

History A

Advanced GCE **A2 H506**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H106**

OCR Report to Centres

June 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	2
F961/02 British History Period Studies	6
F962/01 European and World History Period Studies	12
F962/02 European and World History Period Studies	18
F963 and F964 AS History Enquiries	27
F965 Historical Interpretations and Investigations	50
F966 Historical Themes	53
F966/01 Historical Themes	56
F966/02 Historical Themes	61

F961-2 AS Period Studies – General Comments

Comments

There was a wide range of responses with little evidence of candidates failing to finish or being seriously rushed in their second question. Very few scripts contained a ‘note form’ second answer and even fewer candidates submitted only one answer.

Overall, it is true that very few candidates now submit purely descriptive answers, although attempts to argue or analyse were sometimes weak. There were occasions when too much factual knowledge got in the way of attempts at analysis, meaning that answers became ‘description with some explanation’, while the better and best did proceed from good thematic, analytically orientated paragraph organisation.

A good many answers still begin with factual, ‘background’ introductions, sometimes quite long and often of only marginal relevance. It might be helpful to candidates if they saw the first paragraph as a ‘vital opening’ paragraph in which they outlined their views on the issue in the question, which were then developed throughout the essay. Relatively few candidates succeed in writing the sort of analytical introductions which get an answer off to a good start, e.g. defining criteria for success in ‘how successful?’ questions; but many are able to set out the key factors involved and even give a sense of early relative importance, which should be encouraged.

Links were not always made between paragraphs, resulting in essays that were no more than lists of factors; and progressive relative importance delivered via cross-referencing and cross-assessing was the preserve of the better and best answers.

Many candidates still find it hard to prioritise and assess the relative importance of factors. There is often not enough good cross-evaluation plus linkages of factors and issues. Quite often, bolt-on comments appear with the conclusion serving to rescue the answer in terms of some attempt at judgement, which if it has been justified may take an answer into Level II for AO1b. Once again, a good feature is the development of extended Conclusions, assessing, weighing up factors and issues, usually delivering a judgement – though some are neutral and simply argue that all factors were equally important. In some responses, judgements on relative importance or links between factors are often left to emerge from the material rather than being pinpointed as an argument progresses. However there was little evidence of key factors suddenly emerging in conclusions.

Assertions were less prevalent though some did appear via bolt-on comments or in rather peremptory endings (‘X was the most important...’). However, there is still a ready tendency for some, more evident in the weaker responses, to list factors, sometimes ‘first’, ‘second’, ‘third’ (etc.) or ‘important..’, ‘another important ...’, ‘a factor..’, ‘another factor...’

Standards of spelling, grammar etc. were sound, although there were a number of scripts which used rather too colloquial language. Abbreviations continue to intrude: (for example) HVIII; govt.; Lab; FP; Mrs T; MacM(illan) and it would be helpful if Centre’s discouraged this and remind their candidates that it is a formal examination.

Some candidates continue to spend too long on plans and then have less time to develop fuller answers, especially the second question. That said, overall, this seems less a factor than in the recent past.

F961/01 British History Period Studies

- 1 There were some excellent answers on the importance of the Godwins, showing for the most part a strong knowledge base and clear focus on the issue of importance. The most successful candidates were able to weigh up their influence and judge how over time it developed. Strong answers also compared their importance to other noble families and to Edward himself. Most of the moderately effective answers just explained why the family was important without a counter-argument. Some candidates did struggle to elaborate on the historical evidence they presented. Some described the role of Godwin rather than assessing the family's importance in the political affairs of the time.
- 2 The question on William's claim elicited a great range of answers. There were two major shortcomings at the lower end of the range. Quite a few just wanted to explain why William won the battle of Hastings with little reference to anything else. Others read the question as a straight comparison with the claims of Harald, Harold and Edgar without focusing on William. Weaker responses with better focus tended to describe William's claim rather than assessing its strength.

There were many excellent answers which fully explored medieval criteria for a claim, differentiating sensitively between English and French traditions and comparing William's against the others, while maintaining a clear focus on him.

- 3 This question was more rarely answered than questions 1 and 2. In stronger responses candidates were able to outline what they considered feudalism to be and then used good historical evidence in order to assess whether England was a feudal state. In less effective responses candidates did not use sufficient evidence to justify their view or they simply described England being a feudal state with little evidence. Other than this there were no patterns of misunderstanding: some of the candidates who attempted this question had simply not given previous thought to the issue.
- 4 This was a popular question. In stronger responses candidates had no trouble assessing strengths against weaknesses, and finding a wealth of specific support. They were thus able to come to a reasoned and balanced conclusion. The most common determining factor was awareness of the dates in the question. Weaker responses ignored the date 1470 and some discussed Edward's second reign as opposed to his first. This meant that some of their discussion was irrelevant and could not be credited. Some wrote in general terms about Edward and his brothers in a way which proved they were not aware of the dates, even if not specifically mentioning later material. Some could see no strengths at all, seeing only a catalogue of failure, which begged the question how he was able to gain the throne at all. This was a question where careful application of precise knowledge paid rich dividends.
- 5 This again was a popular question and saw some really strong responses. Most candidates were able to use some good evidence such as financial figures and personnel in their essays. Better responses included themes or areas of Henry's financial system and then assessed with evidence its success or failure. However, candidates rarely compared the areas of finance within their paragraphs to gain 'judgement' marks. Weaker responses simply stated why Henry was a success and listed the achievements without fully considering the context or making links. Nearly all the more modestly successful answers argued that Henry was successful with little counter-argument. The differentiators on the whole were the precision and extent of knowledge, and the ability to move beyond a list of factors to comparison and judgement. Very few failed to understand the drive of the question and all were therefore able to use such knowledge and understanding as they had to address it

- 6 This was a popular question and one which was generally answered well. In higher level responses candidates were able to state Henry's aims in foreign policy and then use this with good evidence to assess whether he achieved his aims. Excellent responses used context in order to judge Henry's achievements, as notably they appeared to diminish as his reign came to an end. Weaker responses did not use a wide range of evidence to support points bar from the main treaties being signed. There were issues in being one-sided as opposed to truly questioning the statement. On the whole, candidates showed better knowledge on this question than they did on finance. Answers were also well focused and analytical for most part. Most disagreed with the statement.
- 7 This was a popular question but one which candidates seemed to find difficult. Most responses, indeed, struggled with it. There were some well-supported, well-argued responses which identified and evaluated particular reasons for Wolsey's rise to power, for example his relationship with Henry, factions and patronage, and showed sound knowledge and understanding of events early in the reign. They showed that the question was accessible, but they were in the minority. Some candidates were aware as to why Wolsey rose to power but were unable to focus on particular evidence to help justify their argument. A lot of candidates used foreign policy from the first French campaign to help justify their discussion and several candidates used examples from Wolsey's domestic policies to help argue their point. Those who knew less tended to draw more material from the later period where Wolsey was already at the pinnacle of power. Some candidates even made reference to Wolsey's fall from power in 1529.
- 8 Some good responses made reference to Pinkie in 1547 as the question did not state Henry but England's reasons for war up until 1547. Strong responses had the depth of detail to really assess the reasons for war and linked this to the context of the 1540s both domestically and internationally. They were also able effectively to develop differences and similarities between France and Scotland. However, this was a question which saw some common shortcomings. In some weaker responses candidates were not able to access AO1a as successfully because they focused too much time on Henry's first and second campaigns against the French in order to link this to their argument for the wars in the 1540s. Too many candidates changed the question to 'was Henry's campaigns against Scotland and France successful or not?' Some showed they did understand the nature of the question by stating reasons for going to war but fell into the trap of arguing whether Henry's wars between 1542-1546 were a failure or not. Many just described what happened rather than answering the question.
- 9 'Mary I's rule of England was a complete failure.' This was the most popular question out of the three and most students were able to gain significant marks. Many showed themselves capable of clear analysis of success and failure in a range of areas, well supported with specific knowledge. Even in weaker responses candidates often reached reasonable judgement throughout and clearly found the question very straight forward. The use of Mary's aims to assess her success/failure was well done but some candidates were not quite as detailed as they could have been to maximise the AO1a marks. Weaker responses described Mary's reign with bolt on analysis/assertions rather than weighing up the relative successes and failures of her reign. There was some use of historiography in some scripts but this tended to be well used alongside candidate knowledge. There were however some instances where candidate knowledge was weak; for instance once candidate believed Mary Tudor and Mary Queen of Scots were the same person and one candidate believed Thomas Cromwell helped Mary with her financial policies. It was possible to approach this question successfully without mention of religion, officially in a different section of the paper, but most candidates made some reference to religious issues. In many cases the level and detail of knowledge and understanding of religion were impressive.

- 10 Most candidates demonstrated excellent knowledge of the early church in 1529. In better responses candidates were able to break down the key word ‘widespread’ and effectively analyse whether this was the case. Strong essays saw excellent use of detailed evidence both nationally and regionally in order to support their arguments. Some candidates did go beyond 1529 and used the 1536 Pilgrimage of Grace to show widespread support for the church, albeit after the date set in the title. As long as awareness of the date was shown, this could be made a useful factor in assessment. Weaker responses simply described the abuses of the church or its critics and dwelt on the various anti-clerical sentiments uttered by individuals and groups without assessing their typicality or even importance. Some candidates did struggle with the period and made reference beyond 1529 without linking it back to the question. This was by far the most popular response out of the three.
- 11 This question was well answered although the use of detailed evidence was an issue. Some candidates struggled with breaking down examples of when Elizabeth effectively resisted the Puritans and better answers were able to assess when and why she allowed Puritans to gain some ground. There was an issue in detailing Puritans within Parliament with some candidates citing Neale’s ‘Puritan Choir’ but rather than explaining it or using it, they simply described it. This was a good example of historiography at AS: it is not required, and when knowledge of a line is simply described, it does not aid progress to the higher grades. There were some good responses on the 1559 Settlement but most candidates did struggle with providing examples of the 1580s which would have demonstrated breadth and depth of the period. This question was more popular than question 12.
- 12 This question was the least popular in this section, though it did elicit some very strong responses. Better responses focused on a number of reasons why Catholicism declined. Better responses were able to break down the reasons and see how these changed over the period. Indeed all but the weakest answers tended to have a sense of change over time. There was also some good focus on Catholicism across the regions which enhanced analysis. Strong essays were able to weigh up the reasons and use detailed evidence. Weaker responses focused on a narrow string of events or ended up describing the various Mary Queen of Scots plots rather than really assessing the actual reasons for the decline of Catholicism.
- 13 This question elicited very mixed responses. The best were excellent, but there was a sizeable minority which showed significant, at times almost complete, misunderstanding of the question. Better answers were able to differentiate between and evaluate the methods Elizabeth employed to control her ministers across her reign, and were aware of the changes over time. Some candidates focused on particular ministers, thus employing specific examples which were good; however too many candidates were making generalisations without having sufficient evidence to back up their argument. One pattern of under-performance emerged when the candidate was unaware of the meaning of the word minister. Some wrote generally about court or Parliament, conflating courtiers and MPs with ministers.
- 14 This was a popular question, and some fine, balanced responses emerged, though a sizeable proportion found it hard to balance marriage and succession as factors. Not all found it easy however. Candidates often described the various marriage proposals Elizabeth had rather than linking them to foreign policy and how far they affected it. Weaker responses made no mention or little mention of succession. Some interesting responses raised religion as a factor but only better responses were able to compare it to marriage and succession. There was some good use of evidence but in some instances there was confusion of the various suitors Elizabeth had. In terms of succession some candidates fell into the trap of describing the issues with Mary Queen of Scots rather than linking their significance with foreign policy. In weaker responses candidates found linking marriage and succession to foreign policy difficult. Some were very unclear on the focus of

the question. Some introduced a third option (often religion or economy) but too often did so very badly, largely because they had run out of things to say regarding marriage and succession.

