situation leading to the outbreak of civil war.

This question was, however, not answered as well as 17 by many, as it seemed that weaker candidates especially found it harder to come to a judgement on the issue.

F961/02 British History Period studies

General comments

Overall the performance of candidates was reasonably good. There was a range of performance but the majority of scripts were average with many candidates, as is often the case in the January series, not knowing the topics in sufficient detail.

There were no rubric infringements with candidates answering more than two essays but there were some candidates who answered only one question or provided a very short answer for their second question. Whether this was due to lack of knowledge, poor examination technique, or not understanding the requirements of the paper is difficult to ascertain.

The most common fault in many of the poorer scripts was the failure to answer directly the question that was set.

From Pitt to Peel 1783-1846

This continues to be a very popular topic, but the quality of responses varied considerably in this series. A number of candidates struggled to get to grips with the demands of Questions 2 and 3.

- Q1** The stronger answers focused on the key phrase 'Never a serious threat' and defined the idea of serious and threat, before attempting to answer the question. Stronger answers also usually adopted a thematic rather than a chronological approach, considering issues such as scale of the radical challenge or its aims. However, a significant number adopted a chronological approach tacking on some assessment of their gravity. Very few tackled the question of what 'threat' meant – to public order, to the Tory government, to the state itself. There were a number of answers where candidates preferred to list and describe different radical groups and bolted on an assertion at the end of each paragraph as to whether they considered the group a threat or not. There were a number of responses that did not cover the whole period and missed out crucial events such as the Cato St Conspiracy. However, there were few answers where there was no attempt to put forward an argument, even a very limited one.
- Q2** Candidates found this difficult because they did not focus on the precise wording of the question and wanted to write an answer to the more usual 'How liberal were the reforms.' Candidates did need to consider whether the trade and finance measures were liberal and whether any other measures were also liberal in order to address the question. As so often in questions on this aspect of the topic, many showed disappointingly little understanding of what 'liberal' meant in the 1820s. Weaker candidates often confused 'liberal' with 'humane' and argued that the Metropolitan Police Act was liberal because it made the streets safer. In a number of answers knowledge of the trade and finance reforms was excellent, but in others it was very vague or, in some, completely ignored.
- Q3** This was the weakest of the three questions in this section. Many candidates simply ignored the terminal date of 1841 and continued, or wrote only about, the period after 1841. Very few were able to produce a balanced account, with most who were able to argue not considering the counter argument and simply stating that Peel was very successful because he won the 1841 election, in contrast to the situation after the 1832 Reform Act. The stronger answers did show some awareness that Peel's attempts to modernise the party and appeal to a wider range of voters was not successful, as reflected in the nature of the 1841 election results. A few candidates argued that it was not Peel who had been successful, but either other members of the party, such as Bonham, or Whig failings that made Peel appear successful. There was considerable insecurity about

the actual events of the 1830s. However, a few did know about, for example, party reorganisation, the genesis of the Carlton Club, the importance of electoral registration, the thrust of the Tamworth Manifesto and Peel's relations with peers and backbenchers and they were able to use this effectively.

Liberal & Conservatives 1846-1895

This continues to be a popular topic area and produced some strong answers, with most candidates being able to offer at least some analysis or argument, although the depth of supporting material varied considerably.

- Q4** This was a popular question, but many responses did appear to be answers to a previous question with little focus on 'transformed.' Most candidates were able to give a reasonable list of reasons for the development of the Liberal party, including the 1846 split, the roles of Palmerston and Gladstone and the emergence of a prosperous middle class. However, knowledge of the Willis Rooms meeting, and even when it happened, was often absent. Some candidates found it difficult to get beyond description and narration to focus on the underlying reasons. Some wrote too much about Gladstone, whilst others wrote not enough or even chose to ignore his contribution. Some were able to deal with aspects of the political context but there was some drift into policy actions of such as Palmerston. The importance of 1859 was under-played in many answers,
- Q5** This question was a good discriminator. There were some thoughtful answers, but the less good ones included much irrelevant post-1867 material and did not focus on the named factor. There were a number of responses where greater detailed knowledge about the events of 1866-68 would have been beneficial and often, where the named factor appeared, it was at times dealt with rather descriptively. Other factors considered included Disraeli's attacks on Peel (sometimes excessive coverage) and the issues of the Disraeli-Derby relationship, the lack of talented politicians, Disraeli's skills and ideas (some candidates wrote up to the 1872 speeches). Many commented on Disraeli's skills as a speaker, but this was often in very general terms,
- Q6** This was the least successful of the questions in this section, largely because a number of candidates simply did not know enough about the domestic reforms and could not therefore argue or comment in a persuasive manner. Weaker candidates resorted to generally descriptive answers with some bolt-on analysis. Only a very few discussed criteria for 'success', but this did allow them to link their material back to the criteria and make some useful comments. Some answers did start by attempting to establish Disraeli's aims and then linking their material back to judge whether the policies achieved his aims. The better responses also picked up on issues such as the permissive and ameliorative nature of legislation as well as the copying of earlier Liberal ideas or else the pursuit of actions the Liberals did not take, but might have had they been re-elected in 1874.

Foreign & Imperial Policies 1856-1914

This has become an increasingly popular topic and produced some good responses, but it also tends to attract some very descriptive and chronological based answers as well.

- Q7** Although this question required coverage of a huge period, those who defined British interests at the start, including issues such as trade, balance of power and the preservation of the Ottoman Empire were usually able to do well. Those candidates who broadened the question to include the Suez Canal, without linking it to the Eastern Question did find it difficult to manage the range of material, but needed to be aware that Africa is not really the Balkans! However some candidates wrote too much about the Crimean war and little after 1878. Some candidates struggled to address the 'how successfully' part of the question – usually taking it as read that Britain was successful and proceeding to explain why. It was disappointing that few candidates succeeded in tackling anything after 1880, although some did drift into the question of the 'end of isolation'.

- Q8** The answers to this question, in many instances, were not that strong. A significant number simply re-wrote an essay on the popularity of imperialism or reasons why it was so. They were usually very well informed on these matters, but were unable to link their knowledge to the specific demands of this question. They often failed to focus specifically on the war and how or if that changed things. The results of the 1900 and 1906 elections are obvious evidence but were very rarely alluded to, with very few showing any detailed knowledge of either election or understanding the results of the Khaki election. A few better answers drew a clear distinction between the boost for imperialism provided down to 1900 compared to the doubts provoked by the protraction of the war thereafter. A number indulged in lengthy descriptions of music hall songs, popular literature and other imperial 'propaganda', and very few offered a nuanced view (some people's attitudes were changed by the Boer War, others' were not). There was surprisingly little reference to the controversy the war caused at home (not a single candidate mentioned Lloyd George, for example) and very little discussion of events between 1902 and 1914.
- Q9** Most candidates were able to offer a range of reasons why Britain went to war. However, as with all 'assess' questions, there were a good many descriptive answers, but most candidates did at least attempt to prioritise or evaluate the relative importance of a range of reasons. However, it was, unexpectedly, less popular than the other questions in this section. It was surprising that some said little about Anglo-German relations or even Belgium; whereas others dwelt too much on the background of changing British foreign policy or else on events in the Balkans and did not relate these to why Britain went to war. Better answers did focus on Anglo-German fears, rivalries (naval, imperial, economic, strategic), in a context of the Ententes and crises (1905, 1911), and even brought in the likes of Grey and Crowe and their views on German ambitions. There was some attempt to discuss the idea of balance of power and the implications for Britain if the country did not become involved in the war, but some did need a clearer grasp of this concept. Some answers also alluded to domestic issues in Britain, hinting at the Dangerfield thesis, but this also needed development if it was to be convincing.

Domestic Issues 1918-51

This continues to be a popular topic, but the factual knowledge of some candidates was very limited and this had a considerable impact on the quality of responses seen.

- Q10** The named factor appeared to cause a considerable number of candidates difficulties. Candidates often did not cover 'policies' or else they wrote about the record of the Conservatives in power, sometimes simply describing legislation or dwelling overlong on the General Strike and failing to link this to why the Conservatives dominated the period. Where candidates did attempt to consider the policies, a significant number suffered from insecurity about the actual sequence of events in the named period and ignorance of Conservative policies (the Wheatley Housing Act, for example, was regularly ascribed to the Conservatives). Quite a number wrote extensively about the fall of Lloyd George as well as the first Labour Government, making at best tenuous links to the Question set. A good many offered the perfectly justifiable view that the key reason for Conservative dominance was the weakness of the other two parties, but failed to substantiate this with relevant explanation, being particularly weak in discussing the split within the Liberal party. Even when candidates were able to discuss the policies of the Conservatives, there were few answers which suggested that their authors understood the politics of the 1920s – none, for example, discussed whether Conservative policies were aimed at pleasing working class electors and thus wooing them away from Labour. Some of the better answers did look at the role of Baldwin, the uses of the new media (cinema vans etc), the appeal to all classes, the organisational strengths of the Conservatives, even the value of the new Research Department, and considered whether it was Baldwin's style or 'New Conservatism' which helped bring about Conservative dominance.

- Q11** Although this was a very straightforward question there were some very poor answers, which were confused and inarticulate. Two common failings of even better answers were: failure to understand that it was the *Daily Mail printers'* action which precipitated the strike, and a failure to distinguish between the actions of the miners' union and the TUC. A few candidates wrote about the Strike itself and its aftermath. However, many candidates did focus on causes and could delineate long from short term, though often the latter were rather truncated in coverage, but better answers showed awareness of the triggers as well as the context. In dealing with the context quite a number wrote at length about mining conditions and the return to the Gold Standard at pre-war levels and the increasingly uncompetitive nature of British coal (often set in a wider context of the problems of the old industries), the problems of the mines (too many, often producing too little, under-modernised); but there was some confusion over the two Commissions (Sankey and Samuel) as well as the place of the Triple Alliance. Surprisingly, not that many assessed trade union leadership, whether TUC overall or MFGB. Baldwin did figure, as did Conservative Cabinet 'hawks', and some contrast was made with Lloyd George's negotiating style and skills. The best answers had some balance between long and short term causes and made good links.
- Q12** There was a wide range of answers to this question, both in terms of issues discussed and analytical skills. Some answers were very competent or indeed more than competent. The best succeeded in balancing Conservative failings against Labour strengths and discussing other factors such as the effects of wartime life and government policies 1940-45. Some effective comparisons were made between Labour and Conservatives in organisation, leadership, appeal, slogans and impact. Some candidates spent a little too much time on the Conservatives and their past record, although reference to their association with problems and failings of the 1930s was relevant, at the expense of covering the importance of the War, its mood, the spirit for change and the place of the Beveridge Report therein. Good answers dealt well with these latter factors and linked them well to the campaigns and to the contrasting attitudes of Churchill and Attlee, also to the cross-class desire for a better Britain after the War. It was surprising how few made reference to Churchill's comment about Labour and the Gestapo.

Foreign & Imperial policies 1945-1990

The number of candidates studying this topic continues to increase and it was pleasing to see that there were a number of very good answers, particularly to Questions 13 and 14.

- Q13** The quality of the responses was very dependent upon how clearly candidates understood and focused the key words in the question. Those who gave attention to 'seriously' and 'co-operation' produced stronger answers, as they were able to see the full implications of the question and realized that they did not need to write solely about the EEC. Stronger answers usually showed good knowledge of post-War Europe, shifting attitudes, strategic and economic-commercial considerations and the changing mood in Britain in the later 1950s and beyond.

However, a significant number of answers were weaker on events pre-1960s, but particularly on the 1940s. Many weaker responses tended to focus mostly on the process of application to the EEC and thus, as suggested earlier, not fully answering the question. A number of candidates tended to write rather more about reasons why Britain did not want to join the fledgling EC/EEC or else why she decided she wanted to join.

- Q14** There were many good answers which were replete with supporting knowledge and a genuine attempt to assess and balance successes against failures. Answers that looked at themes (areas of policy) and evaluated success against failure tended to work better than those that looked at successes followed separately by failures. The well informed answers, which analysed aspects of Thatcher's foreign policy effectively, covered issues

such as Europe, Thatcher and the USA, her role in the ending of the Cold War and relations with the Commonwealth. It was pleasing to see that most were able to go beyond the Falklands, although it still featured heavily in most answers, though there were some where it was ignored completely. Weaker responses never quite managed to present coherent overall judgements. Occasionally answers drifted a little into the domestic impact of Thatcher's foreign policies or considered domestic issues.

- Q15** This question caused weaker candidates particular difficulty, not because of the scope of the coverage, but because they did not engage with 'Europe and world diplomacy'. Stronger candidates made a good job of analysing some aspects (decolonisation, nuclear weapons, the relationship with the US, Europe), but thoughtful overall judgement was rare: good candidates, for example, did make a direct comparison between Britain's position in 1945 (the early years of the period were less well covered, in any case) and her position in 1990. Stronger answers showed a good sense of analysis as well as evaluation, a sense of change, consideration of strategic, military and economic factors as well as simple prestige and power. By being selective but judging well the knowledge to use in support of argument, these candidates did cover the period and convey many of the key issues involved. Most answers, even descriptive ones, did show an attempt to cover the long period, even if they tended to focus on the immediate post-War phases of end of Empire, Decolonisation, the Cold War, the Suez crisis and its importance, before jumping to the Thatcher years.

Post-War Britain 1951-1994

This continues to be a popular option, but it was particularly noticeable on this Study Topic that candidates need to take great care to read the question and focus on the key words and phrases, such as 'Thirteen years of conservative misrule' and 'Conservative party', not policy or government.

- Q16** This was the most popular question in this section, but candidates did need to focus on, and explain, the concept of 'misrule' and not simply list reasons why the Conservatives lost the election in 1964. One or two candidates got sidetracked into lengthy discussion of the Conservative governments since 1951. Weaker candidates also adopted a chronological approach and often finished up by saying very little about the latter years, which were of crucial importance in explaining the election result in 1964. The appeal or otherwise to voters of Wilson and Douglas-Home (a crucial factor) was generally poorly explained. Many candidates gave excessive space to a description of the scandals of Macmillan's last years. Better answers tried for argument (Conservatives' record was not that bad) and counter-argument (Labour recovery, changing mood and needs, economic worries)
- Q17** The main problem here was a failure to focus on 'party'. Few candidates understood the nature of mainstream Conservatism before Heath and were therefore unable to assess accurately how he was attempting to change it. Only a few were able to refer forwards to Thatcher – something which assisted greatly in formulating overall judgements, though perspective and balance were needed. Many answers focused solely on Heath's record as a PM. The most frequent approach was simply to assess the policies that Heath implemented and discuss their successes and failures, answering a different question as to whether the Heath government was a success or failure. Where analysis relevant to the actual question was attempted, it was often little more than bolt-on. However, many candidates did know a great deal about the topic, their problem was using it to answer the actual question set. Some tried to argue that Heath attempted to change the public perception of the party, but because of the failings and U turns it was for the worst and that change would have to wait for Thatcher.

Q18 This was the least popular question on this topic. However, despite the scope of the question, there were a number of extremely well informed answers on relevant events, which succeeded in using knowledge to support arguments and reach a judgement. Although weaker answers tended to adopt a chronological approach and focused on events such as Bloody Sunday, a significant number of answers adopted a more thematic approach which was more successful. There were also a number of answers which focused on why there were troubles, rather than why they could not be solved. In considering alternatives to the factor in the question, most considered the actions of the IRA or the divisions within Irish society.

F962/01 Medieval and Early Modern

General impression of difficulty

The response showed the paper to be of an appropriate level of difficulty and no question presented particular difficulties for candidates. A wide range of responses was seen, although the size of the January entry does mean that comments on some questions will be limited.

Overall performance of candidates

Most candidates knew how to approach particular types of question and structure their response, although it seemed that in some centres there was less awareness of the need to consider the relative significance of factors/issues, so they did not achieve as highly in AO1(b) as they might have done.

There was less of the “Some historians think....” approach this session, and where candidates did use historiography, which is not a necessity to achieve full marks, they tended to use it appropriately.

Most candidates were able to give the appropriate time to each answer – only one or two did not seem to have enough time to give as full an answer as they could. There was only a handful who addressed only one question, who resorted to notes in their second, or attempted three. The rubrics are clearly understood. There were fewer legibility issues, though some answers were still very difficult to follow and it required a lot of time and patience to sort out whether there was actually any merit in the evidence and argument being presented.

Some typed answers were poorly presented, with unnecessarily small font or narrow margins, and candidates producing typed answer are reminded that the instruction to produce clear answers applies to typed scripts as much as manuscript.

3. Individual questions

The Crusades

Q1 This was a straightforward question, though slanted slightly differently from previous sessions. Stronger candidates had no difficulty scoring highly and there was some detailed and effective writing. Even moderate candidates who kept their focus on the question were able to produce solid responses. Most argued that papal ambition was stronger than the desire to aid Alexius, but few pointed out the importance of Jerusalem and the Holy Land to the Christians. Weaker answers tended to think that the Turkish threat was a completely separate factor from giving aid to Alexius and failed to show how they were linked. There were some issues of candidates who wrote as if they would have preferred a different question. A minority drifted into reasons why people went on Crusades, into the appeal of Crusading for those who responded to the call – in particular the prospect of land and wealth (milk and honey!) Where they did address what was required, there was usually a good sense of the context in which Urban was operating, with many able to place events in a wide context, with issues such as the possibility of asserting western control over the eastern Church. There was a problem in some centres with detail – there were some quite generalised responses, where the argument was valid but very simplistic. In a number of instances the range of issues considered was limited, so AO1(a) achievement suffered. A number of candidates who, again seemed to want a different question brought up the issue of Muslim disunity as a reason for Urban’s call. It led them down the route of arguing that he called the Crusade because he thought the Muslim world was vulnerable, as opposed to it providing the means of success, leading at least to some unconvincing argument and in some cases discussing irrelevantly towards why the Crusade was successful.