- 15 This was a popular choice of question and most candidates answered this alongside 14. Many could produce impressive detail and supported analysis of the extent of Elizabeth's power. Most candidates were able to identify the problems Elizabeth faced and why it could be argued her power reduced. This was done successfully by candidates who were able to look at a range of examples of when royal authority was weak but then contrast this with relative strength. Weaker responses simply described the issues Elizabeth faced with Essex and the Irish rebellion and sometimes the monopoly crisis was not fully developed to access the higher marks. Some candidates struggled with the timing of the question and focused most of their answer on Elizabeth from her early reign to the Armada rather than focusing on post-1588. The weakest essays were either confused about the date range of their treatment or could develop no more than description.
- 16 This was a popular question, which most candidates successfully tackled. The question enabled most candidates to access high level bands in AO1a given the nature of the question, e.g. they could use examples and figures around James' financial situation. Stronger essays used context effectively to question James' role in the financial troubles of the early Stuart reign; for instance assessing Parliament's role and comparing this to James. Weaker responses lost the focus of the question and described the issues rather than comparing a range of possible causes to James. However, overall, most candidates successfully tackled this question and were able to assess James' role fully. There was a wide range of conclusions, with some candidates blaming James almost totally and some defending him and placing great emphasis on factors beyond his control.
- 17 Most candidates were able to explain the reasons why personal rule was either sudden or unexpected or not. They were able to form some sort of judgement on good evidence, for instance the Bishops War and Laud's influence on the church. Better essays questioned the key words: sudden and unexpected. They used a high level of evidence to really question this claim and although candidates came up with varied arguments, most were able to fully evaluate the cause of breakdown successfully. Weaker responses struggled with the key focus of the question and simply described the breakdown of personal rule, often with weak themes. A minority were uncertain how far back they could go to support their argument.
- 18 This question was the least popular in the section. Candidates struggled to identify the aims of the short and long parliaments and fell into the trap of simply describing the events that led to the outbreak of war. Better responses identified fundamental aims and then compared within context the two parliaments. The nature of the question perhaps put quite a few candidates off and many of those who did attempt it struggled.

F961/02 British History Period Studies

- 1 This was a very popular question and produced a very wide range of responses. Most candidates could produce a list of reasons and many went beyond that, making useful links and seeking to assess factors. Often there was a sense of engagement and argument over the relative importance of factors. Radical weaknesses were covered well: leadership membership, organisation, geographical factors and numerical problems, although in some responses there was a lack of precise supporting detail, with candidates relying on sweeping generalisations about radicalism. However, there were some candidates who were too eager to deal with other factors and gave only passing references to the named factor. Quite often links were made to the events in France and its influence on the radical movement, and this was also used as a link to the growth of loyalist associations. Pitt's repressive legislation was often discussed in detail and linked well to the actual question, similarly his use of propaganda were adduced and there was some good material on loyalism and loyalist clubs and expressions of patriotic feeling. However, some candidates tried to turn the question into one on Pitt's survival and his political skills and only occasionally did better responses make use of some of this knowledge to answer the set question; a few wrote about his government policies, economic, commercial and fiscal; at times such elements were linked well enough to the needs of the question, but not always. A few candidates got muddled between Pitt's and Lord Liverpool's governments.
- 2 This was the least popular question in the Study Topic. There were a number of candidates who focused on the actual passage of the Reform Bill, whilst others focused on causal factors but without sufficient care for the question. Even when the question was addressed, a significant number produced a simple list of reasons as to why reform was carried out, rather than actually considering the extent to which it was needed. Better responses were able to consider material on such areas as corruption, under-representation, rotten and pocket boroughs, excessive patronage, open balloting and made use of some good contextual material, though some did stray into the unrest and go beyond 1830 or assumed that Chartist was already in existence and that reform was needed to contain it. A few were skilful in using prior knowledge of demands for reform and of failed reform attempts to explain the problems of the electoral system while keeping a steady focus on the actual question.
- 3 Candidates displayed a good level of knowledge of Peel's reforms, and although some simply listed his measures, stronger answers were able to establish criteria, usually Peel's aims, against which to judge success. Most responses were able to cover a range of economic and financial policies and knew about social areas, including Ireland (indeed much was seen about events and problems in Ireland: land, the Devon Commission, religion, education, Maynooth). The Budgets, free trade, fiscalism, taxation, Companies Act and Bank Charter Act figured prominently, although detailed knowledge of the budgets and free trade was somewhat lacking. For some, social reforms were problematic both in attribution and extent of success, although some of the stronger answers were able to link his social policy to the idea of making Britain a cheap country to live in. The Factory and Mines Acts were deployed, although a number simply described the terms of the legislation, and a significant number attributed everything there to Peel. Some useful points were made about Peel's attitude towards the Poor Law. Where problems arose was when candidates moved in to the effects of policies, above all the Repeal of the Corn Laws, on the Conservative Party. Sometimes too much was written there, with the result that a number lost focus on the actual demands of the question. Some candidates did try to argue for a mixed pattern of success for the country (railways, prosperity, basis for growth, business confidence) set against the reverse for the party.

- 4 Although many candidates showed a good grasp of the basic concepts of Disraelian Conservatism, there were a significant number who were able to focus sufficiently on the named factor and often dismissed it in a brief and generalised paragraph. There were those who then wrote in detail about what Disraeli did in power, unloading descriptions of legislation and drifting into past question areas or who spent much of their answer focusing on Tory democracy or what Disraeli did for the working class. However, some did try to assess the three features, making links to actions and ideas (Disraeli's formative political writings and the speeches of 1872 were well used) and integrating examples of legislative actions by careful reference to the question and to other facets of Disraelian Conservatism. One Nation Conservatism, Tory Democracy, imperialism, pragmatism and opportunism were all prominent factors, often well assessed and argued, though at times answer drifted rather too much into what Disraeli did to rebuff Gladstone's policies and measures. That said, some sophisticated answers were seen.
- 5 Most candidates could write, often at length, about the policies, covering and distinguishing between foreign and imperial policies, describing, sometimes assessing. The strongest answers were able to focus on the concept of 'benefit', but many relied on assertions, rather than substantiated judgements and a significant number focused more on success and failure. Some used extensive material from previous answers, but many were unclear on how to pin down benefit. Most had quite balanced material between benefit or not but often came to a more forthright conclusion than their argument suggested they would. Not so many focused enough on 'little benefit' and some wanted to write about domestic policies as well (or instead) while some wanted to use economic downturn as a way to explain the foreign and imperial policies. The latter approach had mixed outcomes. India, the Suez Canal, the Balkans, South Africa and Afghanistan featured, though in uneven degrees of coverage in some responses. Some strong answers were seen but description did appear often and there were issues about approaches.
- 6 Most candidates had a sufficient body of knowledge, with many providing good details particularly on his Irish policy. A few candidates did not address the question carefully and wrote about the First Ministry. However, most did focus after 1880 and quite a number produced a pleasing range of coverage. This usually included some, or all of the following: Ireland; foreign and imperial policies; failed domestic reforms; party splits and tensions. Personalities figured at times; there were arguments over the GOM losing his political touch and about the further revival of the Conservatives (though in some answers Disraeli appeared remarkably long-lived); some responses were good on such aspects as Faddism, the Newcastle Programme, Gladstone's longevity and the problems that created. Surprisingly, not so much was made of the Home Rule tensions and divisiveness. At times, candidates focused more on what failed, rather than reasons for the failure and did not always mould their material to the actual demands of the question. Overall, the 1880-86 Ministry got more coverage than that of 1892-4.
- 7 Most candidates did focus on both principles and the extent of change. However, weaker responses drifted from the concepts of 'principles' and examined Britain's relationship with various countries, often describing the relationship in great detail and losing focus on the demands. There was sometimes an inadequate definition of foreign and imperial policy, but the key aspects were generally confidently recognized, albeit with an almost formulaic, list of factors. A number of candidates found it difficult to construct a tight argument across the whole period and there was a tendency for many answers to focus on either the start of the period or specific events, such as the Congress of Berlin. However, a good number of responses did reach as far as 1902 with references to Splendid Isolation, its ending and the 1902 Alliance with Japan. The Balkans, the Mediterranean, Egypt, and areas of Africa often featured in answers. Those candidates who adopted a more thematic approach usually focused on issues such as the balance of power, trade, economic needs, strategic imperatives, fears of Russia and then Germany, the avoidance of foreign entanglements,

the maintenance of power and of Empire and the advent of ‘Splendid Isolation.’ There were some interesting points made about support for new states and constitutions with events in Italy to the fore.

- 8 This was a popular question and there were a significant number of very strong and well informed answers. There was some overlap in ideas and material with Question 7. Some candidates adopted a geographical-regional approach though this did make the assessment of relative importance of factors more difficult, although some stronger answers considered the relative importance of factors within the region under discussion. However, answers that were thematic often fared better for clarity of argument. Candidates were able to discuss a wide range of factors and were usually able to support this with detailed factual knowledge. Trade, commercial and economic activities and needs were often set against factors such as strategic and military and naval dimensions; the humanitarian (civilising), religious and cultural; the role of individuals and companies. At times there was so much material and so many factors that answers did not deliver the evaluative assessments required or the argument got lost in a plethora of factual details, when selection of appropriate supporting material might have served the answer better. But most answers did seek to assess the factors in context and did range across the period. It was noticeable that weaker responses tended to regurgitate parts of Question 7.
- 9 Although a few responses wrote too much about pre-1902 or post-1911, most focused on the time period given in the title. Generally, answers were sound, some both knowledgeable and secure in argument and assessment levels, but there were a number where candidates simply produced a list of reasons without any evaluative comment. There were still those who saw the commitment as an alliance but most identified it as a form of friendship, one that grew and strengthened in the years after 1904. The roles of Edward VII and of Lansdowne and then Grey were often well elucidated; so, too, often there was good material on the development of military and naval talks after previous areas of tension had been resolved. Mutual fears of Germany, the Moroccan Crises, the Entente with Russia were usually discussed, though there was a tendency to over-describe events in Morocco. There were those, however, who focused almost always totally on rivalry with Germany; this was particularly noticeable in weaker responses where candidates wanted to turn it into an answer on why relations with Germany deteriorated. The French/ Russian specific issues were often a mere adjunct to Germany and showed a lack of understanding of the complexities of the period; however some stronger answers brought in the significance of the Anglo-Japanese alliance. The short time scale was ignored by some with a tendency to want to go on to events in 1914 and the run-up to war with Germany. There were very few candidates who were able to discuss the fact that an understanding with France did not preclude an agreement with Germany, but those who did raise this issue usually scored well.
- 10 Although this was a popular question, there were a number of either very narrow answers or others that did not focus on the precise demands of the question, but instead wrote about the legislation passed by the Labour government and also their forays into foreign affairs. Even those who were aware of a range of factors often produced little more than a list of reasons and did not evaluate their relative importance. At times there was generalisation or else muddle over events, names, factors. This was particularly noticeable in discussing the nature of the minority government, few seemed to know the precise electoral position of the Labour party and some even suggested that the Liberals were in coalition with them. However, most candidates were able to adduce a range of factors, even if the development of those did vary. The minority status, the lack of experience, the newness of the party, MacDonald's leadership (though usually seen as successful), the Campbell Case and the Zinoviev Letter all featured, together with some grasp of the political context. Some candidates were able to point to the particular significance of the Campbell Case, but a large number did not see this as the ultimate reason or trigger for the ending of the government. In many instances more could have been made of the minority status in the context of parliamentary politics; with consideration given to the

attitudes of Conservatives, especially Baldwin, and the Liberals. Some responses described the policies of the Government without sufficient awareness of the thrust of the question.