- Q2** Most answers laid the blame for the Second Crusades' failure squarely with the leadership and produced plenty of evidence to prove their point. However they often had little to say about the strength of the Muslims which produced an unbalanced answer. In fact the failure to address in sufficient detail the named factor was the principal reason for candidates to under-achieve. It was not a question where significant drift was tempting, though in some cases evaluation was minimal. It did seem, in some centres, that the range of factors learnt was not as extensive as it should have been; failing, for example to consider the diversion of effort into the European campaigns, and most paid little attention to the loss of manpower along the way to the Holy Land. While it is stressed that no specific content is ever required, a range of factors did need to be addressed. Equally, while there was a fair degree of comparison with other Crusades (especially the First) there was little mention of the overall lack of religious inspiration to keep them going and too much on the lack of Byzantine support, which was only imperfectly understood. There were some candidates who had an incomplete understanding of events at Damascus, which limited their argument. A few candidates got very confused with the Third Crusade and wrote at length about Frederick Barbarossa and Richard the Lionheart.
- Q3** This was the least popular question in the section. There seemed to be a problem for many in mobilising what they knew to meet the needs of this question. The range of issues considered was again quite limited in some centres. Very few looked at the issue of Jerusalem's weaknesses and some dealt only with the Battle of Hattin and offered little in the way of the bigger picture. There were very few candidates who were able to write in any depth about the problems of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. A number of candidates seemed to think that Saladin's "resourcefulness" meant that he had a lot of resources. Even the better answers tended to give an overview of the factors with little attempt to prioritise.

The Renaissance

- Q4** This proved a relatively standard question for this topic. Most approached it from the angle of the individual states rather than through factors, so it tended to be a comparison of the relative wealth as opposed to the range of influences affecting Italy in this period. The better candidates did quite well in AO1(b) by doing some effective evaluation of the issues, though in some cases the supporting evidence lacked enough specific detail to get them into the higher levels. There was a tendency to generalisation which limited the reward that could be given to attempted analysis and evaluation.
- Q5** Few candidates attempted this question. Better responses offered some detailed comparison of Venetian art and architecture with, for example, Florentine, specifically based on the differing influences and resources. There were some generalised responses which were less strong than candidates' other answer, and showed less knowledge.
- Q6** There was a tendency for this question to provoke a philosophical debate rather than historical analysis. These arguments often became incomprehensibly convoluted – candidates tied themselves in knots. This approach made allocation of marks within the generic mark scheme quite difficult. Some centres appeared to have pre-prepared for a similar question, and candidates produced relatively uniform responses which were not particularly well focussed on the exact question set. Candidates needed to focus on the issue of 'new' if they wanted to access the higher levels and where this was done some good responses were seen. Those candidates who did approach the question directly were able to do well. Even moderate candidates which some concrete examples to support their answers were able to see and compare factors which were new with those which were not.

Exploration and Discovery

- Q7** This was clearly a welcome question to many candidates. They were expecting the area of the topic, and understood the need to weigh the strength of the named factor against others. It elicited some well-structured responses, with some high achievement in AO1(b). More moderate candidates were able to produce a list of factors with some analysis of each, and the extent and quality of comparison and judgement was a key discriminator. Evidence was in many cases not so well-developed, which meant that achievement was less successful in AO1(a), especially when religion was dealt with only in generalised terms. Candidates might have considered the role of Isabella or the desire to find the kingdom of 'Prester John' as a starting point in assessing religious factors. A pattern of failure was a drift into the means as opposed to the motives. Those who wanted to talk about technology were particularly prone to this, and here the importance of care in addressing the precise question was once again shown clearly.
- Q8** This angle was unusual but candidates managed to produce some reasonable responses. The best showed clearly that the candidates had good knowledge and that the question was one which could elicit strong responses. AO1(b) was in many cases at a higher level than AO1(a) as much of the evidence was rather vague and undeveloped. Focus was maintained well for the most part, though there were some patterns of failure. One was that of drift into why the Empires took the form they did. Another was a descriptive approach. However, some successful answers argued that trading posts were more characteristic of the Portuguese, whilst settlement was more typical of Spanish settlements.
- Q9** This was the least popular of the questions in this section, attempted by very few candidates. It appeared from responses that more emphasis in the candidates' understanding of the topic is on the impact of the Empire on the conquered than on the conquerors, and it must be stressed that this question is one which candidates may be expected to understand. The phrase "how serious" required attention, and more modest answers tended to be descriptive of factors rather than comparing them to a judgement. However, where candidates did attempt to address the question many focused on the problem of governance or the economic impact and considered the impact of bullion on the Spanish economy.

Spain 1469-1556

- Q10** There was a thorough consideration of the range of issues by many candidates. The stronger answers identified the problems in the opening paragraph and then evaluated the success of Ferdinand and Isabella in dealing with each problem in subsequent ones. Candidates showed a good grasp of detail, though evaluation was often limited to an assessment of the degree of success within each element of their rule, with relatively little attention given to an overall assessment. In a few instances the support was rather superficial. As a general rule the responses remained focused on the question, though some instances there was some drift into how successful they were in unifying Spain. Some treated this as an essay on the aims of Ferdinand and Isabella, and as a result wrote very tangentially to the question. A proportion of candidates found it hard to evaluate success, and these had a tendency to drift into description of policies rather than maintaining focus on the problems and how successfully they were addressed.
- Q11** The tendency was for the response to focus on the question, though the range of issues was sometimes limited and inadequate specific support kept achievement down in the lower levels. Successful answers achieved very creditable overviews. Some made effective use of early issues faced by Charles I to support their assessment of the position he had inherited. Some candidates found the nature of the question difficult, and their responses addressed the question less effectively, by discussing policies of unification

through the reigns without maintaining focus on 1516. Some discussed this as a question on the success of Ferdinand and Isabella, assuming that unification could be equated uncritically with success.

Q12 There were some strong responses, and candidates were able to offer detailed and well-supported assessment of the financial problems through the reign and to compare these with a range of Charles' other problems. Some candidates, however, found the question challenging. There was a tendency towards a descriptive approach in which the focus on assessment was lost. Some addressed the question, but support was not very wide-ranging and some key elements were missing. While it is stressed that no specific evidence is needed, the named factor always needs to be addressed and in this sort of question compared with a range of others. It was at least clear that no candidate who addressed this question was unaware of the importance of the named factor, and this did enable some credit to be given, even to answers with less specific knowledge.

Charles V

Q13 It was clear that candidates appreciated that there was a range of factors causing Charles' failure to restrict the spread of Lutheranism. All candidates showed an awareness of Charles' views and problems, and of other reasons why Lutheranism spread. There was some detailed knowledge shown and some effective organisation, though the named factor could have had more specific attention paid to it. This was the major issue for many candidates. Too many of them could go no further than to discuss how far Charles was responsible, and comparing his responsibility with other factors. Those who gave specific attention to the phrase "act decisively" were able to refine this, and there were some strong responses.

Q14 Candidates who attempted this question showed good understanding of the issues. There was focus on the question and judgement reached, and this was clearly a question with which candidates were happy. This is not always an advantage, as there were some fairly generalised responses, and some which used very similar material to what they had written for Question 13, without appearing alert to the fact that this was unlikely to be successful. There was drift into a discussion of Charles' problems. Some candidates needed to think more carefully about the princes as individuals, treating them as a homogenous group, and in too many cases not only failing to distinguish between the princes but failing to name any.

Q15 This question was shunned by most, despite being straightforward in its phrasing and an important issue. Those who did attempt it successfully assessed the degree of success through the reign, while more modest answers tended to be more descriptive. Stronger answers often identified the French threat, usually by geographical region and assessed how successful Charles was in each area. The responses showed this to be a question which all candidates could address to the best of their ability.

Philip II

Q16 This question elicited some effective responses. Candidates were, for the most part, able to produce some well-structured arguments. At best, there was some detailed knowledge and skills and candidates were able to achieve highly in both objectives. At worst, support was not developed - no specific knowledge of any one element of finance was required, but there did need to be some figures - and the argument thin. There was, however, no misunderstanding of the question and focus was maintained. However, candidates did need to weigh the issue of finance against a range of other problems that Philip faced in his rule of Spain. No pattern of failure emerged, with results differentiated by detail of support and quality of evaluation.

- Q17** This was on the whole less successfully addressed. Some responses were weak – knowledge was generalised and inadequate, with irrelevant repetition of material used in question 16. Where greater length of response was achieved, there was more detail, but it was sometimes confused and descriptive. Some candidates with limited knowledge stretched their answers through Philip’s reign and ignored the given dates. Others confused issues, with a pattern emerging of candidates not knowing, for example, the order in which the Spanish leaders served, and certainly without much idea of the dates. A regular conflation was to confuse, or merge, Alva and Parma, with very damaging effects on the credibility of the argument. There tended to be relatively little knowledge about the seriousness of the inherent problems of the area, and too often it was assumed that all had been tranquil under Charles V.
- Q18** The best candidates showed full appreciation of the question’s requirements and offered a well-supported argument with a sustained evaluation. Others were less effective – support was vague and not well-organised. Most had at least something to say about Maurice of Nassau. No major pattern of failure emerged, and it was pleasing to see most candidates remembering to focus on the latter part of the revolt, though a minority wrote more generally about Dutch successes, often centring on William the Silent, without considering the factors specific to 1584-1609.

F962/02 European and World History Period Studies – Modern

It is pleasing to report that very few answers produced were solely narratives and most attempted some explanation. There were some issues about relevance – for example writing about Hitler's period in power to explain why he came to power. There were some areas where poor knowledge of the key factor reduced the effectiveness of answers. However, the discriminating element continues to be between answers which reproduce lists of explanations and those who clearly engage with an assessment. The same is true of answers which require judgements about matters such as success. Weaker responses contain lists of successes and failures; stronger answers offer more balanced judgements about different elements.

The standards of expression differed. At the top there were stylish answers which had enough command of the language to grapple with concepts like 'genius' or 'success'; at the lower end, poor expression rendered comprehension difficult and inhibited extended discussion. Common grammatical errors – 'would of' for 'would have' and spellings which indicate that words had been heard but not read reveal some lack of engagement with the written word.

Most candidates are able to organise their time effectively and very few produced second answers that were significantly shorter than the first.

Napoleon, France and Europe 1795–1815

Q1 Most candidates who attempted this question were able to consider a range of issues and usually make links between the factors. Candidates usually considered issues such as his ability and reputation (the named factor), luck, the failings of the Directory and help from other individuals. However, there was some tendency to describe Napoleon's early career without making specific links between events and his rise to power. It was pleasing to see the depth of knowledge that many candidates were able to use, particularly on the weakness of the Directory, which has often been superficial in the past, but also the number of coups mentioned plus dates. Candidates were very well prepared on Brumaire and the role of individuals and could also discuss the successes and weaknesses shown by Napoleon. There were many who were very good on the effectiveness of the army thanks to Carnot and French Revolutionary government and the work of de Gribeauval and du Teil.

Q2 There were many good responses to this question. Many candidates had a comprehensive knowledge of a very wide range of material which they used impressively, covering Napoleon's entire military career from Toulon to Waterloo. A significant number of candidates made very good use of battles like Austerlitz, Ulm and Leipzig to support their argument. However, weaker candidates wrote only about Napoleon's successes with no mention of Spain, 1812, Leipzig or Waterloo. The major stumbling block to coherent responses was the grasp of the meaning of 'Genius'. The very best (and there were some) could make a case for genius from 1796–1807/9 but less so after it. However, they could also at least touch on the wider evidence eg being both political & military leader at the same time & for so long. Some responses considered a natural or inevitable decline of powers and they were rewarded. It was surprising that perhaps more was not made of the weakness of his opponents when arguing that he was not a military genius. Weaker responses, rather than running through a chronological survey of his campaigns tended to list the reasons for his military success and failures without engaging with the criteria for 'genius.'

Q3 This was least popular of the three questions in this section and answers tended to contain lists of different ways that Napoleon impacted on Europe, with some variable knowledge and understanding of the different degrees of influence that France exerted on European territories and states under its control. There were very candidates who could observe the growth of European Nationalism in the face of foreign (ie French) conquests – the irony being it was the French nationalism which fuelled Napoleon’s success for so long. Many who attempted this question found it difficult to write at length and in other than very general terms. A significant number tended to focus on the campaigns, creating a bit of an overlap with Q2. Some explored the alliances which were formed against Napoleon. At the stronger end of the answers seen candidates realised much depended on nearness to France, the length of French influence and control, the attitudes of the population (Spain), the different status of conquered or occupied countries (absorbed into France or if satellites or allies). Issues that were discussed included the impact of Napoleonic Code, especially the degree to which feudalism was abolished, the attitude of the Church and the impact on different social classes. Some responses considered the military aspects such as the levying of troops, taxation and taking land and economic impact, especially the effect of the continental system.

Monarchy, Republic and Empire: France 1814–1870

Q4 This was a straightforward question which elicited a number of good answers. Candidates dealt with the long term, short term and immediate causes quite well and many made the link between Charles’ political mistakes in 1830 and journalists whipping up the economically disaffected Parisian artisans. Where candidates were weak was in the matter of discussing the named factor: many were unaware of the length, depth and nature of the economic crisis 1825–30, though many were aware of bad harvests and high prices. Most argued well that a range of reasons caused the Revolution and often compared Charles X to Louis XVIII to effectively prove why they felt Charles was weak. However, many were content to offer a list of reasons. Attempts to provide judgements about relative importance were mostly assertions. A lack of detailed knowledge of the key element in the title frequently held answers back.

Q5 Many answers offered a chronological account of the main events. There was analysis, but many responses pointed out that what Louis Philippe regarded as successful was criticised by press and public. The criteria for success might have been established more clearly by many, as this would have provided a measure against which they could judge success. Most candidates had a sound knowledge of the Belgian question, events in Poland, the Mehmet Ali crisis, the latter being particularly well done, and the Spanish marriages. A significant number were able to identify the two contrasting contemporary views: ‘France is bored’ against those who felt Louis Philippe was sensibly cautious and successful. Many followed the traditional argument that Louis was successful to 1846, unsuccessful thereafter, followed by the policies were ‘sensible but unpopular’. Much of this was fair enough but candidates did not seem to appreciate the depth of humiliation many French felt over kow-towing to GB, and in particular the climb down in 1840/1.

Q6 This question was not answered as well as the other two in this section as the candidates lacked enough supporting knowledge. The better responses discussed the long and short term reasons (association with Napoleon, Louis Philippe’s appeal to all classes, problems in Paris, the weaknesses of the constitution). Stronger answers gave a good explanation by citing the weaknesses of the Second Republic and the appeal of Louis Napoleon, particularly his name, but without reference to ‘Bonapartism’. Where candidates were weak was on writing about the actual presidency 1849 through to the two coups; this was often glossed over and candidates struggled to explain the coup, pointing out that Louis Napoleon’s enemies had restricted the presidency to a single 4 year term.

The USA in the Nineteenth Century: Westward Expansion and Civil War 1803–c.1890

There were some excellent answers to questions in this section as candidates often displayed considerable depth of knowledge, but were also able to evaluate the relative importance of factors and make substantiated links between them.

- Q7** There were some excellent answers to this question that displayed judgements about links and relative importance, especially the role of the Federal Government. The level of explanation was higher than in other responses in this section. However weaker candidates often focused on the named factor and did not get out of mid-century, whereas stronger candidates started in 1803, referred to land acquisition, explorers, settlers, miners, Mormons et al and stated that the expansion predated the railroad, which was a valid point. However, there were some answers where candidates simply produced answers that stated "another factor" "And another factor", with very little analysis or evaluation.
- Q8** Most candidates could cope well with this, showing a wide range of factors from both sides and drawing conclusions. However, some candidates did not understand the question: instead of writing about why the war lasted so long, they wrote about why the North won (the question they had probably prepared for). There were few candidates who had any understanding of the geography of the South and the difficulty of conquering such a large area. Weaker answers often relied on generalised material about advantages of the South (defending their homes and families, the geographical size, fighting for their way of life, therefore more determined than the North.....). Similarly, the material advantages of the North were extensively covered, though without always recognising the implications of these and linking them to the actual question. Material on the strategies was rather thin, and there was much talk about the war of attrition, though with not much real understanding. The role of Generals, North and South, was explored, but strangely, a few did not pick the change of tactic by Grant. Most were quite good on Lincoln's role, good and bad, and some were very very good on the significance of the Emancipation Edict, and of the Gettysburg Address.
- Q9** This was the least popular of the questions in the section. Some candidates, indeed, reproduced a lot of identical material from Q8. Candidates often confined themselves to Lee and Grant in their discussion of military leaders and no one else. Surprisingly, Sherman hardly ever got a mention but Lincoln/Davis did! Some did consider Jackson, McClennan and Burnside. The best answers had very sophisticated material on the relations between the generals and their presidents, though better on Lincoln than Davis, who was often not clearly understood.

Peace and War: International Relations c.1890–1941

The number of candidates who attempted this option was quite small, but in many instances the quality of the responses was very disappointing, with a distinct lack of knowledge and chronological understanding.

- Q10** This produced some poorly-focused answers. The most common failing was responses that went beyond Christmas 1914 – Verdun, Somme, Cambrai and the Ludendorff Offensive were popular inclusions. Many displayed very limited knowledge of the War Plans, although they are specifically mentioned in the Specification. There was frequently description of the Schlieffen Plan, but it was seldom explained how the failure of it contributed to stalemate. More noticeable was the lack of knowledge of plan XVII. For some there was even uncertainty about what stalemate was. Several took War Plans to be the Alliance system, producing details of their history, but with little or no attempt to link them to stalemate. Some appeared to be so short of relevant knowledge that they used later evidence to explain how new technology eventually made a war of movement possible again, arguing that its lack of availability in 1914 made stalemate inevitable.

- Q11** Better answers did offer a considered judgement about the level of success of various elements of diplomacy, but there were a number of answers that did not go beyond the Peace Treaties of 1919. However, many other candidates were simply content to look at successes and failures of the League, equating the League with international diplomacy and not seeing the need to cast their net wider, which did not go beyond 1924. Many responses made no reference to Locarno, although some did point out that most successes involved smaller countries, with less success when larger countries were involved. Quite a few mentioned the post-war desire for peace. There were a number of answers that focused more on why there were so few disputes and tried to set 'International diplomacy' (the League) off as a factor against other such issues as 'War-weariness' (the legacy of World War One), other treaties and alliances outside the League etc. The best answers kept the phrase 'resolving disputes' firmly in focus. Sadly the disputed Aaland Islands feature highly in the 'memorable history' category and often got much too much prominence. There would have been much more analytical mileage in looking at some of the more threatening disputes caused by the newly created post-Versailles borders, the French invasion of the Ruhr, Polish invasion of Russia, or Mussolini's actions over Fiume and Corfu.
- Q12** This question was the least popular in this section. Answers often focused on Japan's ambitions towards China with a little on Manchuria, but not much else. Many answers seemed a little unsure about nationalism, which was often referred to or explained in very general terms. However, good answers showed sound understanding of it and explained it with specific reference to Japan. In the stronger answers links between factors were generally very well dealt with and substantiated judgements were made. There were some answers where there was very good analysis and evaluation of the significance of economic and strategic concerns and the impact of opportunities offered by the weaknesses of opposition to expansion. Some even went as far as to distinguish between cultural, racial and economic nationalism.

From Autocracy to Communism: Russia 1894–1941

This continues to be a popular option, producing a wide range of responses from the detailed and evaluative to the generalised and poorly focused. The questions showed how important it is to focus on the key words and phrases, as a number failed to deal with the named factor in Q13 or to address why there was a second revolution.

- Q13** Although this was a popular question, too many candidates found it difficult to focus on the economy as the named factor, whilst others failed to link their knowledge of economic problems to the cause of opposition. There was also some failure to focus on opposition and instead a tendency to offer a general account of the problems of Tsarism. Economic elements were not uniformly well-known. There was a tendency in some responses to look at how serious problems were and whether they were successfully dealt with or not, rather than assessing the causes of opposition to the Tsar. Often in dealing with either the social or economic causes of opposition too many candidates gave generalised answers about disaffected peasants and workers with little sense of chronology – apart from 1905. Many wrote very generally about economic problems, arguing that they were always there, which may be true but does not really convey the difference between extreme conditions (ie famine) and relative calm (ie the succession of good harvests 1909–1913). Moreover, opposition varied from class to class, and for different reasons. A number, as might be expected, focused excessively on the events of 1905, but even here there was confusion about the timing of Bloody Sunday and many did not mention Father Gapon in their answers,, a reflection of the many generalised answers that were seen.

- Q14** Most candidates were able to identify reasons for the second revolution. These were frequently explained well, but answers were less successful in dealing with their relative importance and linkages between them. The words 'important' and 'link' were used a lot, but they were little more than assertions. Most considered issues such as the failure of the Provisional Government to deliver on the hopes and aspirations of the populous, and the determination of Lenin and the Bolsheviks to gain power by promising peace, land and bread. Where they did fall down is with regard to actual events: thus the Kerensky Offensive rarely got a mention, the July Days were not explained, nor was the Kornilov Coup. Many candidates failed to appreciate the fact that the Bolsheviks were weak until the autumn; too many felt that Bolshevik success was inevitable as soon as Lenin got off the train in April. Surprisingly, Trotsky was given very little attention. Many appreciated that the Provisional Government could not live up to people's aspirations as long as the war went on. It was also pleasing to see that many understood the issue of Dual power and the importance of the Petrograd Soviet. However, there was some confusion about the Kornilov attempted coup.
- Q15** Many candidates were able to explain, or at least describe the reasons for Stalin's consolidation of power, but did not deal with 'assess'. In general, many candidates seemed better prepared for explaining the reasons why Stalin rose to power than how he consolidated that power. Candidates could confine their answer to 1929 or go on into the 1930s; either approach was acceptable and did not preclude any level being awarded. Better candidates often explained Stalin's consolidation by his control of the party through his various positions of patronage and his underestimation by rivals, but few could really delineate the actual events without getting a little muddled. There were some very good answers that focused solely on 1924–29, and traced their way through Stalin's machinations very well. Those who focused on the 1930s were often quite vague and did not really reflect how much control collectivisation and the 5 year plans gave to Stalin. In fact, they hardly seemed aware of this, and frequently talked in general terms about the purges. There were some very simplistic responses which commented in very general terms about fear or control, without providing adequate supporting knowledge.

Democracy and Dictatorship: Italy 1896–1943

This continues to be a popular option and most candidates were able to handle the questions effectively, although the concept of 'consolidation of power' does cause some weaker candidates difficulties.

- Q16** A straightforward question but too many candidates ignored the actual war, the loss of life, humiliating defeats. Weaker responses frequently described the consequences rather than assessed them. However, for stronger candidates there were plenty of opportunities to make links, and this was often done quite effectively. There were a number of factual errors which candidates would do well to avoid; for example, the 'mutilated victory' was often mentioned, but wrongly ascribed to Versailles rather than St Germain, and a few seemed to think Mussolini was in charge of Italy's efforts in World War One. However, there was little appreciation of what Italy didn't get (apart from Fiume). The economic consequences were fairly well understood though the biennio rosso were occasionally omitted. Apart from the rise of socialism and the beginnings of Fascism, the political consequences for the Liberals were not fully understood.
- Q17** As mentioned above, a significant number struggled with the concept of 'consolidation of power' and often drifted into detailed descriptions of his many 'battles', his use of propaganda, youth groups or his social policy. There was also a tendency to drift into the 1930s and discuss foreign and domestic policy in that period as well. However, even when the focus was on the right material, too many candidates struggled to appreciate the chronology of the period 1922–26. Thus the Acerbo Law, the election, the Matteotti murder, the Aventine Secession (often misspelt) were often jumbled up with little sense of

how one led to the other. Moreover few appreciated that Mussolini was very much pushed by his party into making the key changes of 1925–6. Even when candidates did focus on the actual question, it was often on how he consolidated his power rather than assessing how effectively he did it. Although better answers did compare the different elements. Some of the arguments were stronger in two areas: the power of the Vatican, and the existence of the monarchy, and these two limitations on Mussolini's power were well covered.

Q18 This was a popular question. Some candidates attempted to draw comparisons between the 20's and 30's, but a significant number described or explained Mussolini's foreign policy without getting to grips with "how successful?" Where there was argument, most followed the traditional line of a 1920s/1930s split ie successful/not successful. Stronger answers usually identified his aims before going on to consider different aspects of foreign policy and linking this back to his aims in order to reach a judgement. The quality of knowledge was very variable. Weaker candidates started in 1935 and ignored the 1920s; even better candidates struggled to say much about Corfu, Fiume, the Balkans and international treaties. Most surprisingly, there were a number whose knowledge of Abyssinia was very weak or confused. There was also a tendency in some answers to read history backwards: because the Axis with Germany led to disaster, it was a disaster from the start. Although some better candidates appreciated that Abyssinia was popular, that the alliance with Germany made sense at the time (though few appreciated that his Mediterranean ambitions made friendship with France and Britain impossible), and that his role at Munich and non-belligerence in '39 were all popular – ie his foreign policy was a success until 1940.

The Rise of China 1911–1990

There were only a small number of responses to this topic. However, there were some very good analytical responses.

Q19 There were some outstanding responses to this question which engaged with an analysis of the relative responsibility of the Nationalists, though there was less specifically on Sun Yat Sen. Weaker answers produced a list of problems without addressing the main factor enough.

Q20 Some answers ignored the given factor and therefore limited the level in which they could be placed, but there were some perceptive and well-organised answers which were among the best seen in the whole range of responses and dealt with the whole of a long and varied period and offered clear judgements.

Q21 There were insufficient answers to this question to be able to comment.

Democracy and Dictatorship in Germany 1919–1963

This continues to be the most popular topic, but there are two encouraging developments. The number of very weak answers, even on Hitler, has declined, and the quality of answers on the post 1945 period has improved.

Q22 This was the most popular question in this section and at the top end there were some very strong answers with candidates making substantiated links between factors and offering a range of evaluative comments. However, weaker candidates still trawl through Weimar from its inception. Even here more and more candidates now appreciate that the story really begins with the Wall Street Crash, with the Nazis jumping from 2.5% of the vote in 1928 to 37% four years later. Knowledge about the Depression and its impact, Hitler's appeal, 'backstairs intrigue' were often well covered, although there were instances of sweeping generalisations. Perhaps most surprisingly, there were a number who failed to

cover the Depression and this appears to be one aspect that cannot be ignored if any sense is to be made of the increased Nazi support. Having said that, many made that very point and, even if they did not see it as the most important factor, argued that without it the Nazis would never have had mass appeal and prompted the backstairs intrigue, which was often seen as the vital factor. A number of candidates covered the reconstruction of the Nazi Party 1925–29, but in a descriptive way, not really linking this to his rise to power. A significant number went on to the Reichstag Fire, Enabling Act and even the Night of the Long Knives or Hindenburg's death. Sometimes this was due to confusion about the chronology, but in most instances they were aware of the dates, but appeared to ignore the limits of the question.

Q23 This was done less well than the previous question: too many candidates simply ran through the economic policies with varying degrees of accuracy and did not really address the issue of the war – ie what type of war and when. Detailed knowledge was too often limited. Many did not know enough about economic policy to tackle the question adequately. Some did not even include the 4-Year Plan. The analysis sometimes failed to rise above 'he lost so he wasn't prepared', with few appreciating his wish for short, sharp campaigns (blitzkrieg) and a general war (but still with short campaigns) much later than 1939. Stronger candidates addressed the issue of what sort of war and the early war, and this allowed the development of some very strong answers. Some focused on the idea that he had to embark on Blitzkrieg in order to take resources from the conquered countries. Where candidates were able to focus on the question, they usually covered the policies of Schacht, Goring (Guns and Butter) and Speer and analysed their success by assessing how well the economic aims of the Nazis were met. They used the concepts of Blitzkrieg, autarky and Total War well. Others argued quite successfully that the length of the war was against Hitler. A number of candidates answered a different question and analysed the general success or otherwise of elements of economic policy.

Q24 Perhaps because many candidates considered Q23 too demanding, this was a popular question. In many instances the weakest element of the responses was the handling of the named factor, although stronger candidates were able to link foreign policy to economic success. There were a number of answers that did not focus on the precise demands of the question and instead dealt with how successful Adenauer was and did not link knowledge of success to retaining power. Some really only wanted to write about the 'economic miracle' and were rather superficial in their treatment of other factors. There was usually some reference to foreign policy but this was often in insufficient depth: few, for instance, mentioned Adenauer's visit to Moscow and the repatriation of p.o.w.s. Moreover, the politics of the period were largely ignored or ill-understood. Those who offered good judgements, mostly concluded that economic success was more significant, although some argued for the primacy of the Basic Law as it helped create stability and reduced opposition.

The Cold War in Europe from 1945 to the 1990s

This is an increasingly popular topic but, although the quality of the answers on the earlier period is often quite good, the same is not true of the later period, where many rely on generalisations.

Q25 Most candidates realised that they had to focus on 1945 and before but few had the knowledge to fashion a very good answer. Most mentioned ideological differences without saying what they actually were; some focused on Germany, some on Poland, but not enough did both. Moreover the change in Germano-Polish borders was largely overlooked. It is a constant surprise that candidates seem to blame the USA, Truman in particular, rather than a paranoid Stalin for the Cold War! There is often a distinct lack of balance in the responses. Many focused quite successfully on Yalta and Potsdam and some explored the significance of the change of personalities. Most responses were able to explain a number of reasons. Some offered very good judgements about their relative significance and links.

- Q26** There were a number of very good answers which provided judgements about the degree of success in the short term and balanced this against longer term failures and future difficulties, leading to the desire of satellite states to break away. Some of the best answers broke the threats down into military, political and economic and evaluated success in dealing with them. Weaker answers showed lack of certainty about the threats and referred to NATO, U2 spy plane, Cuba and Suez! Lengthy descriptions of Hungary and the Prague Spring were unfortunately common and confusion between the two was not unusual. Generally, there was too much description of the causes and nature of the threats at the expense of relevant analysis directly linked to the question. Most candidates were able to run through the Hungarian uprising, the Berlin Wall and the Prague Spring; however, not many mentioned Stalin's death, the rising in Berlin in '53, the context of Destalinisation for the events of '56 and the compromise with Gomulka in Poland. The argument that the Soviets were unsuccessful because of 1989 was tenuous to say the least – though it was valid to point out that hearts and minds were not won over.
- Q27** This was the least popular question in this section. Candidates who did tackle it made a good attempt to analyse German reunification, the civil war in Yugoslavia and the Czechoslovak split. However, weaker candidates simply wrote about Gorbachev and the collapse of the Soviet Union, focusing on developments within the Soviet Union — a further example of the importance of reading the question carefully and focusing on the key words.

Crisis in the Middle East 1948–2003

The topic continues to grow in popularity and the quality of the responses seen also continues to improve.

- Q28** This question could be approached in a number of ways. Candidates could either focus on the problems caused by the setting up of the state or consider the longer term problems that creation caused, up to and including 2003. Examiners were instructed to reward either response. Most candidates, however, if they adopted the second approach, went as far as 1967 to introduce the problem of Israeli settlements on the West Bank. There was some reasonable material on the Palestinian problem and Arab humiliation.
- Q29** This question was not done as well as the other two in this section. There was often a lot about Suez and little else, with candidates confining their answer to the 1950s – nothing about Egyptian influence due to its population and cultural influence, very little about the UAR, very little about domestic policy (though Aswan did get a mention but its Cold War context did not) and very little about how Nasser survived the disaster of 1967 — surely a real measure of his popularity. Even when dealing with Suez there were a number of star-struck responses which claimed a crushing victory for Nasser at Suez without crediting Great Power intervention and pressures for his 'victory'.
- Q30** There were insufficient responses to this question to be able to comment.

F963 and F964 AS History Enquiries

This series saw the usual mix of candidates, some entering for the first time after a term's study, some retaking. A few approached the sources with confidence, using historical terminology and knowledge with ease. However, at both the middle and lower end there was evidence that some candidates had, conceptually, not got much beyond GCSE. Their failure to integrate content and evaluation was particularly noticeable and they tended to proceed sequentially and descriptively. As often noted before, the skills required by Enquiry papers take time to mature, noticeably in the handling of concepts, evaluating sources, either individually or in groups and in integrating knowledge into this process. However, most made a clear effort to respond to the demands of this source paper and it was particularly refreshing to see a genuine attempt to put into practice what we have advised over recent years, even if only partially understood. Most tried to compare the passages for a key issue and, in the second question, to group the sources according to both the view in the question and possible alternatives. Candidates often grouped well initially but then proceeded to describe source content and provenance sequentially and discretely, with a judgement on the topic or issue rather than on the sources as a body of evidence for a key issue. Many who did try to integrate content and evaluation at some points (it was clear they knew that they were supposed to do this) just did not manage to achieve it across the response. Some at this early stage in their studies were overly dependent on a set formula which restricted and impeded their engagement with the content of the sources and with the interpretation (a discrete and formulaic assessment of sources which was not then related to any argument). An example of this was to group the sources into three categories – time, authorship and language and proceed to fit everything, on both parts (a) and (b), into this framework. As a result the key issues were only occasionally addressed. Another example was the use of the acronym 'DAMMIT' (date, author, motive, means, information and tone) which, when applied relentlessly, simply got in the way of focusing on the key issue in (a) and addressing the possible views and the extent of evidential support for them in (b). A few very impressive scripts were seen on all topics, with a clear sense of evaluative focus on the key issues matched with an assured sense of context and an application of knowledge to extend and question the sources. They approached the sources with confidence, using historical terminology and knowledge with ease.

The key weakness for many this January was a shaky grasp of history and context, crucial if candidates are to place the sources in relation to a key issue. (Care is taken to locate the issues firmly within the Specification.) They should not be unfamiliar to candidates. It was not untypical for one or two sources to be misunderstood and misinterpreted as a result, particularly in Q(b). A consequence of this was that very little knowledge was deployed to question, qualify or confirm the evidence of the sources. One frequently had the impression that candidates were confined to using only what was in front of them on the paper. Even here many seemed reluctant to really engage with the sources in front of them, confining their comments on the content to one or two, often very general, points.

Nonetheless, examiners were impressed with the fact that much of what we have said over the years is now grounded in some very effective teaching, although the formulaic approach is to be discouraged when preparing candidates (see above). Most candidates knew what they were supposed to do, though they were often either too bound by a rigid formula, misinterpreted the sources, failed to see what was there or, particularly in this series, lacked a sound historical and contextual background. Their history was uncertain or at worst unsound. This was compounded by some serious misreading or misunderstanding of the sources.

Most candidates ranged between 40–75 marks, mainly achieving within levels III and IV. It was disappointing that more failed to reach L2 than in the summer series and most found it difficult to get into the higher 70s, 80s and 90s. Answers and standards were comparable across all four components, although it was felt that the weaknesses alluded to above were especially evident on F963 02. Marks overall were lower on this component and examiner reports stressed the lack of knowledge, context and historical understanding of the topics.

There remains much description and referencing (Levels III and IV) with provenance tagged on in a discrete manner. It is important that the provenance is tied into the evaluation of an interpretation and not just commented on in isolation. It has to work to answer the question. It is noticeable that most candidates will discuss provenance discretely, raising issues of reliability, or utility without any attempt to relate this to an argument for or against the key issue. It remains an isolated and undigested goblet of information that does nothing to move an argument forward. It was also disappointing that many in the middle and top ends preferred to argue their points by source reference and well used stand-alone own knowledge. They knew that they had to evaluate but preferred to do so in 'bolt-on' and discrete sections that did little or nothing to aid the argument on in relation to the question.

Candidates still seem careless of the content of the sources. Some indeed hardly refer to it at all, so anxious are they to move into provenance. Content, what the sources actually say, is vital, although there are no marks for describing this or, at worst, paraphrasing them. It is the content that is the tool for everything else – to compare, to assess and to probe in terms of provenance and utility to the question. Candidates need to remember that there are two key things in terms of content – to establish the **main thrust** of the sources view or argument and to **check the detail** for important caveats or nuances. Poorly understood quotes were often substituted for meaningful comment on content.

There was much evidence of careless reading, both of the sources and the questions. This series, as before, the main fault in reading the question lay with Q(a) where candidates miss the final part – 'as evidence for...' and thus compare generally. It is less of a problem with Q(b) although most will, at some point, drift from the focus of the question as they grapple with individual sources instead of comparing them in relation to the question for a particular view **at every point**. The most effective answers are based on a careful reading of the sources and their introductions and attributions. On Q1 of F963 02 many missed the steer which pointed to the first peaceful Spa meeting and assumed the source was referring to the second violent meeting, in part the context for the second source. On F964 01, Q2, most referred to the Venetian ambassador in Rome as though he was a Papal ambassador. On F963 01 Q3 candidates became very muddled over the figures and the areas referred to on the financing of the two sides in the Civil War whilst on F964 02 in Q4 candidates missed the distinction in the question about pressures outside Germany (From the USA, the USSR and its satellites) and from inside Germany (the DDR and the FRG). Without attention to this, their arguments became muddled. The extra information in the introductions aids candidates in accessing the question but many did not read the Sources carefully or their introductions and attributions. Some seemed to expect to pick up a general impression of what the sources say almost by osmosis, spurning links by quoting without comment, as though each source 'speaks for itself'. Far too many had little or no knowledge and did not understand one or more of the sources, grasping only the basics of content or provenance. Candidates added irrelevant knowledge separately or in chunks with little attempt to integrate. Provenance is still often listed at the end of answers with little or no attempt to use it as part of an evaluated argument.