- 11 This topic was more popular than in the past and there was evidence of a clearer grasp of the national Government's economic policies. There were many solid and indeed some good answers. But there were also a number that were too general or muddled. Some candidates wrote about all aspects of National Governments' economic policies without enough focus on the key issue of unemployment, spending too long discussing issues such as benefits. The better or best responses did have such a focus, were aware of the geographical and regional dimensions, aware of the levels of unemployment in the different regions and even towns, and of the limited impact of policies such as the Special Areas Acts. The Means Test, the end of the Gold Standard, Protectionism, 'cheap money' featured often but there was a tendency to try to argue that the latter three areas reduced unemployment, when, in fact, the benefits went to new industries and only parts of the country. Most argued that rearmament and the coming of war was the key to falling unemployment, though this did lead some to diversion into foreign policy. However, others also considered the consumer boom and the availability of housing, but better answers linked this to cheap money and low interest rates, which was government policy. There was quite good factual support in many answers but the status of rearmament caused issues because it was not seen as a deliberate policy by some, though others argued that it was.
- 12 Labour actually gained in terms of the number of voters in the 1951 election and were only out of power because of the vagaries of the electoral system, a point that was picked up on by many stronger candidates. However, the greatest difficulty that most candidates had was avoiding the list approach, although some stronger answers were able to make links between the factors. There were some confusions and some weak question focus: MacDonald was mentioned; even Churchill as the Labour leader; there were confusions over the 1945 General Election; there was some tendency to unload information about the policies and measures linked to the Beveridge Report and the five 'evils'; in some responses all the key Acts were listed. Better responses made use of such knowledge to argue about the loss of support by 1950-51. Key factors considered usually included: attitudes towards welfare and especially the NHS, nationalisation, the general economic context and so government policies, tired and ailing leadership and Conservative revival. A feature was the number who omitted austerity as a factor and yet at the same time spent a long time discussing prescription charges and the selling out of the working class. Overall, relatively few tried to distinguish levels of importance.
- 13 Most candidates usually did try to compare policies within a themed approach and this made for better answers than where there was a simple listing of governments and policies. The former approach usually highlighted similarity and difference. Most argued that the foreign policies were similar, particularly in terms of attitudes towards the USA and USSR and the Cold War. Some argued that differences did appear over colonial and imperial policy, particularly after Suez and the 'Winds of Change' speech. Those who adopted a thematic approach usually considered issues such as the relationships with the USA and the USSR, the Cold War, nuclear status, defence of Empire or colonies, the growing interest in Europe and the emergent EEC. It was pleasing that candidates usually covered the whole period, rather than excessively focusing on the start of the period and this allowed a more balanced approach to the question. Those who adopted a chronological approach, often replete with detail, found it harder to make comparisons between Labour and the Conservatives and often produced more descriptive responses, lacking the necessary assessment and explanation.
- 14 Although this was a popular question, there were a number who were unaware of the period when Thatcher was in power, with the result that essays often went back to the 1960s or even the 1950s. Occasionally candidates wrote little about the named factor and

Centres should remind their candidates that they must write a good paragraph about the named factor even if they want to argue that it was not the most important. However, most covered the relationship with the USA, often in some detail. Some candidates relied on an overview of foreign policy events without focusing on America. Many answers were typified by a summary sentence in each paragraph to try to establish a link back to the question, with attempts at analysis often being little more than assertion. The role of European policy seemed to provide some confusion, as well as attitudes towards South Africa and Rhodesia as to where they sat in relation to USA. Many handled the attitude to communism and the end of the Cold War well, although some exaggerated Thatcher's role in the ending of the Cold War. In respect of relations with the USA, some argued there was nothing but amity, others that there were uneven moments. Links were made to the Cold War, the Falklands and nuclear weaponry. Thatcher's stance over the USSR and Communism, her attitudes towards Europe and the developing EU, the defence and assertion of British interests and status in the world also featured in many answers. Most candidates did try to argue and assess the relative importance of policy areas and issues.

- 15 This question produced a wide range of answers. Some responses said little about the Suez Crisis; some described it in great detail but at the expense of other factors. Often responses became embroiled in narratives relating to decolonisation since the 1940s and failed to distinguish between pre- and post- 1956 and, even when that was done, there was insufficient linkage in general to the impact of Suez on events. There were some who went into great detail about the events of 1956 and did not deal with the question focus. Most candidates felt it was important but quantifying it was usually avoided. In many answers Suez was set against the factors of decolonisation, rising nationalism, the retreat from Empire, economic and military contingencies and problems, post-War thinking, pressures from the USA, the context of the Cold War. Some argued that decolonisation was already underway because of long term reasons, most notably the war, and pointed to India, whilst others suggested that Suez was crucial in changing attitudes and suggested that it linked to later developments. However, there were some candidates who delivered a prepared answer on the reasons for decolonisation and these did not score well and show the dangers of pre-prepared responses which do not focus on the precise demands of the question.
- 16 Many candidates either ignored the focus of the question or did not understand its implications and instead wrote all they knew about the record of the Conservative governments or even focused on scandals and similar areas, features of recent past questions. A number of responses wrote about prosperity in only the most general terms, failing to relate it to 'Never had it so good' and failed to relate it in any specific way to electoral success. Many answers were weak in considering electoral manipulation whilst some resorted to a narrative of the 1950s without analysing the focus of the question. However there were some excellent answers that contained real links and judgements, which were very well supported by precise details about rises in real wages and the purchasing power of families. Most responses did try to address 'Never had it so good', although an understanding of it was often a discriminator, and put that famous remark into context, sometimes with much topic knowledge about economic developments, fiscal policies, social features (signs of affluence, consumerism), so leading into reasons for dominance. Surprisingly, not so many mentioned Labour weaknesses as a factor in Conservative dominance. Conservative leadership often got much coverage, at times excessively so, with lists of leaders and their personal features and qualities. There were some weaker answers that went on to explain the reasons for the end of Conservative dominance, once again suggesting either a pre-prepared answer or the need for closer reading of the question set.
- 17 There were those who completely avoided any initial definition of controversial and this often made it difficult to link material back to the actual question. Consequently potentially detailed and erudite answers were marked often by assertions at the end of paragraphs or in conclusions. It was surprising that very few candidates mentioned the break with

consensus as a primary factor. Some strayed into the reasons for electoral successes, again a past question. Many candidates could write about Thatcher's domestic policies – some wrote about foreign policy too – but were not able to link this to 'so controversial' other than by simple bolt-on statements. Those who did make the links and explained the controversies did better. Stronger answers often discussed issues such as her economic policy, monetarism, the creation of a culture of greed, a North-South divide usually linked to trade union issues, the Miners' Strike, privatisation and the poll tax. There were some weaker answers where candidates went into great detail about the Miner's strike or the Poll Tax riots, without linking them to the issue of controversial, while others spent too long discussing issues such as the growing divisions within her Cabinet without linking it back to controversial.

- 18 In general, candidates have become more assured in tackling questions on Ireland, but in many instances this question drew responses that were descriptive and often generalised. Where knowledge was used, often it was episodic and uneven, with many spending too long setting the scene and discussing the period before 1950. Many answers were chronological and although this did not prevent analytical answers it made it more difficult for candidates to evaluate issues. Those candidates who were able to write analytical responses often adopted a more thematic approach. Those who adopted such an approach often considered a range of issues such as religious divisions, the growing extremism in politics and in terrorist activities, mainland bombings, the failures of power sharing and other political initiatives, the effects of Direct Rule, leadership figures, and the attitudes of governments. However, many analytical answers struggled to go beyond a list approach and few really tried to offer any distinction in importance between the factors.

F962/01 European and World History Period Studies

General Comments

Most candidates tended to understand the basic argument and they generally seemed more analytical than last year and aware of the issues. But this often led to a fair amount of assertion and generalised explanation when the analysis wasn't supported. There were a lot of useful/focused but 'throw away' comments to start paragraphs which were often not extended - e.g. claiming 'this factor is the most important' or 'more important/significant than other' as a 'lead in' to the paragraph. Although this showed better focus and attempt to argue, this isn't analysis in itself and many candidates didn't go beyond this introductory sentence/argument followed by some explanation. Not many proved their points about significance and truly analysed the relative importance of factors and when they did, it was mainly in the conclusion. Alternatively there were some stronger candidates who had high levels of consistent analysis but their pursuit of argument often led them to neglect the need for more detailed support and explanation to prove the argument as they went along. Overall, there still seems to be a general lack of specific detail to support explanatory points so that what is written doesn't truly reflect knowledge of the topic in terms of 'proving' the argument (e.g. weak generalised arguments about Charles I having 'problems' as he wasn't Spanish but not relating it to actual real problems; general explanation of religious motives for the First Crusade but without proving it by referring to examples where that was clearly the case). Otherwise, some candidates had very good knowledge and understanding of the issues but they lacked consistency throughout the essay or lost focus slightly or tended to list examples without really explaining the relevance to the argument (e.g. Renaissance). Overall, they seemed better than last year but the amount of supporting detail is still fairly thin at times for an AS Level paper.

- 1 Most candidates seemed to be expecting a question which focused on religion as a key motivator of the First Crusade, but the best responses had plenty to say about more worldly factors. Weaker responses had a tendency to give superficial accounts without giving any actual examples, either of different groups within society or individuals. This should have been a fairly straightforward question, but even strong candidates didn't really do justice to the proposition in the question despite making good analytical comments. Not many candidates elaborated on the issue of primogeniture and when they did, they didn't have supporting examples to prove it. Explanation and support for 'wealth, land and power' tended to be limited to a brief reference to Baldwin or arguing against the proposition by making generalised comments about crusading being 'ruinously expensive' and therefore it wasn't a motive. A few of the better responses developed the difference between an initial motive for going on crusade (in terms of expectations) and any difference in motive for their 'continuation' during the course of crusade once they had experienced events.
- 2 In the best responses candidates were able to evaluate just how important leadership was compared to other factors; while weaker responses tended to list factors or say they were all equally important. There was a tendency to write in general terms about military leaders and only the better responses gave concrete examples of leadership on the First Crusade and then linked this to its success. Most candidates tended to argue against the question and felt that Muslim disunity was the key reason, though weaker responses did not fully support this. Military leadership was dealt with in a very generalised manner in terms of making claims of good leadership due to successes and victories achieved (and listing them), rather

than actually explaining ‘how’ their leadership caused success. There were some strong answers though which tied explanations of strong leadership to the exploitation of Muslim disunity. Religious zeal was dealt with well, but other factors had limited support.

- 3 There were some very good answers which considered a wide range of factors in depth. Most concluded that Muslim disunity was crucial but there was plenty to be said for Crusader strengths. Muslim disunity tended to be dealt with generally (e.g. explaining why they were disunited and/or listing crusade ‘successes’ due to their lack of unity) rather than explaining the relevance of disunity to the survival of the crusader states before the Third Crusade. Most tended to deal with Muslim disunity by arguing on the basis of later unity under Saladin (mainly briefly) rather than explaining and proving how disunity helped before then. References to the military orders and castles tended to be quite generalised rather than explaining their significance to survival. There was some discussion of crusader state rulers but this was mainly limited. The pattern of success was linked to the detail and depth of analysis of factors rather than any pattern of misunderstanding of the question.
- 4 The best essays were able to weigh up church patronage against other important reasons. Most were aware of the rising importance of Rome compared with Florence over time, and some were able to show how Venice became more important in the later period. Weaker answers were generally descriptive accounts of which popes were patrons together with lists of specific works of art produced in Rome under papal patronage, although surprisingly few mentioned the construction of St Peters and work of Bramante. Some candidates also referred to support for humanism which reflected good balance of treatment. Overall, there was little real explanation in terms of the question of ‘development’. In terms of papal or church patronage, some acknowledged that this became more prevalent during the High Renaissance and that Rome took centre stage as opposed to the early Florentine Renaissance. However, considering this is a basic factual point in terms of the chronology of the Renaissance period, it wasn’t referred to significantly and when it was, it wasn’t explored in terms of analysing relative ‘development’ across the period due to patronage or other factors. Most candidates tended to refer to Florence and used the guilds and the Medici as alternative forms of patronage but there was generally a lack of discussion of relative importance.
- 5 There were some fine responses, evaluating the importance of the Medici against other factors. That said, very few achieved this evaluative balance. Most candidates answered this question as well as Question 4 and this led to a great deal of repetition of examples used and points made in relation to the Medici and Florentine guilds, thus reflecting limited knowledge, and the fact that often the main weight of knowledge lay in the art rather than factors affecting patronage. There was a tendency to tell the story of the Medici and list examples of their patronage rather than explaining the significance of their contribution. Most candidates only balanced this against guild patronage and generalised comments about ‘wealth’ or listed other prominent families such as the Strozzi and Pazzi; few candidates actually discussed other key factors such as republican government, early humanism and economic conditions and when they did, it tended to be brief or descriptive. Most essays were merely ‘working’ through the factors. Even stronger responses tended not to develop any real analysis by linking Medici importance to the economic and political conditions which allowed them to become prominent. There was some better discussion however in terms of the development of civic humanism under Bruni as well as the Medici patronage of the Platonic Academy and Ficino.

- 6 This question elicited some very fine essays which had an excellent knowledge of cultural developments in the North and focused their answer on the relative importance of Italian influence. Some better examples were referenced to support Italian influence as well as other factors, although their relevance could have been explained more fully to avoid listing. A greater sense of chronology would have aided analysis in terms of showing understanding of the earlier Flemish contributions in comparison to other northern characteristics later on. A few candidates lost clear focus by ending up arguing the question the other way round by referring to northern influence on Italy (e.g. use of oils in painting) which, although a valid point, was not tied back to the main argument. There was also some chronological confusion, to the effect that the Northern Renaissance was influenced by the Reformation with the supporting examples pre-dating the Reformation. There was also a tendency to point out ways in which the Northern Renaissance influenced the Italian Renaissance.
- 7 This was a question, and in a format, that candidates were clearly prepared for. The best answers were exemplary, balancing the named factor against others, supporting those factors with in some cases impressive and precise knowledge and focusing sharply on factors relating to exploration rather than more generally to exploration and empire-building. Less effective answers tended to be more generic in their treatment. The drift into empire building tended to come when considering Cortes and Pizarro, when no distinction was made between the exploration and conquest aspects of their careers. There was virtually nothing in most answers on economic considerations, Charles I or any other explorers beyond Columbus, Cortes and Pizarro, and Magellan was mentioned only by a minority. Reference was rarely made to the individual skills of those explorers.
- 8 There were some fine answers to this question, balancing several motives and evaluation of their relative importance. There was a pattern of drift in weaker answers: it tended to be from development of Empire into exploration. It did seem that the term exploration was often indistinguishable in the minds of some candidates from developing an Empire. There was little consideration of the nature of the Empire as a clue to the motives for its development and very little reference to the Atlantic Islands and particularly not Brazil. Little was said except in the strongest essays about John the Navigator's specific contribution or about any explorers other than da Gama and Diaz but there was significant coverage of prestige and status on national and individual levels. A few had some chronological problems with the use of the Reformation as a motive for developing an Empire – it was used for the wrong period of development. In some cases there was drift into means as opposed to motive.
- 9 This was the least popular question of this unit. Many candidates could not appreciate the differences between the factors relevant to exploration and those relevant to overseas exploration. Candidates who could not differentiate found themselves repeating material used for Question 7. That said it was not difficult to make at least some of the factors relevant to exploration fit an argument about empire building, so it is not entirely surprising that candidates should drift from one to the other. This vagueness of treatment was the principal pattern of limitation. The other was the difficulty some candidates find in moving from the description and individual analysis of different factors to supporting their comments on the linkage and hierarchy of them. Those who could do this handled this question very well.
- 10 Most candidates answered this question. There were strong answers which balanced religious aims and successes against economic or political in order to assess whether they deserved the title. Some attempted this in reference to their aims only, and not limitations of religious policies, but never explained or justified other factors, and were thus limited to making assertions. Some candidates tended to focus on religious aims only and made sweeping statements about the Reconquista and

Inquisition. Few went further to explain limitations to religious policies and discussion about church reform, where present, was too often limited to generalised claims that there was an aim to remove pluralism, absenteeism and immoral behaviour or merely listing a few basic policies. There were some weaker responses which did not focus on the question directly in terms of whether they deserved the title, drifting to writing about religious uniformity or even unity.

- 11 Discussion of Charles' lack of Spanish upbringing, failure to arrive immediately and so on is bound to be very basic if it is not given specific support. For many the only problems identified were the two revolts and there was too often a lack of reference to administrative, financial or economic problems, or to specific incidents or actions. That said, there were some excellent responses which clearly tied in Charles' weakness and failure to understand the nobility with longstanding problems with the towns or the mudejars of Valencia – these candidates had some good analysis and tended to see Charles' inaction as the 'trigger'. The best responses balanced Charles' responsibility with the nature of the difficulties he faced. Weaker responses tended to decide it was entirely Charles' fault but without proving the point and there was little explanatory use of the Communeros and Germania revolts to prove the contribution of either Charles, in terms of incompetence and lack of action, or other long-term factors. Some patterns of failure emerged: some responses merely told the story of each revolt and failed to explain their causes. There was also significant drift into how Charles resolved his problems and a number of descriptive responses.
- 12 Fewer candidates answered this question but there were some very good responses which clearly balanced his failure with financial problems against successes in areas such as pacifying the nobility and dealing with the administrative system. Some answers were quite sophisticated but they could still have supported their comments further with specific examples. For example, a comment about the creation of councils was valid in terms of proving that he aimed to pacify the nobility but in itself, it didn't prove effective government unless specific supporting examples were made to show how and when this occurred. Overall, few went beyond mentioning the creation of the councils rather than proving their success. There was some weaker discussion too about religious policies – although Charles' success in preventing the spread of Protestantism into Spain is a valid point, too much was made of this by most candidates and they did not seem to recognise that this was a weaker argument in terms of it not being a 'problem' in the first place. This made some answers much weaker, particularly if they did not discuss the key problems which Charles faced sufficiently well. There were some patterns of failure. Some responses focused on Charles' overall aims and policies beyond 1524, rather than on 'dealing with problems'. A few drifted to talking about his foreign policy as Holy Roman Emperor and lost focus on Spain.
- 13 This was the least popular question in this section. It elicited generally appropriate responses, though there was some tendency to dwell on how the Theses came about rather than on why he pinned them up. There was a good sense of context. Some were very good at explaining factors but failed to assess their relative significance and so could not achieve highly on AO1(b). This type of question does expose the limitations of candidates' ability to evaluate. A regular pattern of weakness is to assert linkage or importance: "the most important factor..." without justifying it. Candidates tend to expect this structure of question, but do need to differentiate between asserting importance and explaining it.
- 14 There were some very good attempts at this question. Most had good knowledge. Essays worked through the key factors and discussion was generally supported as far as the candidate was able. Most candidates did not really expand on the significance of events surrounding the Diet of Worms, though, which was surprising.

Most discussion centred on Charles' absence and there was some very good discussion of princely particularism with clear analysis tying it in to Charles' inaction and political motives for adopting Protestantism. Less discussion occurred on the appeal of Luther's ideas and when it did, it tended to be quite generalised without giving supporting examples or proof to show its effect other than a brief reference to Nuremberg. However, failure to expand on this was justifiable as there was some sophisticated analysis which clearly put it in context and understood it was less about the appeal of Luther but the ambitions of the princes which Charles inadvertently allowed and then left too late to deal with. Most candidates knew what they had to do: the weaker described the reasons, with the stronger being able to support the linkages between and relative importance of them.

- 15 Most candidates who attempted this question developed sound discussion to balance their argument by showing how France was not necessarily a threat by discussing Charles' superiority in terms of military techniques and resources, whether discussing trace Italienne or apparent greater access to finances. This was generally supported well by referring to specific examples of successful battles or land conquered. Some discussion referred to geography and French encirclement, but this tended to be limited. Few referred to Charles' Burgundian possessions. Overall, many concluded that France was a great threat due to the fact that despite the relative weakness of the French, their hostility was continuous and consistently perceived threat due to dynastic and personal rivalries. Some had good analytical comments though and clearly understood the arguments, but didn't always support or explain these factors throughout the essay, so judgements were not necessarily substantiated. Overall, candidates tended to focus well on the question and be limited by their powers of analysis and their depth of knowledge rather than by any pattern of misunderstanding.
- 16 There were some excellent responses which saw the interconnectivity of the issues and were able to explain and evaluate them clearly. It seemed, however, that this slant was unexpected: some candidates appeared prepared to answer a question about how he handled the problems he inherited. They considered his solutions and/or the impact of the problems on his reign, with the seriousness determined by his capacity to deal with the problem or how much it affected the rest of his reign. Often the range of issues considered was limited: one of these was foreign policy which was not strictly relevant, and very few looked at the nobility issue. Some candidates were able to work through factors but without much analysis and they tended to focus on the seriousness of the financial situation he faced. References to bankruptcy were fairly generalised, complemented by generalised discussion of problems with the nobility or vague references to foreign policy. Weaker answers were characterised by a significant lack of specific supporting examples.
- 17 Candidates seemed to find this a straightforward question, and it elicited focused responses, sometimes of very high quality. Some good knowledge and technique were shown: candidates were able to access the higher levels because they assessed (as they should) relative significance consistently and covered most of the relevant issues. Links between finance and other issues were not always considered and where they were the development was often inadequate. Conciliarism and attempts to control factions were referred to and examples of rivalry or how councils were effective or not were sometimes discussed. There were some patterns of failure. Some drifted into discussing why finance was unsuccessful. Some wrote generalisations revealing little real knowledge of what Philip's domestic policies actually were in order to assess effectiveness. Candidates who did both Q16 and 17 tended to repeat material and there was little real difference between essays.