It is hoped that teachers use the mark scheme with their candidates, perhaps in watered down form. Familiarity with its terms, skills and concepts will assist in delivering the skills that are rewarded. The errors which occur tend to be those that have always marred responses. Centres are again reminded to refresh themselves with what is expected in these units and to incorporate it in their teaching. It is particularly important to use, compare and group sources as part of the teaching process in order to accustom candidates to handling material in this way. There are now sources dating back to 2000 on most of the topics (only the questions have changed) – 25 topics have been set using 4–5 sources each. In effect there are over 100 sources available to practise on in the classroom for each topic, a terrific resource and teaching tool. These can be set formally or be used in discussion – Can you spot the main thrust? How best can its view be explained? What is the vital context? How might it be confirmed or questioned by what has just been covered? How does it differ, and why, from another source? One can focus on particular aspects – purpose, audience, authorship, dates, contexts etc. But please – always relate these skills to the overarching issue and question.

Q(a) The Comparison of Two Sources as Evidence.

This is now done more effectively than in the past and fewer seemed to compare the wrong sources (or all five!). It is now a weaker minority that offer a general sequential analysis, often without considering the question, although the latter is still, alas, frequent. In these cases there seemed to be a sudden realisation, halfway through the answer, that the question named a particular issue and that they needed to identify points of agreement and disagreement on it. A plan might be helpful here. A minority had 'wish-lists' of limitations, and some substituted poorly understood quotes for meaningful comments. The least skilled wrote thin paraphrases or descriptions or massively over-quoted. Some had very little sense of the historical context to explain significance, for example on the Vendee Revolts in Q1 of F964 02 (French Revolution), on the two Spa Fields meetings in Q1 of F963 02 (Condition of England) or the Tudor employment Acts in F963 01 (The Mid Tudor Crisis)). In Q(a) as well as Q(b), lower level answers referenced sources for information, within a general explanation or narrative.

It is worth remembering that the question asks the candidate to compare two sources '**as evidence**'. This means assess them in relation to each other, not extract information from them about the focus of the question. Equally, a *general* analysis is not what is required. There should be links to and focus on the key issue in the question. Candidates often ignore this and would be well advised to highlight it on the paper as an aide-memoire. Many simply compare content and provenance regardless of the issue. For example on Q4 on Germany in F964 02 many simply wrote generally about Western interference, missing that the question's focus was on the situation in Germany in 1961. On F963 02, Q3, on England in a New Century, many wrote about the Labour party in general rather than examine their attitudes to unemployment in two very different sets of circumstances. It should also be a matter for practice in the classroom that the judgement reached should be about the Sources as evidence, not about the key issue. It needs judgement about which of the two Sources provides the better evidence on the issue and an explanation of why.

In both questions the commonest mistake is in the use of phrases such as 'this shows us that', which is neither a comparative nor an analytical approach to the sources. Some candidates seem to think that to use the sources illustratively to support a view is what is required, on the grounds that they are explaining the utility of the source, saying 'Source A is useful, it shows us that...' In Q(a) this leads them away from the comparative issues towards sequencing. In Q(b) it leads to a general answer in which the sources are used to illustrate 'knowledge' points rather than as the central body of material for evaluation. It is important to consider the skills we reward and how to work with candidates on these.

The following points in the 'comparison' answer need careful consideration.

- There are **no** marks for extraneous knowledge, only for bedding a source in its context. Credit is given for demonstrating a concise and clear understanding of the **context** of an issue (for example) and of any **concepts** involved. What is required is a light touch, a sub-clausal reference or at most one or two sentences.
- Many candidates simply focus on the topic, such as parliamentary reform or Tudor rebels, instead of the **specific issue**, attitudes towards the reform of parliament or the way in which governments sought to discredit rebels.
- They refer to the sources to extract information for a general answer to the topic, rather than **comparing them as evidence** for a key issue. The consequence is a sequenced approach, a level 4.
- Many candidates, at some point in their answer, resort to randomly juxtaposing dissimilar points. They do not **compare like with like** or point out that one source may make a point which is absent from the other.
- Some are satisfied with **basic or undeveloped cross references**, often losing the question in the process.

- **Judgement** is often asserted at the end. It must arise from an evaluation of the quality of the content, either throughout or in a developed concluding paragraph. A failure to judge will confine a candidate to level III and below. Also **Judgement is all too frequently on the issue itself**, rather than on the evidence for it (see above).
- It is vital that candidates **identify the relevant issues** arising in the two sources and use these as their comparative focus. Failure to do so leads to description, paraphrase or, at worst, copying out what is there, word for word. Candidates need to spot the similarities and differences in the detail of the sources.
- The **analysis and evaluation of two sources as evidence** has the higher mark weighting.
- A **formulaic approach** often diverts the candidate from both the issue in the question (and the appropriate content) and from the need to compare provenance, integrating it into an explanation of similarity and difference and arriving at developed judgement. **The damage done by a formulaic approach cannot be emphasised enough.** (See the introduction for some examples from this series.) Candidates desperately seek qualities on their 'list' that are simply not there or are of minor or tangential significance. For example, a paragraph may be added on 'completeness' which turns into a wish list of sources that were not used in the comparison. Whole paragraphs are devoted to authenticity. Generic comments on reliability and utility are made without any reference to the content and nature of the specific sources supposedly under discussion. Although this is less frequent than in recent series it continues to crop up in many guises and can be a whole Centre feature, suggesting the possibility that advice given to candidates may be inappropriate. If you are reading this report and recognise this as the sort of advice and technique you recommend to students please revise your advice in the light of the above.
- The key to an effective comparison of provenance is to **ask questions about the authors, their likely purpose, the different audiences and their respective tone.** For example, many candidates will devote whole sections of their answer to reliability. This leads them to discrete comment. For historians, all evidence can be used. Issues such as reliability are factored in and only then are conclusions drawn from it. It is a part of considering purpose, tone and audience. Simply to comment in isolation on reliability is not evaluation, only a relatively minor part of it. Many ignore or simply fail to use the introductions and attributions. These contain vital information to support an understanding of source content.
- **Sequencing comments on provenance and dealing with them separately is not the most effective way.** A separation will often work but more effective candidates will integrate them in a holistic approach. Most however, having compared content, are then quite happy to comment discretely on authorship, tone or purpose. Without effective comparison on this they find an informed judgement much more difficult.
- Candidates will often take sources at **face value.** They need to probe.
- **Misinterpretation of the Sources** still occurs at every level. **Candidates need to read the material very carefully.** It should ring bells in terms of their own understanding of an issue. Often this is simply carelessness. The sources are fairly short but have been edited to contain real historical 'meat'. The language and points made need both careful consideration and cross referencing, which can only be achieved by attention to detail. Again this is something to practise using past sources as and when the topics are encountered in the classroom. A good example of missing important detail came in Q4 on F963 02, Churchill, where in Source D there was a reference, which only a few picked up, to inheriting a devastated land, a possible motive for a change in strategy that was not necessarily linked to post Dresden guilt. There is much **assertion.** Candidates claim that something is useful or reliable, or biased **without explanation, development or example.**

Much 'stock' comment is a result. A new variant on this is to argue that a source is limited because it only gives one point of view. One will use balance as a means of assessing the view in a modern historian and it might be relevant to comment on a particular slant but most contemporary sources will be partisan to a greater or lesser extent.

Q(b) Assessing an Interpretation through an evaluation of the evidence in the Sources.

Most now plan and many try to sustain a clearly structured answer, reasonably focused on the question. Many have some argument, albeit of varying quality and endeavour to reach a judgement of sorts, but often on the topic rather than the sources. Most know to attempt a grouping based on the assertion in the question but, unfortunately, having done the difficult bit, they then still proceed sequentially, usually in two argumentative or more often generally descriptive halves. It is vital not just to pay lip service to the grouping in the introduction. There is then a discussion of each source, entirely discrete and often descriptive, and then a bolt-on section where the provenance of each is discussed, again discretely. No attempt is made **to relate the provenance to provide a relative weighting for the respective views or to answer the question**. This divorces the material from the key issue and prevents candidates from integrating their points into any wider discussion of an interpretation. They fail to make the appropriate links. Candidates need to **sustain their grouping by linking and cross referencing within it**, establishing why two or three sources contribute via their content to a particular interpretation or to challenge it and their relative merits as evidence. Thus, instead of arguing that A and C support the view and then proceeding to discuss A in one paragraph and C in the next, they would be better advised to select the issues both raise in support or point to different ones. That way they cross reference and think about the key issues. They need to consider this more in terms of their answer to a part (a) question – that is to compare and contrast sources they deem to support the issues, remembering that many sources are capable of supporting different views depending on certain phrases or provenance. It is also far better to integrate issues of provenance (authorship, purpose and audience) into this rather than separate them out into a later bolt-on section. It establishes the relative weight to be given to the evidence of a group of sources. It is, perhaps, instinctive for candidates to proceed source by source, even within an established grouping, but they need to bear in mind the need to **compare within and across their grouping** at key points. This needs to be done both in terms of the content and the provenance, which may affect the relative weighting given to their points. Unfortunately some candidates still prefer to write general essays about the topic, either for most (rarely) or for part (usually) of their answers. Others simply quote from the sources, sometimes quite heavily. The sources need interpreting with comments. They must not be allowed to speak for themselves – they don't! That is the candidate's task!

The following points in the 'interpretation' answer need careful consideration.

- Candidates are frequently puzzled by how to use 'knowledge' or context. A few candidates **simply wrote an answer based on their knowledge**, with the sources used for illustration or reference. Some implicitly referred to or quoted Source content to create a general narrative about the topic. Others knew that they needed to keep the focus on the sources, so dealt with this requirement by **bolting on their own knowledge**, either at the end, or scattered through the answer. In many cases candidates seemed to have little beyond a **general contextual underpinning**. They confined their comments to what was in front of them. This was either because their knowledge was unconsolidated or because they lacked it. In some cases it was simply inappropriate and led the candidate away from the focus of the question.
- It is important to realise what is the **role of knowledge in this question**. It is there as a *means of evaluating the sources, extending, confirming or questioning what they say*. It is **particularly important in evaluation**. Selection and use of the most appropriate evidence in evaluating the Sources *for the key issue* is the key to a high level mark for AO1a and AO1b. Many candidates in practice use limited evidence, often preferring to drift irrelevantly outside the key issue or the dates of a question. Knowledge can only be credited if it informs the use of the sources. Many candidates miss key opportunities for **evaluating views within the Sources by use of knowledge** because of this. It resulted in a lack of balance, where candidates rarely spotted the counter-arguments within the Sources. **Knowledge** needs to be selected for its relevance and pertinent use in

integration into the argument – and there were some excellent answers which did achieve this with clarity and control.

- Candidates need to **explain, develop, use and cross reference** the points for or against a particular interpretation in the sources. In so doing they will analyse the material to answer the question and arrive at a well thought through, and argued, judgement. Many manage to do this only through a discrete discussion of the content of an individual source. Thus, often effective points are made in isolation from the question and argument.
- Many answers **drifted out of focus on the key issue** in the question. The sharpness of focus was highly significant in marking out the best answers. Candidates would latch onto a preferred 'big' issue, often tangential, and analyse the sources generally. They were drawn away from the question or key issue.
- **The structure of the argument** was often seriously flawed. Many answers were in two halves with the judgement effectively being just a summary of what had gone before. Some made no attempt to drive the answer using sources, so it became an essay with brief nods to the Sources by letter only, often in brackets.
- **Judgements and conclusions were often divorced from the sources.** Even candidates who had attempted a reasonable source focus suddenly forgot that they were **assessing them as evidence** in their judgements. Instead they resorted to **knowledge points on the issue in general**. The answer would become topic based rather than what the sources have to say about a particular issue. Conclusions which make no reference to the sources are not answering the question 'assess how far the sources support...' Often some better answers **lost sight of the Sources in the final page or so**, meaning that the conclusion and judgement were limited, undermining synthesis.
- Candidates need to **spot the main thrust of argument or view in a source**. All too often they pick on a minor phrase and mistakenly make it central to their case or they allow their knowledge to overwhelm it. Having spotted the thrust, they then need to analyse and integrate content and provenance for *use* in argument, rather than just describe them.
- Candidates must *use* Sources for the question, rather than copying out their content sequentially, or paraphrasing their general gist whilst noting their author and date by simply copying the introduction or attribution.
- Sources need to be judged beyond *face value*, in the light of their context, purpose or audience. Many candidates are often surprisingly naive in this respect.
- Comments on provenance need to be meaningful and linked to the use of source content.
- **Formulaic answers and 'limitation' wish-lists are to be avoided.**
- Candidates should always consider the view in the question first, and balance it with one or more alternative views, driven by the sources.
- Making an **interim judgement** on how convincing a group of sources are, supported by your analysis and evaluation, is good practice before moving on to the opposing group
- Candidates should avoid paragraphs of bolted on knowledge starting 'From my own knowledge I know.....'
- They should integrate sources into Q(b) conclusion and judgement to 'assess how far the sources support the interpretation' – a purely knowledge-based judgement cannot answer the question (see above).
- **The lack of evaluation** was often a key reason for underperformance. Candidates used to confine their discussions on provenance to Q(a). They now know this is crucial on Q(b), but their approach is to do so **discretely**, failing to link their discussions to the grouping and the key issue in the question. Having fallen down on analytical skills in AO1b they compound this by **failing to evaluate the source's relative contribution to the debate**. This confines them to Level 3 and below. They cannot access Levels 1 and 2 unless the source is given relative 'value' in its contribution to the question. Evaluation is best achieved as part of the grouping, either within it, in terms of establishing relative importance, or as part of the grouping. It should always be related to establishing its value in relation to the question.

- By tackling the sources **sequentially and discretely** they inevitably move into Levels IV and below. It prevents them making the necessary links within and between sources, and with the question. Most will have a reasonable focus with some analysis and some provenance and are thus Level 3. If they can evaluate a source and relate it to the key issue and question they will move into Level 2 and above.
- Weaker candidates will often simply **describe the introductions and attributions**, as if this constitutes evaluation. It does not.
- At **Level 5 and below** there were those answers with Source content blatantly copied out sequentially, with merely an uninformative, often repetitive, assertion in relation to the topic rather than the key issue.
- Many low level answers expressed **general comments about the topic** rather than focusing on the question itself or analysing the detail of the Sources. At the lower levels, several answers stated that the author 'had an agenda' without elaborating. However at the highest levels there were some perceptive answers with an impressive awareness of detail and the use of well chosen evidence in evaluation of provenance as well as content. Other able candidates lost marks for using sources at face value and not considering their provenance, reliability or use.
- **Synthesis** is about bringing together all the above skills. In particular this is where we reward not so much the knowledge used per se but its integration and relative balance (unevenness and then imbalance).
- Fewer candidates now seem not to realise the need to group Sources for analysis according to their view in order to create an argument of two or more sides for the 'assess how far' element. However some still seem to think that, as the question begins with 'use your own knowledge', they should begin 'essay style' instead of using the Sources to drive their answers to Q(b). Thus they will underachieve on AO2b by failing to achieve sufficient synthesis.
- Only a few responses **failed to find more than one view** in the Sources.
- And finally there were many examples of **weak or unclear English** and some inappropriate use of slang, or of terms that were anachronistic in their use. Sometimes there were unintelligible, 'made-up' words. 'Bias' seems to have reappeared. Informal language is inappropriate in an examination.

Candidates would be well advised to

- 1 **read the sources with care** in relation to the question.
- 2 **plan** using grouping; **cross referencing** those sources that can support two or more views. A structured argument is one of the keys to an effective answer.
- 3 then **assess the value of their grouping** (evaluation), building in any relevant knowledge at this point. Content, provenance and knowledge will then enable an evaluation of the linked sources to occur. It is important that there is a specific and applied approach to using historical knowledge rather than the broader brush. The grouping needs to be according to view for the sides of an argument rather than for undeveloped cross reference that loses sight of the question.
- 4 use pertinent **evidence within the date range of the question**, not from the broader topic.
- 5 **not rush into writing** everything in an 'ad hoc' manner. A more concise, reasoned and considered answer is usually more convincing. Thinking about a judgement and conclusion before starting to write and planning accordingly is very important.
- 6 remember that a judgement on the value of the sources as evidence, whether here or in Q(a), needs **support** to be convincing. It cannot suddenly be asserted or come out of the blue.

Teachers should take note of the following strengths and weaknesses this series in terms of the two assessment targets, A01 and A02

A01: Use of knowledge, clarity of expression; structure, analysis, evaluation, judgement.

Positive points:

- Most planned and tried to sustain a clearly-structured answer for Q(b)
- Many did try to focus on the question and answer it
- Most had an argument, albeit of varying quality, and most created an argument of two or more sides for Q(b)
- Many did try to reach a judgement of sorts – but often on the topic or issue rather than the sources as a collection (which is what they are asked to do)
- Many eagerly explored every angle that occurred to them
- A few had a range and depth of pertinent detailed knowledge to use for evaluation

Points to work on:

- Understand the requirements of the question and the key issue (see above)
- Avoid rushing into writing everything you know ‘ad hoc’ – a concise, reasoned, considered answer is more convincing – see ‘Instructions to Candidates’ on the front of the examination paper!
- Planning, structure and coherence are vital for comparison in Q(a) and argument in Q(b)
- ‘Purpose’ is a useful way into evaluating for the question and will focus a candidate on the right questions.
- Use relevant evidence within the date range of the question, not from the broader topic, unless it is of relevance.
- Use a ‘specific, applied’ approach to historical knowledge rather than ‘broad brush’ and bolt-on. Knowledge needs to flow from and add to the source. It should not divert into something tangential.
- Judgement, on the value of the sources as evidence, needs *support* to be convincing.

A02: Skills of Source analysis and evaluation; synthesis of grouped Sources with relevant knowledge in evaluation of the interpretation.

Positive points:

- Very few this series compared the wrong sources in Q(a)
- Most attempted to use provenance as well as content
- Most did use the grouped sources to drive their answers to Q(b), and did not put their knowledge first
- Most did attempt to group the sources in Q(b), with varied success, but many still in effect sequenced their subsequent approach.
- Most did try to *use* the sources as well as they could, if only as quotes (they need comments)

Points to work on:

- Subtleties in the sources were often not explored. They need a good attention to detail.
- Avoid writing essays about the topic with brief nods to the Sources by letter or in brackets. This prevents evaluation of the sources ‘as evidence’ for the question.
- Quote full phrases, not just *part* quotes (which can distort), and explain them rather than letting them ‘speak for themselves’. Do not copy out whole chunks!
- Analyse and *use* integrated content and provenance for argument, do not just describe.

- Use Sources for the question, rather than copying out their content sequentially, or paraphrasing their general gist and noting their author and date.
- Judge sources beyond *face value*, in the light of context, purpose, audience, tone, typicality, and remember that not all of these will apply to all the sources. Sometimes the key is the date. At other times it will be tone or typicality.
- Try to make meaningful comments on provenance and **link provenance to content**.
- Avoid formulaic answers and 'limitation' wish-lists, such as 'letters from peasants' or simply 'people' and especially the desire to include the whole of the PRO.
- In Q(b) always first consider the interpretation in the question; only then use grouped or cross-referenced sources to develop other alternative views to balance the argument.
- Make an interim judgement on how convincing a group of sources are, supported by analysis and evaluation, before moving on to the opposing group
- Avoid paragraphs of bolted on knowledge starting 'From my own knowledge I know. . .' – a purely knowledge-based judgement cannot answer the question.

Unit F963 01

Comments on Individual Questions

The Normans in England 1066–1100

There was one complaint received about this question – that there was a lack of clarity over which King, William I or William II, was being referred to.

- Q1(a)** This question proved accessible for most although it was easy to slip into describing and juxtaposing. Better answers linked concepts effectively and used some knowledge to develop content in light of provenance. Most lacked the knowledge to explain significance. Most found a judgement difficult, as the question asked them to use the sources 'as evidence of invasions of the land borders', and both sources were valid. The key to success here was to assess the authors of the sources in relation to what they had to say. Both were Churchmen and clearly disapproved of the land invasions. Florence of Worcester invokes God against Malcolm but he also comments on the destruction of William's ships. Although no comment was made on this fact, it might be inferred that Florence did not like William and also saw him as labouring under God's disapproval. Henry of Huntingdon, from the vantage point of a strong reign, comments with clear English disapproval of the Welsh. Both provide effective evidence of invasions. When many candidates had compared the invasions they did not know which aspect to use to support a judgement. The phrase 'God would not allow it' was used by some in evaluation, but often unconvincingly.
- Q1(b)** Most candidates found the grouping reasonably easy to establish given that Sources A and B were sea invasions and C, D and E land ones. The challenge came in assessing which constituted the greater threat to the two Williams. Effective responses stressed that Sources A and C, invasions from Swein and Cnut, were intending to seize the throne and thus the whole kingdom, whereas Malcolm and the Welsh were either seeking expansion (Malcolm) or were defending themselves through attack and raids (the Welsh). The latter were opportunistic; the former were the sort of thing that William I himself had done and were thus more serious. Less effective answers tried to proceed reign by reign, chronologically. The sources were already grouped on the paper, by reign, with the exception of the modern Source E which looked holistically at the whole period of the first two kings. Many responses followed a rather sequenced argument. Few candidates had much knowledge to evaluate the sources except the Harrying of the North. Some failed to use the useful difference in approach of William I to the sea invasions. In 1069 he appeared less worried, which may suggest that this particular invasion was less threatening, although another interpretation would be that he was caught on the hop and Orderic was using his response to downplay any threat to the new

regime. In contrast Source B refers to very serious and damaging measures, although the ASC may well have been making an English point here. There was some confusion about how many times Malcolm invaded when cross-referencing C with E and such differences were unconvincingly seen as source limitations. There were some inaccurate comments on the nature of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle and the nationality of Orderic Vitalis, who suddenly became French.

Mid-Tudor Crises 1536–1569

Q2(a) A surprising number of candidates made little comment about the detail of the sources, including B, which better responses explored in some detail. It was surprising how many discussed E without mentioning apprenticeships, but weaker candidates only spotted the reference to farming and presumably did not read the attribution or the gloss on the paper. A rather large number ignored the key issue of 'dealing with unemployment'. Amongst the common errors were that Somerset was said to have 'proclaimed' B, so E was the more reliable, as the people were represented in Parliament giving it wider support and validity. They were both Acts. Many used the introduction to B, concerning its repeal, but few tried to explain this, for the most part explanation was inaccurate. In both sources many claimed that the unemployed were punished in a similar fashion, when in fact there was a considerable difference between 'slavery' and prison'. Again candidates need to take care with their reading, as imprisonment in E was not a general punishment, only for servants improperly leaving their master's employ and briefly for employers paying over the odds. The context of both sources was stated as a time of economic crisis when this was much less so in E (1563). E was stated to have been a reaction to B, despite being 16 years apart. Slavery was occasionally stated to be the same as an apprenticeship. Judgement was most often in favour of E because B was repealed, as stated in its introduction – a fair point but only if developed as a more wide ranging measure built on the experience of the previous decades.

Q2(b) Most created at least a basic argument of two sides, seeing the alternative to the greed of the rich as the idleness of the unemployed. Very few responses were seen that focused on both key terms of the question (unemployment and its consequences), but these had strong arguments. Most had some knowledge of context, but it often stood in a discrete section of narrative. Although the only point used from Source D was often 'wars' and sickness', few knew of wars against Scots and French or of epidemics of influenza and sweating sickness. Instead some inferred that this meant Ket's Rebellion (war) and some stated that the unemployed *caused* sickness and war, which was a touch harsh. Many were unsure how to use Source D or from where it came. It was mostly taken to mean a mass of poor Londoners, when in fact it was from the wealthier merchant and legal classes. It provided interesting evidence that efforts should be made to tackle unemployment and it implicitly blamed former City authorities for not doing enough and government. The author of Source A was stated to be biased because he was unemployed and poor, despite writing a letter to the king. Some saw the view in A to mean that lords were making it difficult for poor men to buy houses, when the reference was to enclosure and engrossing and high entry fees. Many did not spot that both Source A contained evidence to condemn rich men and also that Henry had passed some good laws on vagrancy, although the provenance here might suggest why the comment contained such views. Only a few candidates mentioned the Dissolution of the Monasteries in A and C or knew the significance of 'Commonwealth' writers for C. Some saw the clergy as the ruling classes, but dismissed C without comment except that, as a poem rather than an official document, it was obviously unreliable and of little historical use. Common mistakes were to change the question to the effectiveness or otherwise of government on unemployment (and the economy in general). Such responses argued on blame for ineffective laws and praised Elizabeth as a friend to the poor, unlike Somerset and Henry. There was little mention of trade in discussion of E, except for a few who knew of the collapse of the Antwerp cloth market.

The English Civil War and Interregnum 1637–60

- Q3(a)** There were many points of cross-reference within the sources on the management of local revenue. Some responses depended on statistics for their comparison, but missed 'a month' in A and 'weekly' in B, so the point was mistakenly made. Few noticed that whereas A referred to one county (some were muddled here as to whether it was the city of Worcester or the county), in B three counties grouped their resources. Few recognised the difference between local and central control in the management of funds, and there were some odd interpretations of 'democratic' systems, missing the control of the gentry in both cases (JPs in Source A; Committees and Treasurers in Source B – in effect the same type of person). Many misread the steer in Source A and stated that the contribution tax was like ship money, rather than seeing the point that the existing officials were used to collect both. Many misread the introduction to Source B and stated that Parliament demanded £10,000 from the 3 counties, rather than from London. Only a minority noticed the important point about delinquents and papists in B providing additional revenue for parliament. (There were no such fines mentioned by the King in Source A.) Some candidates were at pains to point out that the King was more autocratic in A, missing the very similar forms of gentry control used by both and the King's concern to use more traditional and familiar forms of revenue collection. This tended to distort judgement.
- Q3(b)** Generally, this proved an accessible question and some candidates managed to consider 'organised' and some version of 'ruthless'. Others focused more on 'organised' and rather forgot about the 'ruthless' part of the question. More effective responses had their arguments structured using a logical sequence of views – 'Parliament was more organised'; 'Royalists also organised'; 'Royalists less organised as war progressed'; 'Parliament ruthless'; 'Royalists divided, corrupt or inefficient'; 'Rupert a loose cannon'. When these arguments were well supported by sources analysis and evaluation and solid, well integrated knowledge, some really excellent answers were seen. However, weaker responses included mostly irrelevant or very general context and showed misunderstanding of the thrust of Sources C and D. Some stated that Leveson in Source C acted ruthlessly against royalists as a parliamentarian, when it was clear that he was simply acting ruthlessly on behalf of the royalists and had come into conflict with the local gentlemen on the Commission responsible for raising royal revenue in Staffordshire. Many stated that the King himself had taken the actions rather than his royalist officials, and some saw the purpose of A as propaganda, with the King demanding money from parliament-held areas. Most managed to cross-reference B with E, but only the very best set this in the context of events of the war and evaluated Davenport's status as 'neutral' in the light of his attendance at the Commission of Array. Many could not see that Source E provided evidence of both royalist and parliamentarian ruthlessness, as Davenport is the victim of both sides, although parliament seems the more efficient in gaining his goods than the more random Prince Rupert.

Unit F963 02

Comments on Individual Questions

The Condition of England 1815–1853.

Q1(a) This was reasonably well answered in that candidates seemed aware of both Hunt and Cobbett, with attributions used more successfully than in other questions, though there was much confusion in Source A over which Spa Fields Meeting was being referred to, despite the guidance in the introduction ‘to the first, peaceful’ meeting, and so a lot more unnecessary information ensued. Many candidates assumed it was about the second, more violent meeting hijacked by Spenceans and ending in a drunken riot. This then often ensured that they missed the fact that Cobbett was writing after the second meeting and clearly was keen to keep radical methods non violent in the wake of a government that used the second Spa Fields Meeting to clamp down. It would seem that candidates knew of only one Spa Fields Meeting. Most candidates spotted that both sources stressed peaceful methods but that Hunt did not rule out the use of force. They were also able to spot his ambiguous phrasing here, although few developed it. The main failing was not to focus sufficiently upon the key issue – radical methods, both sources themselves being examples – press reports, publicity and the open meeting. Source B allowed candidates to embark on detail about the ‘Weekly Political Register’, often inaccurate. Differences of language or tone were only rarely picked up in dealing with ‘differences’ or provenance of dates and geography.

Q1(b) There were grouping problems here for some. More successful responses stressed divisions in Sources A, B and especially D, countered by unity in E (or over ambition in terms of aims) and government repression in C. Source C, important for the counter argument, was underused, despite the help provided on the paper. There was insufficient knowledge about government action, with much confusion between the Gagging Acts of 1817 and the Six Acts of 1819. There was not much knowledge shown of the basic differences between the various radical groups. Source D proved difficult for some, Hazlitt obviously being less well known, but candidates were told that he was a literary and radical journalist and they could have done something with this provenance. It was clear from his comments that he considered the radical leadership arrogant and divided but some responses showed a clear misunderstanding over his vocabulary. Bamford in Source E also proved tricky for a minority who did not know how to use his much later evidence as to radical organisation and aims. Writing at the height of Chartism, he is likely to stress ambitious aims and national organisation, which candidates could challenge or use to reject the questions assertion of division. Candidates were often confused about the sequence of relevant events between 1816 and 1819 and a minority became confused with the Chartists of the 1830s and 1840s, with some concerned to discuss the distinctions between pre-Chartists and Chartists, which were not relevant here.

The Age of Gladstone and Disraeli 1865–1886

Q2(a) Most candidates compared the sources, although a significant minority preferred to sequence their responses. They seemed uncertain of the precise context – the Midlothian campaign and the General Election of 1880. The similarities were the power of Gladstone’s oratory, both using similar language to describe it, but a certain lack of reason (The Times in B stressing lack of considered argument and Watson in C ‘ecstasy beyond reason’). Candidates were better at stressing the differences, particularly in the impact, although few picked up that Watson was not necessarily uncritical. He sought to analyse his reaction to Gladstone’s campaigns. Few analysed The Times’ view that Gladstone would have no impact on the thoughtful classes. Such a view, if context was used, would be seen as mistaken, missing the point in C that Gladstone empowered his audience, who would vote accordingly.

Q2(b) Most managed a reasonable debate here, using the sources to illustrate their points rather than evaluating them, and most realised that the alternative view was that the campaign was used to advance Gladstone's political ambitions – to come back as Liberal leader and PM. This was especially true in Sources B and particularly E, although a careful reading of the other sources would also reveal hints of ambition and leadership. The moral argument was in C and D and, by implication (Gladstone rejects the idea of coming back), in A. There were a few essays about British Foreign Policy which moved in and out of relevance and tended to use the sources only for occasional reference (and often included Gladstone's later policies for good measure). The source that proved hardest to grasp and use was Source A, perhaps because of its explicit rejection of the possibility of a return and because it made no specific mention of foreign and imperial policy, despite the introduction stressing this as the context ('during the Midlothian campaign'). Nonetheless, most were able to use it at face value and on this level it worked as part of the debate. Few used the context – Bright's pressure on him to return – or spotted the last sentence about Gladstone's pleasure at the enthusiasm aroused and the impact on opinion, which could be taken as a nod to Bright that all was going well and that at that stage Gladstone did not want to muddy the waters by openly suggesting he resume the leadership. Some also handled Sources B and C poorly. Source B could be used in a variety of ways – to suggest that he was moral given the 'passionate temper' and The Times' view that the electorate would reject such an approach or the opposite if the 1880 election was brought into play. Similarly, Source C could be approached in the same way – evidence for moral passion but also that Gladstone was highly political – 'I voted for him at the election'. Only a few candidates seemed to know about Gladstone's refusal to serve in a subordinate capacity after the 1880 election, in direct contrast to his statement in Source A but in conformity to the comment in Source E. In Source D several responses showed misunderstanding of the reference to Disraeli's sympathy with the Turks.

England and a New Century 1900–1924

Q3(a) Although most seemed not to have come across the Poplar rates rebellion in 1921, they managed to produce a reasonable comparison of provenance, although more tended to neglect content. Generally differences between Documents B and D were dealt with well, despite some vocabulary problems in Source B (the imagery of teeth and claws). Nonetheless, Source B was used more effectively than Source D, where few noticed that Lansbury was talking about local government. Hardly any candidate knew that Lansbury was on the left of the party but, as a future leader, saw him as a typical middle of the road Labour Party member. (This also affected the way candidates dealt with him in Q(b)). Some wrestled with finding a range of comparison, preferring a focus on one single point (indifference in B; activism in C) and they would have done better to focus on the key issue – Labour attitudes to the unemployed. Some struggled with the issue of rate equalisation, despite the gloss and the text. It was occasionally seen as Lansbury trying to withhold money from the unemployed rather than from the LCC. There was a common assumption that the parliamentary party and leadership were fully behind the rebellion, perhaps because they read that Lansbury was a future leader, but a more careful reading would tell them that at that stage he was a local politician and former mayor. The other main weakness here was the context of Source B, where few seemed to realise that Labour was linked to the Liberal Government by an electoral pact, hence Tillett's diatribe against a perceived liberal agenda for Labour MPs. Topically some thought they were in coalition with the Liberals.

Q3(b) Most managed a reasonable discussion of power versus principle for the Labour Party in the period 1900–1924. Most managed to group the sources into principle (A and D) and power (B, C and E), although there was much sequencing thereafter. Very few leavened their discussions with an awareness of the various groups within Labour – ILP, SDF, Fabians etc – and they were rather unfamiliar with Snowden, Tillet and Gallacher. Some had heard of Lansbury, a few more of Beatrice Webb, although her position was not fully understood or whether she was talking of the pre war or war period (made clear in the introduction). Source C (Beatrice Webb) proved the most difficult to evaluate, causing confusion over Webb's position and expressed views in the document, especially the criticism of MacDonald. The Radical element was not picked up in the context of the source and there was much misinterpretation of her comments on Keir Hardie. Source A also saw some linguistic and imagery problems – 'pasted slips on gates' and 'religious fervour'. It perplexed some as to the period under discussion but it was intended to refer to the earlier years of the party before the First WW. Better responses picked up on the chronology of the sources and developed an argument based around early (A) or local (D) principle versus the practicalities of power evident once they did deals with the Liberals and became a more sizable grouping of MPs after 1908 (B, C and E). In general there was a reluctance to use contextual knowledge after 1908, which proved difficult when it came to handling Source E, as few could talk of MacDonald's government, although most spotted that Gallacher was a Communist from the far left.

Churchill 1920–1945

Q4(a) Candidates had fewer problems here with content and provenance and did seem aware of historical context whichever level of response. Most managed to make something of the dates, although a large number simply stated the difference rather than making something of it, which was important given the strategic changes and imperatives of the war. In Source B, rather surprisingly, only some commented on tone and oratory. Precise comparison was lacking in many responses, with much sequencing. This question required a more precise comparison of Churchill's attitudes to bombing in the two sources than many managed – revenge; tonnage of bombing; the targets (Dusseldorf was industrial rather than civilian); defence; future problems (the 'ruined land'). Most commented well on different purposes and on the different audiences, both of which were of importance here. Much was included on the 'morality' of war and other themes, obviously taught to be included no matter what.

Q4(b) Again, rather surprisingly, many did not pick up on the central thrust of the question – the allegation of 'poor judgement' on Churchill's part. For some, however, this was an excuse to include much extraneous and irrelevant material on Churchillian errors across the entire period. Nonetheless, most managed to group the sources, seeing the argument for good judgement in A and B, poor judgement in C, D and E. More effective responses used the context to argue that this was an oversimplification and realised that Source D, crucial in many respects as a private memo by Churchill, could support both good and poor judgement depending on your view. In 1945 he was judging the bombing strategy to be played out but this did not mean that it had not had an effect. Most saw Source D as a straightforward admission of poor judgement. Few made much of Churchill's concern at taking over an 'utterly ruined land'. Most wanted to discuss whether the bombing of Dresden (the context for D) made Churchill a war criminal, which was not the focus of the question. Source E was of particular use, both in terms of content and provenance, yet few used it extensively. Indeed, it was frequently tagged on at the end of a response, mentioned almost in passing and for form's sake. This was a pity as it had much to say about the impact of the bombing from someone in a position to know and gave crucial information for those who had not realised it before on the distinction between targeted bombing, area bombing and terror bombing of whole cities and their civilian population. Some misinterpreted Source E altogether. Others simply rejected it on grounds of anti-British bias, missing his status as an historian and someone who had both served in the

war and worked later with Speer, the man responsible for dealing internally with the Allied bombing campaign. Very few picked up on his important distinction between Churchill and Harris. Those who knew something about Harris used this profitably when judging Churchill. Source C's provenance proved difficult for some (he was dismissed as an out of touch cleric by some; a few noticed his position; others rightly picked up on the steer which referred to his 'minority view'). Source A was also poorly handled by many but more effective responses used this well to establish the changing context of the war, particularly the importance of keeping Russia happy in lieu of a timetable for a Second Front from FDR and Churchill. Bombing was the alternative offered to a beleaguered USSR. Those who did not develop this simply saw Churchill (and FDR) as trigger-happy bombers. Some candidates seemed unwilling to commit and make a judgement. Much was included on the 'morality' of war and other themes, which tended to divert from the issue of Churchill's judgement. Given that the question was on Churchill's judgement, the weak standard of candidate judgement on his approach was of note.