- 18 There were some sophisticated responses to this question. Most candidates managed to cover the full length of the relevant period and construct well-supported arguments. There were a number of different interpretations as to the main reason – each well-justified. Although geography, leadership, foreign support and Spanish weakness/distraction were mainly identified and discussed, only the stronger answers were able to show how these caused the continuation and length of the revolt. There were some very vague answers, where candidates recognised the relevant factors, but failed to offer specific instances where they prolonged the conflict. Two patterns of error developed. Some considered why the Dutch were successful. Others discussed reasons for the outbreak of the Revolt and tried to stretch this to meet the requirements of the question.

F962/02 European and World History Period Studies

- 1 This was the least popular of the three questions in this Study topic. Many candidates found it much easier to write about the issues of liberty and equality rather than fraternity, which some simply ignored. Candidates tended to focus on issues such as education and the law to the exclusion of any obvious remarks about the autocratic nature of the constitutions and local government. The tendency was to oscillate between this was a revolutionary principle, this was not, leading to a list-like response which did not go beyond Level III for AO1b. However, a few attempted to organise the essay via the three principles but this did not always work very well. Stronger responses did attempt to make judgements or offered a balanced discussion about how far each reform applied the revolutionary principles. ‘Fraternity’ caused a few problems for candidates, though one candidate did point out that the Edict of Fraternity (1792) was not a domestic reform at all, but a call to arms to oppressed peoples everywhere.
- 2 Most candidates were able to identify reasons for success and on the whole made sound judgements on the role of the Army. However, some failed to mention Carnot, the Levee and the size of the French army in comparison to those of the allies; but stronger answers made the sound point that the Army of Italy which Napoleon inherited was a shambles, thereby demonstrating his abilities. All said he was a great general, but failed to state what he actually did in the battles that was so great or could support their claims by specific reference to battles and campaigns. In contrast, stronger answers were well supported by specific examples. The paragraphs on the weaknesses of his opponents tended to be very generalised; few could give any examples of how the allies failed to co-ordinate or co-operate. Overall, the question produced a significant number of responses that relied heavily on assertions.
- 3 The question tended to produce a list of reasons why Napoleon was defeated by 1814, with very little assessment or evaluation of the factors. Many answers spent too long on his earlier career, with some going back to 1798. Although many candidates knew a great deal about events in Spain and Russia, the most significant problem was that many focused on why he lost in Spain and Russia, rather than explaining how these events resulted in his overall defeat by 1814. Most disappointing was the lack of knowledge about the events of 1813 and 1814, with very few candidates able to go beyond the fact that he lost at Waterloo. Candidates should be aware that long-term causes have little impact without short-term causes and this should impact on the amount of time they give to earlier events.
- 4 This was a popular question, which covered a wide range of material. Examiners did not expect candidates to cover everything, but what mattered was the quality of analysis and reasonable coverage of both monarchs. Sometimes candidates produced answers which essentially listed the changes under Louis XVIII and saw them as a series of swings from centre to left/right. Many focused on the reasons for the changes and explained them, rather than dealing with the extent to which they changed, whilst others focused on the success and failures of the monarch’s policies. A significant minority focussed either only on Louis - with nothing or very little on Charles X. The best answers identified politics, economics and foreign policy, and then assessed both monarchs’ reigns, focusing on the degree of similarity and difference and the extent of change, either comparing the extent of policy change between Louis and Charles or the changes that took place between the early years of Louis and his later years.

- 5 The key to a successful answer was a balance of longer and shorter-term factors, and a spread of domestic and foreign issues. Many candidates who chose this question seemed competent as regards different factors, usually long and short-term, and the necessary supporting detail, and most attempted explicit judgements about relative importance. Most candidates argued that the short-term factors were key and were often able to link two or three of these in their judgements. However, weaker responses, although they described or explained a range of factors, such as conditions in towns or foreign policy, were unable to explain how this contributed to the 1848 revolution. In addition they often failed to address the relative importance of factors, simply producing a list of reasons. A significant number of candidates still struggle to get to grips with the term ‘assess’ as it is used regularly as a command word and Centres might benefit from greater emphasis on it. Some candidates drifted from the precise focus of the question and seemed to be addressing a question about whether revolution was inevitable, whilst others dwelt too long on personality and character aspects instead of more weighty factors.
- 6 Of the three questions in this section, this one was the least popular. There were a number of ways this question could be approached and examiners were aware of the possible variety of approaches. However, whichever approach was taken, candidates would have benefited from a definition of liberalism in their opening paragraph and then used that as a measure against which to assess his Empire. Despite this, most candidates attempted to give a balanced answer, with some suggesting that there was some liberalism before 1860s, or that there were elements of authoritarianism after the liberal reforms. The better answers considered a wide range of issues and usually dealt with politics, economic and foreign policy, to address ‘to what extent’. The best answers often compared the 1860s with the 50s and questioned the extent to which Napoleon III’s Empire became more liberal, whereas weaker answers gave reasons why he became more liberal, but did not explain to what extent. In some weaker responses candidates were more concerned about whether he was successful or not in carrying out his policies and wrote little on the actual question itself. There were also some candidates who paid too much attention to Paris’ development and its ‘benefits’.
- 7 Many candidates lacked substantial knowledge about the key issue and many also did not see the significance of the dates in the question. As a result, answers were often generalised or went well beyond the scope of the question with focus on the development of railways after 1850. Most candidates were able to consider a range of other factors that were relevant in explaining the opening of the West. These commonly included Manifest Destiny, the role of Federal Government, explorers like Lewis and Clarke, transport improvements, including the Pony Express and Cumberland Road, and pull factors like the California Gold Rush. Stronger answers were able to prioritise and link factors, for example, the role of Federal Government was commonly highlighted as the most significant factor and was linked to the role it played in developing communication, and as a means of allowing settlement further west. Additionally, links were sometimes made between Federal Government incentivising explorers like Lewis and Clarke to map their movement west. When fur traders were discussed they were usually seen as a less significant factor because of their number. The Gold Rush was cited as having a greater impact because it involved so many more, albeit for a relatively short period of time in some cases. Only a few candidates discussed the persecution of the Mormons and the impact of overcrowding and other push factors. Moreover, it was not uncommon to see the fur trade only briefly discussed. As a consequence weaker responses failed to analyse and evaluate the main factor in the question in enough depth to go beyond Level IV. Another common error was the discussion of the Homestead Acts and other pull factors for farmers. These were indeed examples of Federal Government intervention in opening up the west but were beyond the demands of the question. So too was any discussion of the Trans-continental railroad.

- 8 The question was often answered by a 'list of factors' which caused animosity between the whites and the Native Americans. Only a few candidates distinguished between different sorts of Native Americans and different periods. A common approach was to consider 'different cultures' or 'a different way of life' in which the Native Indians wanted to roam about and the whites wanted to stay in one place, but this was a very simplistic approach. However, some candidates did consider a range of factors which included the actions of Federal Government, the aggression of Native Americans, and the actions of white settlers. Stronger answers explained in detail about how and why a peaceful compromise could not be reached. There was a range of knowledge applied to the question and many candidates provided extensive evidence of how white settlers and the Federal Government had exacerbated problems. A commonly used example was the breaking of the Laramie Treaty and the trespassing on the Black Hills once gold was discovered. There were interesting analyses of cultures and evidence of massacres was used to blame Native Americans (Fetterman) and whites (Sand Creek) for appalling actions. Substantiated judgements were sometimes made and used a raft of evidence to damn the actions of the government for encouraging and incentivising the white settlers to encroach on Indian territories. Surprisingly few people mentioned Manifest Destiny and racism as a key factor.
- 9 Out of the three possible questions on this Study topic, this question yielded the least analysis of factors and generated a greater degree of narrative. There was an accurate range of evidence used but it was sometimes not fully applied to drill deeper into the demands of the question. Slavery, economy and westward expansion were commonly dealt with. Invariably, westward expansion was tied to slavery due to the 1850 compromise that had occurred. Candidates achieving Level 1a and Level 1b demonstrated a more accurate sense of context and precision, analysing tariff issues and sectionalism against the backdrop of heightening tensions. Effective judgements were made about the linkages between economy and politics.
- The most common error was to focus on developments prior to 1850 without justification, and address events after the 1850s, in particular Lincoln as president or to write about the causes of the Civil War. Another error was to focus so heavily on slavery that westward expansion was not explicitly discussed or linked to the peculiar institution of the south. Many saw westward expansion as somehow different from the slavery issue and few really engaged with the major issues caused by lands taken from Mexico or the violence in Kansas and Nebraska. Some candidates produced sequential descriptions of a few issues – the Fugitive Slave Act, John Brown's raid, for instance without much link to the question or long accounts of the lead up to the Compromise of 1850.
- 10 There were a number of candidates who struggled with the named factor and wanted to dismiss it quickly and write either on Germany or more general issues such as the alliance system or imperialism. Weaker answers often did not get beyond Russia was to blame because they mobilised or it was Germany's fault because they issued the 'blank cheque' to Austria-Hungary. There were some stronger responses that were aware of the humiliations of 1905 and 1908, but this was rare. Knowledge of events at the end of July and early August 1914 was also rare or superficial and candidates seemed unaware of the importance of the Schlieffen Plan in turning a Balkan war into a larger scale conflict.
- 11 This question did generate some sound answers with a good appreciation of France's wish to dismember Germany and Lloyd George's public and private faces discussed thoroughly. Better responses developed this and appreciated that France's desire for revenge was equalled or even exceeded by her fears for the future. Candidates were usually able to balance the desire for revenge against other factors, particularly issues such as self-determination or economic factors. However, weaker answers often went little further than describing the terms of the Treaty of Versailles or listing the motives of Clemenceau, Lloyd George and Wilson.