F964/01 The First Crusade and the Crusader States 1073–1130

Q1(a) Effective responses focused on the key issue of 'the attitude of Alexius to the Crusaders', but many drifted into making general comparisons. Some compared Crusader attitudes towards Alexius rather than the other way around. There was some confusion about the subtleties of Alexius's reasons for failing to join the Crusade, and some confusion as to who the Germans and Hungarians were in relation to the Crusade. The basic points of mistrust, supply and absence from direct participation in the Crusade were usually seen, but some responses judged Alexius personally as selfish and greedy and took a very subjective view of his actions, undermining the credibility of their attempt to analyse the sources. Raymond of Aguilers was mistaken for Raymond of Toulouse on some occasions. Anna was generally considered too slanted in her views and therefore unreliable, but better responses balanced their evaluation of E and judged its utility to outweigh its subjectivity. There were some stock responses that dismissed Anna's evidence as too far distant to have any credibility. The similarity that was seldom recognised was that Alexius was actually willing to crusade. Another common error was that some candidates seemed to think that Alexius was willing to commit all his men and goods to Raymond rather than the other way around.

On provenance and context, it was a little disappointing how often candidates did not go beyond timing or the obvious prejudice of the authors to find evidence of some balance (in C) or credibility (in E).

Q1(b) Most responses managed to group the sources effectively, using Source A and elements of B, C and E for unity and B, C, D and E for disunity (both between the Frankish and Greek Christians and within the Franks). However there was also much sequencing following such a grouping. It was particularly noticeable just how little crossover there was with sources as responses firmly lodged them on one side of the argument or the other. Only the very best responses suggested there may be evidence on both sides in most or all sources, as indicated above. In starting with Source A, some responses irrelevantly drifted to a focus on the Appeal of Urban II and then to religious motives for going on crusade. Some candidates took a long time to recover from embarking on such familiar territory and had written essays on motives before looking back at the question. Better responses saw Source A as an appeal for support, used knowledge to confirm Christian unity and evaluated the limitations of A, but many used it irrelevantly. Relatively few perceived that the appeal in Source A had shown a lack of a unified response in the first place. A two-sided answer, as above, was accessible to most, but few discriminated between Western and Eastern Christians. Sections on divisions within the Crusaders sometimes led to a general and tangential narrative of Bohemond's activities and wider events. Control of evidence in support of the sources marked out the most focused of answers from those who wished to impart their often considerable knowledge with the Sources as referenced vehicles for this.

The German Reformation 1517–1555

- Q2(a)** The more effective responses focused clearly on ‘solutions’, and saw the changing context of the Sources as well as the narrowing of options. There was common confusion on the audience of A – many thought the Venetian ambassador was writing to the Pope. Some missed the fact that he was reporting on Charles V’s letter to the Pope and attributed the views to Foscari himself, judging that he had no power to do anything so D was better evidence as Charles V did. Source A was commonly taken at face value when candidates had no knowledge of the Habsburg-Valois Wars, though quite a few did. It was stated that Charles was weak because he had to depend on the Pope. Better candidates realised that Charles had French and Turkish challenges, so was unable to go to Germany and was attempting to shift responsibility on to Rome. Some excellent answers made the point that Charles still genuinely believed that reconciliation was possible before the failure of the Colloquy of Regensburg in 1541. The most effective responses compared the changing contexts of A with E. Some understood that a General Council had not long been convened at Trent at the time of E, written 22 years after A, and argued that Charles had lost any early opportunity to fight against the Lutherans, even though he would have preferred this option. By 1546 the truce with the Turks and the Peace of Crêpy with the French gave him an opportunity to follow his preferred course and a lull in the Italian Wars gave him the promise of significant Papal funding for his armies. In many cases responses missed opportunities when it came to similarities and differences and instead became involved immediately in explanations of what was happening in or around the respective years involved. As indicated above this was obviously important but should have been integrated more within the comparison. Most candidates could see the two main solutions (a Council and war) whilst better responses compared the role of the Pope in this (with some confusion as to his role in D – some wrongly saw it as pivotal – he was paying for it; others rightly spotted his more subordinate role in D).
- Q2(b)** There were some common misunderstandings here and candidates needed sound contextual knowledge to make sense of both the sources and the main lines of potential argument. Use of this tended to veer to the two extremes, with there not being enough to consolidate or question a line of argument or too much so that source content was merely used for reference within a narrative. As stated above, the provenance of A was not read carefully, and little was known of the Diet of 1530 in B, leading some to irrelevant discussions about Melancthon or the Edict of Worms. Campeggio’s report of advice given to Charles V at the Diet in Source B was not linked to C. The fact that A and B were both reports was not noticed. More perceptive responses showed awareness of the link between the provenance of D, a letter to Philip, and Charles’s fears for his son’s inheritance, the Netherlands, arguing that his purpose was to stress that war against the Lutherans was essential. The best responses argued the key issue well. Others struggled with their alternatives – the strength of the Lutherans (in B and D), especially the princes (including the wariness of the Catholic princes in C) and the response of the Church authorities (in A, B and E). More effective responses recognised the threats to Charles’s territories from the French and the Turks, using C with E and sometimes linking to the implications of a lull in the Italian Wars in D. A few linked this view with A, judging that the Italian Wars were the reason that it was impossible for Charles to go to Germany in 1524, some adding knowledge of the Battle of Pavia. Those who successfully linked these distractions to the key issue of preventing the Emperor from defeating Lutheranism often made a convincing argument. Some excellent answers evaluated whether Charles was ever realistic in hoping to defeat the Lutherans by force, citing the Battle of Mühlberg and its aftermath and linking to the content of E. However, only a few understood and developed Maurice of Saxony’s role or the combination of Catholic and Protestant princes with the French. Some argued this as the reason why Lutheranism was victorious in 1555, though several mentioned the Peace of Augsburg less relevantly. Such later knowledge was not required for the question, but made some arguments more

convincing. A logical line of argument led some effective answers as indicated above into the alternative view of Sources B and C for the role of the German Catholic princes in preventing Charles from defeating Lutheranism. There was sometimes good evaluation of the motives of the Catholic princes in refusing financial and military aid for Charles in 1530. Some argued that this was not only because of French and Turkish threats to the HRE, but because the princes feared the Emperor gaining power and the loss of their own power if their subjects chose the Lutheran side. More candidates linked B and C to the strength of Lutheranism as a factor, using references present in all the sources. However, when Luther himself was argued as a factor, this was much less convincing, especially if done after his death in 1546. Sometimes answers argued irrelevantly on Luther himself, who did not appear in the sources at all, using irrelevant early knowledge of indulgences, the printing press and the 95 Theses. A minority of candidates failed to mention the Pope as a foreign ruler.

F964 02

The Origins and the Course of the French Revolution 1774–1795

- Q1(a)** Candidates found the similarities easier than the differences and identified the latter mostly from what was included in only one of the Sources. The religious factors as a similarity were well understood and reasonably well developed. Many missed the key context of A – potential conscription into the revolutionary armies. Some candidates could not believe that B, coming from the wife of an aristocrat, could be sympathetic to peasants and so misunderstood it, disregarding the statement that the peasants were *brave*. Few candidates saw the key difference between A and B, that A was not against the Revolution per se nor necessarily wanted the King back, while B did. There were some stock evaluations of B (ie that it was written after the Revolution and therefore she would have forgotten things – self-evidently she had not, although it was legitimate to point to her particular slant, especially in relation to her husband). Some effective judgements were seen, particularly from those who did see A as more reliable as it was contemporary, was not extreme and did try to explain the peasants' position while B was aimed at 'glorifying' opposition to the revolutionaries and did use a rather dramatic turn of phrase.
- Q1(b)** Candidates mostly knew why France was divided but found it harder to make a full analysis of the Sources rather than a general essay on the subject that was used to offload information on the Terror, the Committee of Public Safety and Robespierre. As happens too often, the word *economic* confused some and they had difficulty disentangling the various reasons from this. Most could use C, and to a lesser extent E, to establish economic distress, but not many spotted its existence in A and B. This was despite having referred to it in their earlier response. An economic cause of social unrest was not handled well as a concept. Knowledge often outran Source use and the focus on 1793 became blurred. Chronology was not always accurate, with some wild variations on the date of Louis' execution. A surprisingly large number managed to forget religion (having discussed it in Q (a)) when it came to analysing division. Few latched on to the ideological differences advanced through D and, to a lesser extent, E. Indeed, very few saw Marat and Chaumette comments as reflecting an extreme anti-aristocrat ideological position that was intended to and did divide France. D particularly discriminated between effective responses and those whose grasp was less assured. Some perceptive responses took account of the rural provenance of A and B, in contrast to the Parisian focus of C, D and E, and observed that division was caused by a radical Parisian agenda that sought to use economic distress as a class weapon to advance revolution. Sources A and B, both provincial, were the reaction to these radical economic, political and religious agendas. The former were speeches and articles in popular and radical journals whose agenda was to arouse the people and ensure the radical grip on affairs. Sources A and B were declarations, and responses detailing revolt, and came from two different perspectives – peasant and local aristocrat.

The Unification of Italy 1815–70

Q2(a) Candidates appreciated that Southern Italy was hard to govern and handled the comparison reasonably well, as the general tone of the sources was similar with clear differences in detail. They were less strong on provenance with many getting no further than the information in the steers. Although most knew a little about the Brigands' War, they could not expand much on the specific problems posed. More tried to make a judgement, with the majority favouring B as the better evidence, since he was there and had obviously seen it for himself. He was in charge of the military in the South. Many were less impressive on d'Azeglio, in A, who was dismissed as theoretical and out of touch, many missing that he had been a former Piedmontese PM and was writing to a friend and fellow politician. They could not appreciate his quite perceptive stance on the South – Piedmontese principle and policy were clearly alien and unwelcome and should not be imposed by force if Italy was to be cohesive. A minority failed to pick up on Govone's purpose and audience, which might explain his hard line approach. Rather more failed to spot the similarities in diagnosis, despite the different emphasis and conclusions drawn from this.

Q2(b) Most candidates could argue that there was change over time to explain the different attitudes in the Sources on the prospects for unity in the 1860s. Most grouped the sources into those, like C and D, who thought unity possible (and B if full force was deployed in the South) and those, like A, B in part and E, who did not. Nearly all saw A as the prime source which felt prospects for unity were weak, although the more perceptive spotted that d'Azeglio did want unity and simply thought that force was not the way to achieve it. Most used B, C and D to show that there were obstacles, but that these could be overcome. These sources were optimistic, especially given their provenance. Some saw C as arguing that unification was unlikely, missing the significance of Garibaldi's final words – 'men of Destiny'. Source E was less well used, with candidates unable to distinguish between the power of church and state. They rightly argued that the Pope remained powerful and a bar to unification but missed that political, temporal, power now resided in the hands of Piedmont. More effective responses saw it as symbolising the lack of social/cultural union: in less effective answers it was used to say that unification had not happened, despite all political signs to the contrary. They backed this basic view up from the demeanour of the two figures: the Pope being stern and unbending and the King flexible and conciliatory. The provenance of E was variably assessed. Some saw it as reliable simply because it was a British source. Others saw it as unreliable because it was in Punch or because the British wanted Italian Unification. A surprising number reached the conclusion that chances of unification were not good whilst explaining that it had happened! More effective responses used the time differences in the sources, the sources' provenances and their own knowledge to argue that chances improved as the decade went on and that an unpromising first few years gradually led to success. The most effective also argued that unification in 1870 was still only partial – politically and geographically it had been achieved (if you discounted Nice); culturally and socially, no. Only a few were able to comment that the sources came from those who supported unity and that the opposing view needed to be inferred from what was said, particularly in A, C and E.

The Origins of the American Civil War 1820–1861

- Q3(a)** Most candidates made some sound comparisons and used both the steers and the attributions, although a surprising number strayed into a sequential response at some stage with some just purely A then B with a line or two to sum up. Source A was particularly prone to detailed description. Some were weak when it came to relating provenance to content. Some missed the reference in C to the indolence and lack of skill prevalent among slaves, but most picked it up. The general conclusion was that B was more reliable as an eye-witness who had experienced both forms of labour whilst C was arguing a case in a polemic of some sort with a pejorative title, although few spotted or used the latter. Others missed Parker's experiences in Virginia (B) altogether, an important omission in assessing the evidence of the two sources. As always there was much general evaluation based on North/South comment and some formulaic responses to provenance, especially in relation to tone. The reference to 'the slave shares the profits of the farm' in Source C created a problem for many candidates, who interpreted it to mean a monetary share rather than the general benefit accruing from a prosperous plantation. This re-appeared in part (b) responses. It was amazing how many candidates thought slaves were paid. Some candidates just did not read the texts closely enough, a failing more apparent in both parts of this question than in any of the other Units or topics – several thought that B indicated "how *much* a slave, or group of slaves would accomplish" (rather than how *little*) and that this therefore agreed with C.
- Q3(b)** This proved more challenging than part (a) as candidates found it harder to use both Sources A and E effectively and lacked relevant knowledge. Candidates knew about key events in the 1850s (from Missouri Compromise through to Lincoln's election) so they tried to tie these to the sources. For example, some claimed Source C was produced to affect events in Kansas-Nebraska; that Uncle Tom's Cabin had stimulated B to produce his attack on slavery etc. What was consistently lacking was any apparent understanding as to how slavery tied in with the Southern economy (despite the clues in Source A) or how North and South differed economically. Where candidates did look beyond political events, if only with a light touch, they tended to produce a more coherent and convincing answer.

The grouping was variable, as A was cited on both sides of the argument when clearly it provided better evidence for efficiency and profitability (these two strands to the question were frequently ignored, candidates preferring to focus on profits) and E was not readily understood. The points in E about the impact of slave labour on whites in slave states were too subtle for many and misunderstandings were common. Some candidates just left out E. Relatively few candidates placed it in both alternative interpretations. Most went for the first sentence and saw it as arguing against the interpretation, following it up with references to 'slow and careless' and the '100% higher' employment in free states. Others did see the hiring as a way to profit from slaves. Most saw it as un-typical but many merely stated this and did not therefore evaluate its utility in that light. The hiring at \$10 per month added to the confusion around C's 'sharing the profits'. Some effective responses did conclude that slavery was profitable but not efficient. There was also some ambiguity in the response to Source A. Some candidates made excellent use of A for both profits (prices, though said to be low, seemed quite high for the time; \$400 for an infant represented almost all profit) and efficiency (range of tasks available; differentiated prices suggested range of skills and effectiveness; planters would not pay those sums if they were not getting a reasonable deal). One or two linked these costs to the Fugitive Slave law – if that money had been laid out to buy a slave, then a failure by the North to enforce the law was a serious business and represented a serious profit loss. Some felt that A showed slaves fetched good prices, using E or their knowledge as a benchmark, and suggested that even lame and infirm slaves were worth something and that slaves could live to a good age. Others were convinced by the claim that these were low prices to show slaves were not profitable and cited the need to sell following the owner's death.

The particularist views of Sources B, C and D were explained rather better, with some good evaluation of D, based on some knowledge about Free Soilers, although others tackled Source D poorly. It could have led to a general discussion about North v South economies (some did comment on Ohio's better transport links because of geography, as opposed to Kentucky) but most merely quoted the content and then gave a fairly stock 'Free Soiler' evaluation.

Dictatorship and Democracy in Germany 1933–63

- Q4(a)** Candidates seemed disconcerted by the fact that the Sources both came from the Communist viewpoint, and some were not clear what the Warsaw Pact was. Some candidates guessed it might have something to do with Poland! It was important to spot that there was a difference in origin – Source A was a Warsaw Pact Communiqué from all the eastern Bloc countries; Source B was an internal Decree from the government of the DDR. That is why one blamed the situation in Germany on the Western Powers, the other on the Federal Republic specifically. Very few were able to see this, merging the Federal Republic into the Western powers, thus muddying the comparative waters. Otherwise, the comparison gave no trouble as long as candidates concentrated on the situation in Germany. Some digressed into the situation in Eastern Europe and the USSR. Several did not read the question properly and used the sources as evidence for the building of the Wall. On provenance, most knew that the date of the Sources coincided with the building of the Wall. Many used knowledge to evaluate and argued that spying was rife on both sides and was in both sources and that emigration from East Germany was taking place ('leaving' in A; being 'enticed' in B). Only some responses commented on how both sources played this down through use of language and in terms of prioritising within the sources themselves. Some challenged the description in B that the situation was equivalent to Civil War. Hence they saw A as slightly more reliable, although the propaganda nature of both sources was clearly recognised. The key to an effective judgement was to comment that both sources were useful for different purposes – A for an international Cold War perspective; B for the DDR's specific interest and view.
- Q4(b)** Candidates experienced problems in grouping the sources as several could be interpreted in more than one way, but many coped well with this and made a variety of groupings to good effect. Provided they focused on the question – external pressures were more important than internal German ones in creating the Berlin Wall – candidates could be reasonably effective. Often they did not. Most opted to group Sources A, C and E as evidence of outside pressure and Sources B and D as internal German pressure, a reasonable start, albeit ignoring the ambiguity of many of the sources. They were, perhaps, over-eager to reject Sources A to C, as favouring one side or the other and thus being useless, when deeper thought and analysis could have provided a fuller response. Better responses showed awareness that A mentioned the Western powers causing the militarism in Western Germany and hence necessitating the building of the Wall, that B showed how West Germany was a threat to the East and so led to the Wall, that C blamed the Warsaw Pact states, though for reasons not unlike those given in B, while D, despite being an American Source, suggested there was some justification for the fears of the East. The relative even-handedness of D led candidates to see it as the most useful. Source E proved a stumbling block for many as they could not relate it to the building of the Wall and did not recognise that it was part of Russian strategy to get a settlement in Europe. Some even took the view that Kennedy was to blame for increasing the armed forces, which was not the argument of E. Many settled for general comments about the Wall being built due to pressure from either the Soviets (a fair point) or the USA (more dubious) as part of the broader Cold War. The link between cancelled Soviet defence cuts, the increase in refugees and the building of the Wall was rarely made.