- 12 The overall standard of responses to this question was not high. Only a few candidates did make the link between the Great Depression and Japan's aggression, but detailed knowledge was often lacking and answers frequently relied on generalisations. Even more surprisingly, very few candidates made the link between the Great Depression and Hitler's rise. A few made the link with Britain and France's inability and unwillingness to support the League and ultimately their decision to adopt a policy of appeasement and linked that to the deterioration of international relations. There were a number of answers that were very descriptive, but even here factual knowledge was not always accurate with confusion over dates of the Anschluss and the occupation of the Sudetenland, which undermined the argument that was made.
- 13 In the past candidates have sometimes struggled with questions on Nicholas II so it was pleasing to see a significant number who produced high level analytical answers which addressed the question of his authority. Overall, candidates demonstrated a sound knowledge base, although the depth of understanding, quality and specificity of examples varied between different candidates. The October Manifesto was almost universally discussed. However, good candidates developed the discussion by assessing the extent of authority lost and the degree to which this was due to Fundamental Laws, the role of Stolypin and the division of opposition. Many candidates mentioned how authority was never fully restored by pointing to the Lena Goldfields massacre. Weaker responses were descriptive of events and did not analyse in depth, largely making assertions about whether or not the Tsar had restored his authority. The factors discussed were commonly the October Manifesto, Stolypin, and the creation of the Duma. Sometimes the Duma analysis was a little too descriptive; however it was impressive to see some candidate's knowledge of the bicameral nature of the new Russian parliament, and occasionally the implications of this. Detailed analysis of opposition groups was limited. Few made the distinctions between liberal opponents, left-wing opponents and peasant opposition, and how this was dealt with in various ways. However, a minority did discuss the Union of Unions, Kadets and Union of Liberation, and specifically addressed the skill of Stolypin in restoring order in the countryside. Some candidates had an exceptionally good command of knowledge and mentioned elements like the Vyborg Manifesto and it was common for such students to be critical, judgemental and excel on this question. Occasionally candidates went beyond the onset of war and spoke about the Tsar's role as commander-in-chief, and even 1917. This material was irrelevant.
- 14 This was a very popular question, but also attracted a large number of very general and superficial responses with candidates unable to support their claims with specific examples. Most Candidates were able to consider a reasonable range of factors. The causes of Red victory were covered by many candidates and ultimately assessed as White weaknesses and Red successes. These points were then often subdivided into a range of factors accounting for Red strengths, notably the role of Trotsky and Lenin, control of railways, Red strengths and the central, industrial location of the Bolsheviks. White weaknesses were discussed as the opposite to Red strengths, notably their far-flung position across the empire and ideological variation and divisions. War Communism and an effective analysis of the Greens were rare. Nevertheless the explanations were accurate even if lacking in quality and depth. Strong candidates were more specific and relayed information to support judgements about the relative strength of the factors discussed. Such candidates spoke of Denikin, Yudenich, Kolchak and Kornilov, and made specific links between the energy of Trotsky and the efficacy of Bolshevik propaganda, and the weaknesses of the foreign interlopers.
- 15 This was a popular question. Most candidates wrote about both industrial and agrarian policies, although some did ignore agriculture and limited their response to Level III. There was a range of facts deployed about progress in heavy industry and the common conclusion was usually referring to the social cost and lack of freedoms. Collectivisation was analysed, on the whole in less detail but it often had enough coverage to warrant some explanation and analysis of its success. Surprisingly some candidates wrote about

collectivisation but did not cover the famine. It was quite common to see the role of de-kulakisation played down. Strong candidates made the link between rural, economic successes and industrial successes. Others categorised the consequences of economic successes and failures. Akin to question 14 the responses often lacked precision and specificity regarding AO1a and commonly showed a competent or clear command without any in-depth analysis using specific terminology.

- 16 Although this was quite a popular question it was sometimes done very poorly. A significant number of responses tended to describe Italy's problems, not the efforts of the Liberals to solve them. The level of supporting knowledge was sometimes very thin and this reduced the attempts at argument to little more than assertions. Some candidates ignored the dates in the question and continued to include the war period and beyond. When candidates did analyse the attempts to solve the problems most were able to produce balanced explanations of where their failure was most significant and where there were limited successes. There was some evidence of real problems with chronology and candidates would start with Red Week or Libya and then go back to Adowa. Moreover, a number tended to write very generalised accounts of the North/South divide and the problems of unity that in some cases predated this period. There was some appreciation that Giolitti passed reforms but few could state what they were.
- 17 Although most candidates had little difficulty in pointing to the weaknesses of the Liberal governments they found it much harder to explain how they actually contributed to the rise to power of Mussolini. In some weaker responses candidates repeated much of what they had said in Question 16. The sympathetic attitude of the king and the elite was rarely referred to, and the work of the Blackshirts in combating the Left was similarly passed over in most answers. The March on Rome was also seen more as a cause than a consequence of Mussolini's rise. Generally candidates were weak on the events of 1921-2, some believing that the fascists had electoral success. However, stronger answers were able to provide judgements about links and relative importance, especially in relation to the fear of socialism and the role of the elites.
- 18 Most candidates had sufficient factual knowledge, but were unable to 'assess' the impact, instead either simply describing the economic and social policies or launching into an explanation as to whether the policies were either a success or failure. Some answers were stronger on the economy, although many candidates got into a muddle about the effects of the strong lira on imports and exports, and weaker on social policy. A few strayed into political matters such as censorship and the one party state. Some missed the focus of the question by concentrating on Mussolini's aims, whereas stronger answers focused on the issue of 'impact' and established a series of criteria against which to assess the impact. Many candidates produced list answers, simply running through the various 'battles' and producing a limited analysis at the end of each paragraph. However, some did suggest that the impact was limited as most of the measures were propaganda, but few raised the problem of the difficulty of assessing the actual impact on the Italian people.
- 19 Candidates displayed a sound factual knowledge about either the reasons for Mao's success or the reasons for Chiang's lack of success. However, there were few who were able to balance their coverage and most showed a weakness in dealing with one of the sides. In particular, candidates did not appreciate that Chiang did not control much of China and they did not give sufficient consideration to the war with Japan: indeed a lot of answers only really covered the period 1927-1937. There were very few candidates who appreciated that for much of the period the GMD and CCP were (supposedly) allies, making it harder for the Nationalists to crush the Communists.

- 20** The question produced a wide range of responses with a significant number omitting the redistribution of land 1949/50 and also often omitted the first five year plan, and seemed to confuse the period of recovery '62-'66 with the third five year plan '66-'70. In contrast, the Great Leap Forward was dealt with at length, but the link between Lysenkoism and the appalling famine was often not made. However, stronger essays were well-informed and could draw a clear distinction between the relative successes of the First Five Year Plan and the disasters of the Second. Many of these essays showed a good grasp of the evolution of Mao's agricultural policies and were able to evaluate the relative success or otherwise of his policies.
- 21** The answers to this question were quite strong. Many were factually well informed and could make at least some distinction between the three strands in the title, often contrasting economic reform with continued political repression. However, practically all omitted mention of the one child policy and none went beyond 1989. Most wrote a great deal up to Tiananmen Square, but it would have been worth mentioning that, while the Soviet Union collapsed, the Chinese Communist Party retained complete power, did not reverse the economic reforms and did not cut itself off from the outside world.
- 22** This question was the least commonly answered question from this section. Some candidates struggled with an address of the 'Golden Years'. Such candidates seemed to want to analyse the reasons for the failure of the Weimar republic and assess the role of the Great Depression. Thus, a significant proportion of questions discussed the impact of the Great Depression, but only a few candidates clearly contrasted this to the mid-1920s, and used the short-term loans as a factor in making a judgment about the relative significance of foreign investment.

Many candidates were aware of Stresemann, and the Dawes Plan. Fewer candidates spoke of the Young Plan, and international developments like the spirit of Locarno, acceptance into the League of Nations and the Kellogg-Briand Pact. Thus, the range of evidence was relatively limited, often little more than competent at times. There was some confusion over Stresemann's role with weaker candidates, and some individuals found it difficult to draw out a range of factors and categorise reasons for the Weimar recovery. Stronger responses discussed a broad range of factors, used precise terminology and discussed a cultural and political recovery as a result of foreign aid. These candidates were judgemental and drew explicit links between the factors.

A number of candidates spoke of the falling number of attempted takeovers and linked this to growing political competency. However, there was a degree of confusion about the political orientations of some challengers and the reasons for the failure of each putsch.

In the main, most candidates avoided turning this into a 'what were the problems?' question, though some tended to see 'investment' as down to Stresemann rather than 'foreign powers'. Most candidates attempted to deal with the given factor, and most were able to identify and explain 'other factors' (with reasonable knowledge), before attempting to make judgements about relative importance.

- 23** This was a popular question. Many candidates chose to address the factors of Nazi terror, propaganda and Nazi promises and policies. Additionally, it was frequent to see answers address the issue of Gleichschaltung and the forcible coordination of politics and society in the early stages of Nazi rule.

Strong candidates discussed the concordat with the pope and suggested that opposition control was not extensive because of the existence of opposition groups like the Pirates, Swing Kids, and perhaps the White Rose movement, although weaker responses drifted into a description of opposition rather than assessing the reasons for a lack of opposition. The candidates that operated effectively made clear judgements about the extent to which

the Nazis controlled society and they tried to quantify levels of control with reference to specific knowledge. Additionally, candidates might discuss which factor was most significant in enabling Nazi control. However, linkages were not common and most candidates stopped short of analysing opposition during the war years, when it was arguably at its most serious. The Reichstag Fire and Enabling Act were dealt with quite well, as was the use of the Gestapo and concentration camps. However, a more detailed analysis was required by many to really address, compare and contrast the extent of control.

- 24** This was popular question and it was pleasing to note the overall improvement in the performance of candidates in dealing with questions on the post-1945 period. Many candidates divided Adenauer's chancellorship into successes and failures and usually demonstrated at least a competent command of knowledge. Candidates seemed well prepared to answer such a question and it was quite common for candidates to achieve Level III, or above in AO1b by combining a mixture of analysis and explanation. Stronger responses classified successes and failures into economic, political and social and weaker candidates fell back on a list-like explanation of Adenauer's terms in office. There was a wide degree of analysis for why certain policies were successful, e.g. economic miracle, and the growing acceptance on the international stage. Candidates also explained reasons for failures with alacrity. The 'Der Spiegel' was common, as was Adenauer's delayed response to the construction of the Berlin Wall.

Strong essays developed the analysis of strengths and weaknesses further to highlight how age and weariness may be a factor accounting for weak responses later in his political career; many candidates gave an overall evaluation of success, although some were not the most convincing in their selection of material to suggest why.

- 25** Many responses divided up the question into two areas, Stalin was responsible and Truman and the USA were responsible. Overall, many candidates believed Stalin to be ultimately responsible. There was a strong emphasis on the aggressive actions of Stalin with regards to the Berlin Blockade. However, there was also blame laid at Truman's door for the Truman Doctrine, and Marshall Aid. Furthermore, the contravention of Potsdam was recognised in better responses as a clear reason for the blockade. It would have been good to analyse and compare reasons for the Cold War hotspots in more depth. However, most answers contained a degree of explanation as to why events increased tensions.

Fewer candidates showed an appreciation of the role of Britain and the French in proceedings, and the 'iron curtain' speech was frequently not discussed. Stalin's actions in Europe were analysed in detail by strong candidates although commonly this was described in quite basic detail. However, stronger answers reached substantiated judgements which arose commonly from the links between events and these. Candidates often showed a clear appreciation of cause and effect and linked these analyses explicitly back to the question, within the context of a sound ideological understanding.

- 26** A significant number of candidates found it difficult to go beyond a description of events, often limiting their answers to the Berlin Blockade and the Berlin Wall. Candidates that also failed to acknowledge key developments from both east and west across the whole period usually produced a more narrative response. However, some other candidates sometimes focused on events throughout the Cold War causing tensions and did not focus solely on events in Germany. Few candidates mentioned the Berlin uprising and how this spread across East Germany, and a number also failed to mention the Berlin Blockade which was surprising. Thus, candidates tended to focus on Khrushchev's ultimatum, the Gary Powers incident and the construction of the Berlin Wall. Strong candidates linked these events together and assessed their significance relative to other events. Also, strong responses made effective links between the development of economic, military and political alliances like the formation of NATO and the Warsaw Pact, Marshall Aid and Comecon and Cominform.