Contextual knowledge about the relative life-styles in East and West Germany, levels of emigration and the extent of espionage was prolific in some cases, minimal in others. This needed to be controlled to be successful and integrated with the content of the sources. A surprising number ignored the drain of talent from the DDR, given that there are direct or indirect references to this in all five sources. There were the usual evaluations of all five sources (except that E was not criticised for absence) based on East v West or, in the case of D, an American background.

The USA and the Cold War in Asia 1945–75

- Q5(a)** Candidates found this challenging because they largely failed to focus on the key issue of the extent of US involvement in China. There was much sequential comment, with little comparative linkage on issues like observers, military aid and aircraft. Some were able to use the first sentence in C and picked up the fact that only military observers were sent, contrasting it with large-scale civil war and bombs in D. The provenance was developed by some along partisan lines which worked for Chou in D but was less successful when applied to Dean Acheson in C. The reference to McCarthyite criticisms in the steer to C was not always understood. Those with some context were able to evaluate D very well, pointing to the triumphal tone and the wider attack on US tactics. Others found the oratorical flourishes of D more difficult to assess, some taking them at face value. There was little integrated identification of Chou's status and role in this respect. Few were able to develop the context of C, with some dismissing his points on stock grounds (they came 20 years later in half remembered form).
- Q5(b)** Again some of the sources were not well grouped or used. More effective responses argued that Sources A and B showed that the US did little to protect the mainland, in contrast to Sources C, D and E which did. Source A was a test for some to group appropriately: did this show US commitment or not, and if so, in what connection? Many responses failed on this, with candidates not realising that Source A showed some reluctance from the US. They interpreted Syngman Rhee as stating existing US policy rather than what it was – a plea for the US to change and to implement what Rhee was referring to. Others found the proposed solutions put forward by Rhee in Source A harder to analyse as they did not always know whether they had been put into action either before or after. Source B was more straightforward for candidates and was often praised as reliable since US generals unusually were here advocating withdrawal. Source C was variously used on each side of the argument. The view in C, that it was Communist vigour and Nationalist apathy which was to blame, was not applied very readily as an alternative to the view in the question, although most could use it to suggest a strong defence of the case that the US did try to protect the mainland, in this case through supporting Chiang Kai-shek's forces. For most candidates D was good evidence of US action in defending mainland Asia, but suspect because of its author and context. Source E was linked to the domino theory and seen as supporting D. It was obvious to all that US action in the face of North Korea's invasion was strong proof of a willingness to defend the integrity of this particular part of mainland Asia. Contextual knowledge often showed candidates had not read the question carefully and Japan and the Philippines (not the mainland) were mentioned. As a contrast (and for Defensive Perimeter Strategy) this was a fair point but most did not use their information here in this way, diverting instead to lengthy digressions using own knowledge on the situation in Japan and the Philippines. Better responses clearly understood the difference between mainland Asia and the defensive Perimeter. Most disagreed with the interpretation, basing their argument on C, D and E.

F965 Historical Interpretations and Investigations

There was a much smaller entry for the January series than for the Summer, but it reflected the strengths and weaknesses reported on in June 2012. While encouraging that many candidates' work is assessed according to nationally agreed standards, it is nevertheless a matter of some concern that advice given in previous reports has not been taken by some centres. While this does not apply to the majority, it may be worthwhile to reiterate some key reasons why there has been disagreement between moderators and centres. However, it is important to begin with the strengths of the work seen and the way it was assessed.

Strengths

- 1 It was clear that candidates were grappling with the passages set and not, on the whole, merely making a few references to them. Where there was sustained evaluation, centres who were using the mark scheme correctly did offer relevant marginal comment and in some cases offered convincing comments on the support offered for judgements about the passages.
- 2 Though not all candidates achieved a sustained focus on the issue in the question, it was very helpful when centres commented on this and offered an appropriate mark.
- 3 Centres which understood the use of the mark scheme made sure that their marginal comments were consistent with their final comments and the marks awarded.
- 4 Most centres offered full annotation and it was easy to see why they had awarded marks, even if those marks were later changed. There was a considerable amount of care taken with comments and it was relatively rare to see very limited marginal comment.
- 5 Candidates had taken trouble to research the Investigations issue, to find appropriate sources and to use them. Even if the degree and depth of critical evaluation varied, there was evidence of the deployment of appropriate source material.
- 6 The writing of many candidates was clear and there were few problems with poor spelling or expression which made the meaning of the argument unclear. Much trouble had been taken in many cases to offer accurate prose and to use historical terminology correctly.

Advice for improving work and assessment

Little of what follows is new, but its importance cannot be overstated.

Interpretations

- 1 In interpretations, the thrust must be towards assessing the four passages. Marking should be firmly based on that and not on assessing issues arising from the question in which the passages are referenced and used but with not much critical sense. This does not mean evaluating the historians or investigating their background to make assertions about why they might hold a certain view. The passages are not sources, but interpretations and must be assessed by contextual knowledge and by using the evidence in the other passages to challenge or confirm their view as a whole about the issue in the question. The first stage in this is to identify what that view is. Marking must show when this has been done and when the candidate is merely writing generally about the content of the passage.
- 2 The following is a frequently asked question: Will candidates be marked down for dealing with each passage separately? The answer, which is definitive, is as follows:

What marking has to reward is the understanding of how each of the passages links to the question and how well the answer has evaluated each passage's interpretation of the issue in the question using contextual knowledge and the evidence in the other passages. At inset we have stressed the importance of considering the whole interpretation offered by each of the passages and have suggested that a thematic approach is not always the best way to do this. There is no reference to any specific approach in the mark schemes, so you should not penalise any candidate for how he or she has approached the task, but focus on how well the passages have been understood in relation to the issue; how convincing the evaluation is; and how strong the support for judgements about each passage is in terms of knowledge and evaluative cross reference. The reports on the unit deal with these matters and moderators will be told firmly that there must be no penalising any particular approach, but that decisions must be made on the quality of evaluation and argument about the interpretations in the passages. The passages should be the focus of the answer and answers which merely reference them to discuss aspects of the issue will not score as highly as answers which evaluate the views in the passages. It may be that candidates decide not to deal with passages A, B, C and D in that order, and that they take passages with similar or supporting interpretations together, but the approach is less important than the quality of the judgements made and the sound understanding of the interpretations and their validity or otherwise. You should not penalise any candidate – marking should reward positive achievement. There should be no penalties attached to any particular approach; it is a question of how best candidates can show their understanding of the passages and their ability to deploy knowledge and evidence to confirm or challenge the interpretations offered by the passages. If evaluation is limited or simplistic then that must be taken into account; but it should not be seen as simplistic to adopt a passage by passage approach. I hope this is clear and thank you for your enquiry.

A thematic approach does not preclude evaluation of the passages, but often leads to evaluation of different views chosen by the candidate, rather than the views in the passage which must be the focus of the answer.

- 3 Marking must show how closely the answer is addressing the question in the title. If the question is concerned with the importance of political issues in the USA as a cause of the ending of that war, then the view of all four passages must be explained about that issue and not merely about the war in general. This was not always the case with January's marking.
- 4 When judgements are made about the passages, then it is very helpful if the quality of the support for those judgements is commented on. Unless the quality is excellent, then A02 Level 1A should not be awarded. Unless the quality of analysis and judgement is very good, then Level 1B is not appropriate. If there is no supported judgement of the passages, then Level III or above is not an appropriate mark. It is not helpful simply to write 'A02' – the moderator needs to know what the marker thinks of the quality of the A02 writing – ie the critical evaluation of clearly identified interpretations directly about the issue in the question.
- 5 If the relevance is variable; if there is limited argument about the passages and if the quality of supporting knowledge is not very high, then 6 should not be awarded for A01a or A01b. 6 is not a default mark which candidates should be given for some knowledge or some understanding.
- 6 The practice of using other historians to support or challenge the given passages is increasing. However it is only useful if the evidence used by the additional authority is identified. To say 'Beal also takes this view of appeasement', even if duly footnoted, is unconvincing unless the candidate explains on what basis and with what credibility Beal takes the view. There are already four interpretations to consider, and to introduce more without considering what evidence they are bringing to the discussion is unhelpful in itself and should not be over-rewarded.

Investigations

In Investigations, as in all previous series, marking was less accurate and realistic than in Interpretations. A02 marks should be awarded for the evaluation of the sources, as is made clear in the overall heading in the mark scheme.

- 1 Moderators still saw answers with no indication of any source evaluation being shown by marginal annotation being awarded higher level marks. Even if sources are well researched and even if they are used to support an argument, candidates are not showing critical judgement about the evidence and must not be rewarded as if they had evaluated that evidence.
- 2 It is very helpful to note how well sources have been evaluated. It is not convincing to say that a historian is an expert in military history and therefore his view of Napoleon will be convincing because he has studied battles in detail over a long period. Another historian of similar background may well come to different conclusions. What is at stake is not the background of the writer but the evidence on which his or her conclusions are based. Though this point has been made consistently in reports, some candidates are still relying on this way of assessing views. The results are often superficial and naïve. (“Geyl is Dutch and so will be biased”). Without using knowledge or corroborative cross- and counter-reference, candidates are unlikely to score highly and, if high marks are given by centres for this sort of evaluation, then they will be reduced and candidates will be disappointed.
- 3 If sources, especially historians, are merely compared, then evaluation will be very limited, no matter how learned the authorities referred to may be. Lists of historians with little explanation of the basis on which their views are held is merely name dropping and of little value. For high level marks candidates must get to grips with the validity of evidence and not merely note that historians agree or disagree.
- 4 The requirement for a range of sources to be considered has been met by some candidates by offering a series of short extracts – sometimes a sentence or even a phrase – and then offering a commentary on it. A short extract will not explain a historical view or the basis for it. This is an unsuitable approach which rarely leads to higher level marks and should not be encouraged. Good work makes the basis of the view clear, considers why it is held and offers other evidence to support or challenge it. This cannot be done by, for example, saying that *Historian X considers ‘Thatcher was an abrasive personality’. She did indeed have a powerful style which often upset people, so this is right.*

The view cannot be considered properly unless it is presented in a more developed way.

- 5 Needless, to say, the views presented must relate to the question. There were examples of candidates not answering their own question and still being given Level 1 marks. As with the Interpretations marking, it is absolutely essential to show that the work has been addressing the question set before rewarding it highly.

Centre Marking Issues

- 1 Comments should always be directed to the moderator and always be linked to the mark scheme. ‘A02 Level 1A 26 He has really got the bottom of this’ is not helpful. For this mark, a moderator should be told that the candidate has offered excellent critical evaluation and a strong argument and that the standard of applied knowledge is high.
- 2 If comments about judgement are made, then these should relate to assessment of the interpretations passages and the sources chosen by the candidate rather than to judgements about the issue which are not related to either.

OCR Report to Centres – January 2013

- 3 If there are pages in the Investigations in which there is no reference to evidence, then this should be noted and should be a consideration when making a final assessment.
- 4 The level of annotation and final comments must be similar for all candidates. It is not fair that some work should be annotated very thoroughly and some work merely have a few symbols. Where inconsistency and inaccuracy of marking occur it is often the result of a failure to adopt a consistent marking style and there were examples of this in the January session.
- 5 There was some work which had virtually no annotation and still some work which was extensively ticked without indication of what the ticks represented. This has been consistently commented on in reports as being unhelpful to moderation and likely to lead to poor and inaccurate assessment, which was the case in examples seen in January.

By this time, large reductions in centre marks should be exceptional, but despite previous reports, an extensive inset programme and the availability of marked examples on the OCR website, this is unfortunately not the case. It is essential that centres which have had substantial adjustments do consider the points in this report very carefully for the sake of future candidates. For most centres, the second part of this report has not been relevant and moderators would like to thank teaching colleagues for much careful, helpful and accurate assessment and to congratulate many candidates for their thoughtful responses.

F966 Historical Themes

General Comments

The overall standard of responses was in line with previous January performances, with perhaps more evidence of stronger answers in F966/1, but there were also a considerable number of weak answers on both papers, as candidates struggled either to cover the whole period or to focus on the precise demands of the question. As in previous series, examiners did comment that candidates often answered a slightly different question, usually one that had been set in a previous series. In many cases it appeared as if candidates had a pre-learned answer and tried to fit it to the question set; this does not work and will not score highly. Instead candidates need to be flexible in their approach. Although the paper does require a 'broad brush' treatment, candidates do need to support their arguments with precise details and the quality of knowledge was disappointing in many cases, particularly with a lack of dates or inaccurate dates, which made analysis weak. Candidates should note that without dates it can be difficult to demonstrate change/continuity. There was also a lack of awareness of linking events to particular reigns, presidencies etc. This was most noticeable on the Eisenhower question on F966/2, where candidates argued he was not important, but then wrote about the great significance of events that took place whilst he was President. There were a significant number of weaker answers that relied on sweeping assertions or thin factual support. Candidates should also be reminded of the need to focus on key words such as 'aims', instead of writing about motives or policies. This was similar with 'government', where candidates wrote about policies, particularly economic. Candidates do need to read the question carefully and focus on the key words and not write about a topic where the question is answered with only the occasional nod. Turning point questions still present many with a considerable challenge. It might be helpful to remember that they are marked according to exactly the same generic mark scheme and therefore should be approached in the same thematic way. However, the Civil Rights question on F966/2 revealed a new and problematic approach. Candidates often discussed Eisenhower's presidency, but then went on to try and consider African American leaders or the Supreme Court as a turning point, turning it into a factors style essay. It is also important that candidates are able to distinguish between terms. For example, for Tudor Rebellions, instead of objectives, many wrote about aims or causes. In many of the essays candidates are required to weigh up the relative importance of factors. However, there are still a significant number who explain the factors, but are unable to compare their relative importance. At the higher levels this comparison of the relative importance will be present in most or every paragraph. More worrying was the tendency to avoid argument and analysis by asserting that 'clearly' or 'it is clear that without the achievements of Richelieu/Mazarin Colbert's achievements would have been impossible'.

This paper does require coverage of the whole period, but there were still a significant number of answers where this did not happen; most noticeably on the Civil Rights many considered the period only after the Second World War. The other key element which will have a serious impact on performance is an understanding of the key assessment element: synthesis. Despite INSETs and exemplar material the understanding still appears to be very variable. It is **not** simply piling up a list of events from across the period in the same paragraph, but a comparison between those events to show patterns of change and/or continuity. However, Centres should also be reminded that those comparisons need to be valid.

There are still a significant number who adopt a chronological approach, which makes synthesis and comparisons very difficult and will seriously limit the level that can be awarded. There are also a number whose first paragraph is thematic, but who then drift into a chronological approach. It was interesting to note that few candidates establish a clear thesis or line of argument; many would be better starting from their conclusion, where they do set out the direction the essay has taken. It is essential for this paper that candidates plan and think through line of argument before they start writing. Better answers also used all the key words in the question in their first and last paragraphs.

OCR Report to Centres – January 2013

Presentation was generally satisfactory though some candidates continue to write in pale-grey ballpoint which they loosely apply to the page, exerting little pressure and making it very difficult for examiners to read.

F966/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1066–1715

Comments on Individual Questions

English Government and the Church 1066–1216

There were few answers to this Theme and therefore the comments are limited.

- Q1** Although candidates were able to write quite knowledgeably about the impact of continental possessions in driving the changes in English central government, some did not evaluate other factors but assumed this to be a question about the Justiciarship. In order to score highly the named factor had to be compared with others, such as the personality of the monarchy or the need for finances. The latter factor allowed stronger candidates to make links between finances and continental possessions and often helped access the higher levels.
- Q2** The archbishops who had poor relations with their monarchs were usually identified as Anselm and Becket. Stephen Langton was problematic in that, though he was abroad for so long skulking in Rome, his part in the events of 1215 was seldom acknowledged. These three were contrasted with Lanfranc, Theobald (mostly, anyway) and Hubert Walter but it was also encouraging to see archbishops not mentioned in the Specification, like the effortlessly mediocre Richard of Dover. Some candidates wrote off the relationships as 'variable' and often wanted to explain the reasons for the differences rather than do what the question asked.
- Q3** This was the least popular of the questions in this section and candidates were often unsure about 'the power' but did show that it was difficult to exercise it from exile in Rome or France.

Rebellion and Disorder under the Tudors 1485–1603

This continues to be the most popular topic, but a significant number of candidates struggled with the questions, often drawing their examples from a narrow part of the period or lacking sufficient depth to support their points. Many also failed to focus on the key words and phrases in the questions.

- Q4** This question highlighted many of the generic problems outlined above. A significant number of answers outlined the causes of the rebellions, ignoring objectives altogether. When candidates did address the issue of objectives they were often quite vague, particularly when dealing with taxation or dynastic rebellions; they were stronger when religious rebellions were considered. Many candidates tried to account for the differences rather than examine their extent. The question required candidates to have reasonable knowledge of the Irish rebellions; this caused a significant number difficulties and they relied upon sweeping generalisations.
- Q5** Once again, many candidates found it very difficult to focus on the precise wording of the question '...slow to respond to the outbreak..' and reference to it figured in the answers of very few candidates. The standard answer either sought to explain why the rebellions lasted for so long a time or why the government reaction was slow, rather than discuss whether they were slow to respond. The better answers often suggested that there were a number of factors that determined whether they were slow to respond, with a number arguing that if the rebellion was dynastic government action was usually rapid, as it was a direct threat to the monarch's position. This was sometimes contrasted with taxation unrest which, as in the case of Cornwall, was not tackled immediately.

- Q6** Once again, candidates needed to focus on the key phrase ‘maintaining political stability’; instead some responses considered how rebellions were put down. Some weaker arguments in support of the statement took the line that all civil power depended on the Crown. Others drew up long lists of ‘other methods’, commonly church, nobles, propaganda and justices of the peace. These were often followed by a final paragraph of hopeful comparison. Candidates did struggle to weigh up the relative importance of the factors and were often reduced to very simplistic assertions. There were a number of answers that focused on issues such as Crown propaganda, through paintings, but were unable convincingly to show how these created political stability. Those who defined ‘the Crown’ at the beginning side-stepped the flaccid writing which characterized many answers.

England’s Changing relations with Foreign Powers 1485–1603

There were many good responses to this theme as candidates focused on the demands of the questions and avoided the chronological surveys of the period, which can often characterise this topic.

- Q7** There were some very strong answers to this question. Candidates were able to see where finances were important, either allowing a bellicose foreign policy or where a lack of finances prevented aggression. Most were able to weigh the named factor up against a good range of other possible factors, most notably dynastic security or national security. Some answers interpreted ‘royal finances’ as money made abroad by trade rather than a lack of it being a factor limiting foreign engagements. Some candidates described Henry VIII as ‘vainglorious’ and ‘bellicose’ and left these as reasonable alternatives to money as either an enabling or motivating factor.
- Q8** Candidates were usually able to explain the reasons for the changing relations between France and England, often considering the decline of the Auld Alliance and the question of Scotland, unrest in France and the power of Spain. However, candidates did struggle to assess or evaluate the importance of those reasons, although, where that did happen, many argued that it was due to the growing power of Spain, which was seen as a threat to both nations, and therefore it was the fear of a common enemy which brought about the most significant change in relations. However, weaker answers simply described the changing relations between England and France.
- Q9** This was not a popular question. Candidates wrote very generally about foreign affairs and made a few unconnected remarks about the question.

The Catholic Reformation 1492–1610

There was a wide range of responses to questions in this section, but there were some very strong answers, with candidates displaying an excellent range of knowledge and an ability to apply it to the questions set.

- Q10** There was a tendency to overrate the extent to which the church needed reform in the first quarter of the sixteenth century. Weaker answers focused on the second half of the period and therefore often ignored the concept of ‘transformed’, as they did not compare the post Trent period with the pre-Reformation developments. The force of ‘transformed’ was generally ignored and taken to mean ‘had influence on’ or simply saw it as equating to ‘change’, ignoring the full meaning of the question. But candidates did know about the Spanish and Roman attempts to deal with slackness and corruption and balanced the onslaught of Luther and Calvin against other factors.

- Q11** Many candidates had an excellent knowledge of the full range of sixteenth century Popes and were usually able to argue that the later Popes were crucial to the Catholic Reformation, although stronger answers did note that not all of the later Popes were of such quality. Most were able to compare the influence and role of the Popes against other factors such as the Council of Trent, the New orders, particularly the Jesuits, or secular rulers. Many stronger answers were able to make developed links between the different factors, often arguing that without the Popes Trent would not have happened or that the New Orders would not have developed.
- Q12** While a few candidates wanted to explain why the Catholic Reformation had limited success in Europe, others used concrete criteria to judge its success, for example the number of Jesuit houses in the European states. In many answers, candidates displayed a very wide range of examples from Spain and Italy to Central Europe. There was some discussion of developments in France and the Netherlands, whilst others made insightful comments about developments within the Empire. Candidates were usually able to show where the Catholic Reformation had limited success. However, there were a number of responses which went beyond Europe and considered events in the New World and Asia, which were not relevant to the question.

The Development of the Nation State: France 1498–1610

It was noticeable in this section that a number of candidates did not focus on, or appear to understand, the key phrases in the questions, such as ‘development of the French nation state’ or ‘lives of his subjects’ and this often meant that responses were rather general and less focused.

- Q13** Candidates often failed to define ‘the development of the nation state’ and in some answers there was very little focus on the reign of Francis I against other periods. However, in some responses the reign of Francis I dominated at the expense of others. Some candidates showed little knowledge of rulers other than Francis I and Henry IV, with some brief references to Henry II. There were also a number who adopted a chronological rather than thematic survey, which limited the level that could be reached, regardless of the quality of the analysis.
- Q14** The stronger answers used the opening paragraph to establish definitions or criteria for ‘lives of his subjects’ and then related their discussions back to it in order to assess the validity of the view. Answers sometimes used the same material as in Q 13. Some answers portrayed Henry IV as some kind of democrat who ‘lived like a peasant.’ Others did compare Henry IV with his predecessors but they often wrote generally because they had not done as the better candidates and focused on ‘the lives of his subjects’. Least successful were general comparisons between Henry IV and the ‘Renaissance monarchs.’
- Q15** Better answers began by stating in the opening paragraph the criteria for ‘effectively’. There were some candidates who read ‘Calvinism’ for religious issues and hence produced a very narrow answer, ignoring humanism, Lutheranism and the issues of the Catholic Church. At a simple level, many argued that the governments were ineffective because of how long the Religious Wars lasted. Mediocre efforts defaulted to ‘narrative with comment’ while some remained at the narrative/description level.

The Ascendancy of France 1610–1715

There were many strong answers on this theme as candidates were able to address the demands of the question, focusing on key words and phrases, and support their arguments with precise details.

- Q16** Good answers often began by defining ‘absolute monarchy’ and saw that this was the subject of the question, rather than Mazarin. Weaker efforts tried to compare Mazarin with Richelieu by asserting that ‘Mazarin continued Richelieu’s aims’ but sometimes failed to explain how this was done. A number of answers argued that beyond the Fronde, Mazarin did little and made the case for Richelieu and/or Colbert. Some argued that the legacy of the Fronde was crucial in the development of absolute monarchy and had a great influence on Louis XIV.
- Q17** This was not a popular question. Responses were very general and often relied on assertions.
- Q18** The key to a good answer was firstly to focus on ‘the rise of France as a major European power.’ Good answers often began by defining the point at which France became a major European power and this often provoked discussion within the essay, and often varied according to the range of criteria used. However some left this out until they got to Ratisbon. Mostly candidates compared Colbert with Richelieu and Mazarin. Le Tellier was often relegated to the status of Colbert’s sidekick though some answers tended to inflate his contribution. Some answers drifted from the question and explained ‘who made France a great power’ and usually came down on the side of Richelieu.

F966/02 Modern 1789–1997

Comments on Individual Questions

The Challenge of German nationalism 1789–1919

The questions were reasonably well answered, although some candidates did lack specific knowledge to support their claims or relied on rather simplistic analysis of events.

- Q1** This question was reasonably well answered, with most candidates considering Metternich, Bismarck and William II. Weaker responses often simply provided three sections of information about each leader with some added overall analysis and occasional evaluation at the end of their answer. Better answers showed an ability to compare thematically Bismarck's role with Metternich and William II. This allowed candidates to conclude that different leaders were better able to manage nationalism effectively depending upon the issue. There were some who simply suggested Metternich failed because of 1848, but did not look at events from the earlier period, whilst similar simplistic comments were made about Wilhelm over the declaration of war and subsequent outcome. It was noticeable how sketchy some answers were on the events of the 1860s, which limited the depth of analysis and synthesis in some answers.
- Q2** This was answered effectively by most candidates, with evidence of some effective synthesis. The main weakness was the coverage of the period. Some candidates stopped their answer in 1914 and did not discuss the issue of nationalism's popularity during World War One, whereas most were more confident in dealing with the earlier period and could provide precise evidence to support their claims about events such as the Wartburg Festival. Many argued that nationalism became more popular as the period progressed and did link this to the support for war in 1914. However, the role of liberal parties in the 1860s was poorly understood and the assumption was that they all supported Bismarck's actions wholeheartedly, which is far from the truth.
- Q3** This question was reasonably well answered with candidates identifying some factors and discussing them synoptically. The main weaknesses were either a limited number of factors or failure to cover the whole period, although there were a significant number who struggled to deal with the named factor and were much happier writing about economic, military or cultural factors. Some candidates were unsure how to deal with the diplomatic developments of the 1860s, which could have been discussed as part of the political factor. Economic developments were invariably linked to military developments and little else and few candidates were able to tease out the political implications of the Zollverein and/or Zollparlament.

The Changing Nature of Warfare 1792–1945

In most instances candidates knew enough material, but were unable to use it to answer the precise questions set. There was a tendency to drift to slightly different questions or provide excessive detail about particular wars or battles, most notably the Napoleonic, rather than adopt a broader approach.

- Q4** The biggest problem for most candidates was understanding the difference between tactics and strategy and this prevented some solid answers from scoring higher. In most answers, candidates simply dealt with the two issues as if they were indistinguishable or treated the words as interchangeable. Many answers adopted a chronological approach and, hence, struggled to identify clear patterns of change and continuity, which should be the focus of this paper. In most instances, those who attempted analysis agreed that not much changed

until the second half of the period. Candidates must ensure that they keep to the focus, as a large number drifted into detailed discussions of logistics and how they changed. However, it is pleasing to note that references to the two world wars seem to be improving but too much analysis is still based on assertion it seems.

- Q5** There were some good attempts to answer this question, with candidates providing some good analysis of alliance against other factors. Some would have benefited by providing more emphasis in their discussions on the issues of 'effective' alliances, rather than writing about alliances in general. Many candidates would have found it useful to define 'effective alliances' but only a minority did so. Candidates were divided on the extent to which alliances were effective or not, with many seeing Napoleon's early success as evidence or the ineffectiveness of alliances and then overlooking the fact that it was an alliance that brought him down. There was a tendency to concentrate on the early and later parts of the period, with much focus on the Napoleonic, Crimean and two World Wars. Most made an attempt to discuss a range of factors. Some answers dwelt on individual battles, rather than the "outcome of war", and provided further evidence of the importance for candidates of focusing on the precise wording and demands of the question.
- Q6** This was the least popular question in this section, but still attracted a wide range of responses. Many answers equated economically strong with industrially strong and often produced quite a narrow response as a result. Such answers often contained much description of technological developments that improved weaponry and war craft/transport. Many argued that economically strong states were successful. Some did note the economic strength of Germany, particularly in the First World War, and used this to challenge 'always', although they often pointed out that the USA was even stronger. The American Civil War was also frequently put forward to support the statement, but this only highlighted the weakness of much that is known about this conflict. However, there was a mixed response in attempting to balance this argument. Some candidates tried to argue that there were economically strong states that failed but most candidates provided 'other' factors for success. Weaker answers often relied upon assertion and/or generalisation regarding economic factors in the outcome of war.

Britain and Ireland 1798–1921

There were a limited number of Centres who attempted this theme, but a full range of answers were seen. At the highest level the depth of knowledge and quality of synthesis was very good and candidates were able to identify patterns of change and continuity across the period.

- Q7** The greatest weakness in many responses was the fact that the policies of the main parties were poorly known across the whole period, including the Liberal Party post 1880. Those candidates who adopted a thematic approach and considered the parties' attitudes towards land, religion, repression and the Union were usually able to make some comparative comments. However, many were unaware of the subtle similarities or differences between the parties; for example few were aware of repression and coercion under the Liberals or Land reform under the Conservatives. It was also noticeable that many answers failed to deal with the twentieth century or treated it in a very superficial manner.
- Q8** Most candidates provided an appropriate approach to answering this question. However, the problem for some candidates was that they did not distinguish clearly between The Catholic Church and the Catholics. This meant that they did not deal adequately with the named factor and those who did provide reasonable information on the Church tended to cover only part of the period. However, when candidates considered other factors that determined the success of constitutional nationalism the responses were usually stronger.

- Q9** Most focused on ‘reasons’ although only a few offered a genuine assessment or evaluation of their relative importance and even fewer were able to adopt a comparative approach. Many instead relied on a list of reasons with any judgement about the relative importance bolted on to the end of a paragraph. Some confused characteristics of groups with reasons for success. Thus, a frequent observation was that Sinn Fein was more successful as it had more support but only a handful of students explored **how** and **why** Sinn Fein gained more support than earlier groups. Compared with Q8, candidates were generally very good on 20th century developments but struggled when it came to making links with earlier revolutionary groups.

Russia and its Rulers 1855–1964

This continues to be a very popular theme but, as the comments on individual questions show, many candidates found some of the questions challenging or did not focus on the precise demands of the question, often appearing to use material from previous essays to fit a different question.

- Q10** There was even coverage of wars and revolutions but little consistent focus on the development of Russian government. This was surprising given that this issue has frequently been flagged up in previous examiners' reports and also because there is plenty of accessible material available that discusses issues such as changes in the ideology, structure (especially via constitutions) and tools of governments. Most candidates were aware of the general requirements of this question and made an attempt to compare the impact of wars and revolutions; however a significant number did not focus on ‘the development of Russian government’, but instead wrote at great length on policies, particularly economic, with government considered only in passing. Some candidates simply provided evidence and discussion for wars followed by revolutions and did not then fully compare them. Some candidates only dealt with wars and then realised that they should be including revolutions and tagged them on at the end. A significant number of candidates did not provide a wide coverage of the period and ended up really discussing 1917 and World War One, which severely limited attempts at synopsis. Some had difficulty separating war and revolution when it came to assessing the events of 1905 and 1917. This resulted in some very weak analysis. Not enough was made of the medium or long term results of either war or revolution other than the most generalised of statements.
- Q11** This was the most popular and the best answered question in this section. Most candidates made an attempt to address the question, although weaker ones provided more general information and did not analyse a range of issues concerning ‘lives’ of the peasants. However, many candidates seemed better informed than usual on the lives of peasants and how to measure changes in peasant living standards. A number twisted the question into one that focused on the extent to which the lives of peasants were ‘uniformly bleak’. It was also pleasing to note how many candidates were able to give a balanced and measured assessment of the plight of the peasantry throughout the period and not succumb to the “things were always bad and did not change” approach.
- Q12** This question presented many candidates with difficulties, as they were unable to focus on the key word in the question – ‘aims’. When this was addressed, very few were clear about the actual ‘aims’ of the rulers and were often limited to economic development and maintaining power. Most attempted to discuss the wishes of all leaders to maintain authoritarian rule but only a minority went beyond this to discuss specific political, economic, military and social aims. Even some of the more able candidates failed to remain focused on aims and drifted into the methods of achieving those aims, such as repression and terror. A significant number of candidates tended to mention the ruler’s aims in their opening paragraph without developing the ideas and then proceeded to discuss and explain policies and methods rather than focusing on aims. As a consequence, many responses were about the topic rather than the question. Those who

were able to construct a thematic argument usually agreed with the proposition in question, but few based their answers on broad assertions/generalisations, with very little precise factual support, unless they drifted into descriptions of policies.

Civil Rights in the USA 1865–1992

This continues to be a very popular theme and it was pleasing to note the increased knowledge that candidates displayed about labour and trade union rights and Native Americans. In many cases the weakest answer was on African American civil rights, as candidates struggled to come to terms with the idea of a turning point and comparing Eisenhower's presidency with other presidencies.

Q13 This was not particularly well answered. There was some poor identification of turning points, with many being lengthy periods of time rather than specific events or other presidencies, and some of them were quite broad. Teachers would be advised to spend some time discussing the concept of turning point with their students as there still appears to be some misconception over this. For example, despite what a significant number of candidates would like to argue, it is difficult to make a case for a period of twenty to thirty years or more to constitute a turning point. The degree of knowledge and understanding displayed about Eisenhower varied considerably. Even well informed candidates tended to list information (eg Brown v Topeka, Little Rock) and not use it support arguments. Some candidates assumed the question required comparative analysis simply of the role of presidents and lost sight of the fact that the focus was on 'turning point' more generally. The presidency of Eisenhower was not well discussed as many candidates simply made the turning point the 1950's. As usual, some candidates turned their answer into a focus on Martin Luther King, or even the role of the Supreme Court, which hardly constitutes a turning point. A significant number of candidates looked on the Eisenhower Presidency solely through the views of the president himself and not through the key events of the 1950s. This led many to argue that the presidency of Eisenhower did nothing to help AAs other than to let a few AA students into Little Rock High School (and then from selfish, political motives) and then say how momentous the Brown v Board case was and its great impact on the development of AA civil rights. Some argued that the Presidency was not important and then argued how significant events that took place during his Presidency were, apparently forgetting the actual dates of his Presidency, despite its appearance in the question! The role of the Supreme Court seems to be poorly understood and centres need, perhaps, to spend time making it clear that it does not legislate and that its role involves the interpretation of the constitution.

Q14 This question was the best answered in this section, with candidates attempting to provide a balanced argument. The better answers looked at the role of Congress, Presidents and the Supreme Court within a framework of 'help' and 'hinder'. However, as with answers to Q13 there was a tendency to list events etc without consistently linking the information to an argument and/or to showing an ability to make comparative analysis. Some candidates discussed the role of labour unions and other influences, which was not really the intention behind the question. However, there are still candidates who do not seem to have a clear understanding of what constitutes Federal Government and, therefore, their discussion was hampered. It is pleasing, though, to see that most candidates seem to be comfortable these days with the details of the development of trade union and labour rights and many answers to Q14 did assess the role of the federal government very well, as well as considering other factors.

Q15 Unfortunately this topic continues either to attract narrative/descriptive responses to questions or pre-planned frameworks for analysis which are not always appropriate to the question set. Candidates must take a deep breath and think about the implications of words in questions before plunging in to get down on paper 'all I know about...'. The 'Importance of actions' was largely glossed over; it would have been refreshing, for

example, if candidates had provided a case for Native Americans resisting oppression more than is often made out in some of the standard texts. Teachers might like to get hold of Angie Debo's work on this topic (*A History of the Indians of the United States*) as it provides a more insightful and genuinely sympathetic view of Native Americans compared with some of the more 'Westernised' accounts. Many candidates did not really assess the importance of the actions of the Native Americans; rather, they either described the developments of greater civil rights or explained a list of factors. That said, knowledge of the plight of Native Americans is well understood on the whole and many were able to put forward an argument, mostly to the effect that only in the post 1965 period was anything substantial done by Native Americans themselves to further their civil rights. The knowledge some candidates have regarding court proceedings etc affecting Native American civil rights is prodigious and, provided it is applied to the actual question set, will allow them to score well.

The Development of Democracy in Britain

There were insufficient responses seen to these questions to be able to make valid comments.

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
1 Hills Road
Cambridge
CB1 2EU

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

For staff training purposes and as part of our quality assurance programme your call may be recorded or monitored

Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations
is a Company Limited by Guarantee
Registered in England
Registered Office; 1 Hills Road, Cambridge, CB1 2EU
Registered Company Number: 3484466
OCR is an exempt Charity

OCR (Oxford Cambridge and RSA Examinations)
Head office
Telephone: 01223 552552
Facsimile: 01223 552553

© OCR 2013