- 27** Most candidates focused on the question to address Eastern Europe. Only a few specifically addressed Russia and communism in Russia alone. Thus, there was commonly a competent command of knowledge and a degree of explanation and analysis followed. Where candidates could improve was on their depth of analysis regarding the Eastern Block. More successful candidates assessed the role of individual countries in detail and linked developments in Poland, Germany, Czechoslovakia, etc. with Gorbachev's actions.

Most candidates demonstrated an impressive understanding of Glasnost and to a lesser extent Perestroika. There was a strong focus on these factors in almost every essay. Candidates also showed an appreciation of the end of the Brezhnev Doctrine, in a number of cases this was effectively linked to the economic restructuring of Perestroika and the demands of the Second Cold War. Thus, Gorbachev's policies were deemed significant in the collapse of Eastern Europe as a Soviet buffer zone. Candidates also highlighted the role played by the USA in the collapse of the Eastern Bloc. Many attributed the collapse to Reagan and his dogged pursuit of military supremacy. Candidates evaluated the pressure applied by US policies and used examples like the Star Wars initiative. This was linked to the economic, and subsequent military failings of the USSR and the knock-on effects for the Soviet hold over the Eastern Bloc.

- 28** This question was not particularly well-answered by some. The confusion lay in the specific conflict that needed to be addressed and difficulties with a short-term focus on causes. There were sometimes problems with candidates citing factors such as 'Nasser's brinkmanship' or 'Israel's Iron Fist approach' or 'Aggressive defence' without explaining, or showing a clear understanding of, these concepts. Some candidates tried to demonstrate an awareness of the question by focusing heavily on the first and second Arab-Israeli wars. Whilst relevant, some candidates did little else. Candidates also showed evidence of difficulty by failing to address the countries involved other than Egypt. Although Nasser played a key role this was not analysed in depth, and the role of Syria and Jordan was often overlooked. Thus, it was difficult to reward responses that solely focused on the crisis of 1957 and little else due to the lack of relevant material. There was some appreciation of the Arab alliance by some, and these candidates made effective links between the alliance and the emergence of Nasser as the leader of the Arab world. This was also effectively dovetailed with Nasser's bombast and bluff, and the short-term causes for the war in a few cases.
- 29** This was the least popular choice in the Study topic. The responses to this question were varied, some candidates displaying a lack of detailed analysis, whilst others showed a commendable range of detail across the whole period. Answers focused on a range of Israeli causes, alongside the actions of Palestinian nationalists. The most significant weakness was an inability to effectively apply knowledge to create structured explanations and analysis. Some candidates just did not have enough command of evidence surrounding the Fatah, PLO and PLFP. As a consequence the essay was usually narrative, focused on a limited range of factors and failed to satisfy AO1b to a high level. As a result, weaker arguments were general and failed to support points with appropriately selected evidence and developed explanations.
- 30** This question provided a good opportunity to link factors and weigh up their importance. A good range of answers were put forward, although specific knowledge of the role of the named factor (the Shatt el Arab waterway) was lacking in some otherwise excellent answers. The lack of emphasis on the waterway is highlighted by the fact only one candidate mentioned the Algiers Agreement and Hussein's desire to right this humiliation. However some candidates demonstrated a good understanding of the waterway and its significance to Iraq whilst others saw the waterway as just one aspect of historical rivalry between Iran and Iraq, and the territorial ambitions of Saddam in Southern Iran. Stronger responses then went on to develop their analysis of the waterway as a means of generating tension. A number of candidates simply did not develop their analysis and

therefore fell short of fulfilling the demands of the question. Although a competent command of knowledge was sometimes applied, the range and depth was often limited. The personalities of Hussein and Khomeini were often noted, but again there was a lack of specificity and explicit development for how this caused conflict to occur between Iran and Iraq.

Ultimately, some factors were known and some knowledge was applied, but the level of analysis was commonly limited to weak analysis, combined with narrative and explanation and a failure to evaluate the significance of Shatt el Arab against other factors.

F963 and F964 AS History Enquiries

General Comments

This session saw the usual range of candidates, most entering for the first time, some retaking. Most approached the sources with confidence but were less expert in using historical terminology and applying their own knowledge appropriately. The failure to integrate content and evaluation remains noticeable and many tended to proceed sequentially and in part descriptively. 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 a source paper and it was particularly refreshing to see a genuine attempt by most to put into practice some of what we have advised over recent years, even if only partially understood. Most tried to compare the passages for a key issue or at worst a generic issue and, in the second question, to group the sources according to both the view in the question and possible alternatives, although in some cases this was not always successful. It is all too frequent for candidates to group well initially but then proceed to describe source content and provenance sequentially and discretely, with a judgement on the topic or issue rather than the sources as a body of evidence for a key issue. In particular many if not most commented on provenance discretely, making no attempt to link their points to the key issue or any argument for the question. Such sources are analysed in isolation, almost for their own sake. Such comment didn't help to advance the argument which tended to come, if at all, later or all too frequently in the conclusion. This will limit them to a L3. Their failure to integrate content and evaluation was particularly noticeable, although many did try to do this at some point (it was clear they knew that they were supposed to do this; they just didn't manage to achieve it across the response). The skills required by Enquiry papers require a handling of concepts, an evaluation of sources, either individually or in groups, and an integration of knowledge into this process. The Sources need to be treated as evidence for an issue. They must not just be used to reference or illustrate an argument (Levels III and IV). Candidates need to integrate provenance into their assessment of the relative value of what is said in the sources. To do this many are still overly dependent on a set formula which restricted and impeded their engagement both 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, as above).

An increasing tendency is to base a judgement as to which interpretation is most valid on sheer weight of sources. This is to be discouraged. Thus the economic argument for Q1(b) F964 02 on the French Revolution was, by some, largely discarded as it had only one clear source supporting it (Source E), while the Enlightenment had at least three (Sources A, B and C). The Enlightenment won on a 3 to 1 score. Every question on all four Units saw this 'winning by source number' approach - from all types of candidate.

Knowledge can often dominate, often in whole chunks, which tend to be of the descriptive or narrative variety. It invariably diverts from a focus on the sources, the point of this paper, and can end up dictating a tangential argument or even a different question. We intend the sources to dictate the answer to a given question, not the related knowledge. Knowledgeable candidates who know or have been taught about debate and recent scholarly views often twist the sources or the question to fit these preconceived approaches. They end up answering a different question and offloading large amounts of scholarly knowledge in the process. The Q(b) that we set asks whether the 5 sources would support a particular view in the light of their content, provenance and whether knowledge can support or challenge this. The knowledge is there to serve, not to dominate. A version of this is the increasing habit of some candidates to just string together part quotes to form an argument that is largely knowledge driven. In previous reports we have recommended the use of a judicious part phrase from a source but this must not just be left on its own for the examiner effectively to do the work. At worst it becomes paraphrase. At

the very least it is often taken out of context and invariably lacks any explanation or linkage to the question and argument. A source cannot simply be dealt with by one or two part quotes that are left to speak for themselves. Another version of this is when candidates take the odd few words out of context and then use them to support an argument not held by the source's author – for example a response writing about poor harvests in Q1b in F964 01 on the French Revolution quotes Source D as follows: 'to talk about "poor harvest" and Source D agrees this was "annoying" and "burdensome to the poor"'. The Source D references were in fact to the system of tax exemptions not the poor harvests. The sources need to be contextualised, explained and used to drive the argument. The danger is that the candidate will move immediately onto knowledge so that the response becomes knowledge based with the sources used for part reference – at best a low L3 for A01 and A02 or L4 ('undeveloped', 'uneven' or 'imbalanced'). There were more examples, though still less than one would like, of evaluation via own knowledge rather than just the basic *ad hominem* evaluation ('he would say that, wouldn't he'). This latter approach suggests that the source has not been read. Two examples came from Q1 Source D and Q4 Source D on F964 02 (French Revolution and Germany). Both sources tend to provide information that can be evaluated by own knowledge to be broadly correct – in Q1 the aristocracy were not all wealthy, they were resented for monopolising key roles; the Night of the Long Knives was not widely condemned and in places was well received – but the attributions led candidates to almost "knee-jerk" and dismissive evaluations (including, given the hindsight of Source D in Q1, age/time passed and de Bouille's obvious mental infirmities by 1821).

Conversely, as is all too frequent, a key weakness for many was a shaky grasp of history and context, crucial if candidates are to place the sources in relation to a key issue. We are careful 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, the opposite of where knowledge dominates, was where very little knowledge was deployed to question, qualify or confirm the evidence of the sources. One frequently got the impression that such 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 before them, confining their comments on the content to one or two points, often very general. Indeed some candidates were often so general and vague that they couched their responses with claims that, for example, A supports B and undermines E with no reference to content at all. They are entirely generic and formulaic. They use the language of analysis and argument with no substance whatsoever.

Candidates try to cover a whole range of categories come what may. Some will talk about 'breadth' (how wide a range of comments there were in the source) and "depth" (how much detail). Not necessarily a bad aide-memoire but deadly when applied without real thought for the needs of the question ('the source is very narrow in depth but its breadth is very wide'). The other danger with the formulaic approach is the dependence on a few key evaluative buzz words like utility, completeness, tone or reliability. It became a 'catch all' for more careful, nuanced or even common sense assessment. Reliability was usually simply asserted rather than demonstrated or used in relation to an argument. All too frequently 'reliability' comments bore little resemblance to such issues. Thus on Q1 F963 02 (Condition of England) Source D was seen as reliable 'as it tells us how factories were harmful to females'. Whatever it is that might make Source D reliable it is not this. Another is "completeness". Some candidates feel that a source 'lacks completeness' if it does not have a range of views, which is absurd but a regular criticism by many (e.g. a southern view of Kansas-Nebraska as F964 02 Q3 on the US, Source A "lacks completeness because it does not recognise a northern view"). This is true for both part questions, as is the lamenting of the absence of a source from a different perspective. It could be valid to criticise the sources in a part (b) in a general sense, by suggesting that absence of a particular point of view weakens the sources as a set but laying out a whole list of potential sources for each alternative argument (as some do) is neither valid nor helpful. There has also been an increase in the number of candidates whose focus is almost wholly on 'tone'. This has its place and some sources lend themselves to this more readily than others. However, the

application of English lexis, without historical context or understanding, is particularly pointless, yet another cul de sac for candidates. Its practice is to be discouraged.

Nonetheless a fair 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. It was a pleasure to mark such intelligent and sensitive responses to the sources. 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 (comparing for the key issue and evaluating the sources for interpretations) and fell short only because they were either too bound by a rigid formula, misinterpreted the sources, failed to see what was there or lacked a sound historical and contextual background.

Most candidates ranged between 40 -80 marks, mainly achieving within levels II, III and IV. A fair few got into the 80s and 90s. Answers and standards were comparable across all 4 Units. Nonetheless at most levels candidates were at least trying to do the right thing. There remains however 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. We have often said that candidates need to do the work not the examiner. Vague references alone will not suffice. They must be explained and contextualised. It is noticeable that most candidates will discuss provenance discretely, raising the issues of reliability or utility mentioned above without any attempt to relate this to an argument for or against the key issue. It remains an isolated and undigested gobbet of information that does nothing to move an argument forward. Many in the middle and even top end of the mark range 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 source’s 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 were instances where the candidates did not address the detail of the questions or where they missed details given in the sources. Careful reading of both questions and sources is very important. This session, as before, the main question reading fault has lain 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 read the sources and their introductions and attributions carefully and make use of this information. Thus on F963 01 Q1(b) some missed the helpful steer that the historian considers William I ‘unjustly criticised’ and went on to accept that the Anglo Saxon Chronicle was right in its condemnation of the king’s greed; in Q2(b) the steer that the Council issued a final version of Henry VIII’s will was taken to mean that this was its version of the will rather than the king’s; on F963 02 Q4 many failed to spot that the question asked about the possibility of international support for Britain against Germany in the 1930s – it did not just ask about the military situation (the focus of the (a) question); on F964 01 Q1(b) was about how the crusaders saw the crusade whilst on it, not about their motives in embarking upon it; on F964 02 Q1(a) a fair few failed to spot the helpful steer that the journalist

was only commenting on unrest in Paris, not the rest of France; On Q2 many assumed Trevelyan to be a modern historian, missing the date (1928) and the tone of his comments; on Q3(b) many commented generally on the causes of the American Civil War missing that the question only asked whether the Kansas Nebraska dispute was a threat to the Union 1853-58; on Q4(a) large numbers missed the question's focus on Hitler's methods and instead discussed and compared the views on his rise to power whilst also missing that the author of Source C came from a liberal family (not many seemed to know what liberal meant). Without attention to this sort of detail arguments became muddled. The extra information in the introductions can aid candidates in accessing the question but many appear not to have 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'. 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.

We hope 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 we reward. The errors which occur tend to be those that have always marred responses. It is particularly important to use, compare and group sources as part of the teaching process to accustom candidates to handle material in this way. There are now sources on most of the topics dating back to 2000 (only the questions have changed) – 26 topics have been set using 4-5 sources each. In effect there are over 100 sources available to practice 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, arguments, views 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 much more effectively than in the past and fewer seemed to compare the wrong sources (or all five!). It is now a minority that offers a general sequential analysis, often without considering the question, although the latter is still, alas all too 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 Assembly of Notables for Source B in Q1(a) on F964 02 (French Revolution), on the Factory debate in 1846 in Q1 on F963 02 (Condition of England) or the manner of coming to the throne in F963 01 (The Mid-Tudor Crisis)). In Qa) as well as Qb), 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 do not do this and they might find it helpful to highlight it on the paper as an aide memoire. Many simply compare content and provenance regardless of the issue. For example on Q4(a) on Germany in F964 02 many simply wrote generally on Hitler's coming to power, missing that the question's focus on 'methods'. On F963 02, Q3(a), on England in a New Century, many wrote about the reforms in general rather than examining their 'impact'. 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 to judge which of the two sources provides the better evidence on the issue and explain 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 are points to consider in the ‘comparison’ answer:

- 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 and of any concepts involved. We are looking for a light touch, a sub-clausal reference or at most one or two sentences.
- Many candidates simply focus on the topic, factories or on Luther, instead of the specific issue, attitudes towards female labour in factories or on first impressions on meeting Luther. 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.
- Many candidates, at some point in their answer, randomly juxtapose 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 give only 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.
- Judgement is 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 the need to compare provenance, integrating it into an explanation of similarity and difference and arriving at developed judgement.
- The key to an effective comparison of provenance is to ask questions about the authors, their likely purpose, the different audiences and perhaps their respective tone.
- Most candidates sequence their comments on provenance and deal with them separately. A separation will often work but it is more effective to integrate them in a holistic approach.
- 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.*

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

Most now plan and many tried to sustain a clearly structured answer, reasonably focused on the question. Many had some argument, albeit of varying quality and endeavoured 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, having done the difficult bit, they then still

proceed sequentially, usually in two argumentative or more usually generally descriptive halves. It is vital not just to pay lip service to the grouping just 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 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 raised 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 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 the majority (rarely) or for part (usually) of their answers. Others simply quote from the sources, sometimes quite heavily. The sources need interpreting with comments.

The following are points to consider in the ‘interpretation’ answer:

- Candidates frequently struggle to use ‘knowledge’ or context appropriately. 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. In some cases it was simply inappropriate and led the candidate away from the focus of the question.
- It is important to realise what the role of knowledge is 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* was the key to a high level mark for AO1a and AO1b. Many candidates in practice used 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 missed 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 do this only through a discrete discussion of the content of an individual source. Thus often effective points are made in isolation of 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 are drawn away from the question or key issue.

- The structure of the argument was often seriously flawed. Many answers were of two halves with the judgement effectively being just a summary of what has gone before. Some made no attempt to drive the answer using sources, which became an essay with brief nods to the sources by letter only, often in brackets.
- Judgements and conclusions were often divorced from the sources.
- Candidates need to spot the main thrust of argument or view in a source. 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 out the introduction or attribution.
- Sources need to be judged beyond *face value*, in the light of their context, purpose or audience.
- Comments on provenance need to be meaningful and linked to the use of source content.
- 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.
- 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 Q. (see above).
- The lack of evaluation was often a key reason for underperformance. 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.
- 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.
- 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).
- 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 should be reminded to –

- 1 To 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 to rush into writing everything in an ‘ad hoc’ manner. A more concise, reasoned and considered answer is often more convincing. Thinking about a judgement and conclusion before starting to write and planning accordingly is very important.
- 6 To 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.

F963/01 British History Enquiries

1 The Normans in England 1066-1100

a) This was well handled by almost all candidates although some merely described and cross-referenced source content without explanation and some struggled with the idea of ‘nature’ in the question. They could see similarities in the sources’ references to William’s taking counsel and to the thoroughness of the survey, whilst also identifying a difference in the sources’ judgement of William’s behaviour, shameful greed versus scrupulous concern for custom and law in the interests of stability. Many went on to discuss whether its nature was as a survey for tax or as a record of ownership to settle disputes given the huge changes that had occurred post-conquest. Some did not notice this key difference. Most candidates made sensible, if rather general comment on the sources’ provenance. Most were aware of the late date of D but missed the clue in ‘Exchequer’ and considered that the source made no reference to revenue. Most were aware of the tone of A, ‘shameful’ indicating disapproval. Few reached a meaningful judgement, invariably based on the date of D. A number wrongly identified Henry II as a Norman king, rather than an Angevin.

b) Most responses included a debate centred around the raising of revenue versus other government purposes – justice, power and firm rule, godliness and security, but answers were not always well developed, and there was often little knowledge added to assess the sources. Others referred well to fines, church building, paying off enemies and explained that the structure of Domesday did not fit well with it being a tax book given the manner the data was collected – all useful to challenge or confirm the sources. Some candidates saw ‘taxation’ and ‘revenue’ as quite different things and this reduced the effectiveness of their analysis, i.e. a source could tell some candidates about taxation, but did not mention raising revenue. Sources were grouped sensibly (A and C versus B, D and E), though some had difficulty with the rather ironic tone of E and misinterpreted it (wrongly seen as evidence of monetary greed when the author was gently criticising the Chronicle for precisely that). Few linked ‘an honest man could travel with his pockets full of gold’ in E to ‘each man being content with his own’ in D, but the phrase from E was seen as proof that taxes were not high. The inherent cross-reference in E and A was missed by some but many used this effectively. Others were too willing to accept B at face value, as evidence of William’s pious generosity. The significance of the date escaped them (the end of the reign and concern for ‘the salvation of my soul’) with little contextual knowledge of William’s dealings with the church shown. Some claimed B was reliable because it came from the Bishop of Durham. Others missed the reason for the grant in B and asserted that the writ was done ‘to make William look good’ therefore could not be trusted as a source. Comment on provenance was a little predictable (E had the advantage of hindsight, impartial research and access to many documents, for example) and the moral judgements which drive William of Malmesbury’s work were not identified: in this case, the corrupting effect of cupidity. Some failed to pick up on the grudging comment by William of Malmesbury that there was a possible reason other than cupidity – the need to deter and ‘buy-off’ enemies. There was some confusion about William of Malmesbury’s standpoint in light of his lineage. Judgements were usually well-balanced and supported.

2 Mid-Tudor Crises 1536-1569

a) Many candidates struggled to get a purchase on ‘ways in which monarchs came to the throne’. Those who made a reasonable attempt saw both accessions as atypical in a variety of ways – age, gender, crisis times and ministerial manipulation. They picked up on the speed of accession, the views, importance and attitudes of the Council, the deceased monarch’s wishes, the ‘acceptance of new monarchs and, perhaps less successfully, the attitudes of the monarchs themselves. Many noted the difference between a diary and a private letter, some explained the purpose of C (the element of a plea of innocence and for mercy), though fewer understood the circumstances clearly. Many viewed Northumberland as totally responsible for Lady Jane being named queen, some pointing out she was Northumberland’s niece. Few mentioned Edward VI’s role or knew the significance of his Devise for the Succession, sometimes wrongly called a Succession Act. A number of candidates pointed out the role of manipulative advisers, Somerset and Northumberland, but were perhaps too eager to assert that Edward and Jane came to the throne solely because of the machinations of these men. Indeed several diverted wrongly into the politics of power at an accession rather than the accession itself, something that was repeated in Q.(b). Others thought the reference to ‘he spent 3 weeks in the Tower’ indicated that Edward was a prisoner (and thus Lady Jane Grey’s accession was smoother). The final sentence of B was interpreted by some as evidence that Edward was ritually mocked by the assembled Lords. Many linked the lamentation in both sources. Some made effective comments on the emotive tone of C, but only a few made good cross-references with the objective third-person tone of B. Most saw Edward’s diary as more reliable, often for ‘stock’ reasons, with some stating starkly that Lady Jane was lying to save her skin, ignoring the very effective evidence she gives and its probable veracity. However some claimed Source C was of little use because she was never Queen. Comments on Edward’s diary ranged from accuracy (written for his eyes only) to speculation that it was dictated to him or he was only 9 and thus had no idea what he was writing about or he wrote to please his tutors (invariably referred to as teachers).

b) Many answers became very tied up on this question, often moving from clarity to obscurity (that all five monarchs chose – thus failing to present a two-sided argument). Contextual knowledge proved of particular importance here. Candidates took markedly different approaches to the sources’ relationship to the interpretation. C, D, and E, in particular, provoked different ideas and judgements. Some saw C as supporting the interpretation whilst others asserted too bluntly that it had been Northumberland, not Edward, who had brought Jane to the throne. More successful responses used Henry VIII’s Will in Source A as the benchmark of choice linking it to Mary in D (which referred back to it) and Elizabeth in E (although she refused to confirm it and, in effect, negated it in relation to the Scottish claim). More difficulty was had using Edward in Source B, which confirmed Henry’s choice. Many diverted into material on the Council and Somerset, missing the point that this related to power during a minority, not the succession itself. Such responses then used Lady Jane Grey in C to argue that Edward and Northumberland chose her but the attempt failed in favour of legitimacy and Henry’s Will. Thus most realised that Henry VIII had some choice of successors, although few noticed that Mary Queen of Scots was omitted from Henry’s Succession Acts and surprisingly few noted that the blood line, legitimacy and a male heir always took priority. C was clear evidence that Edward had tried to choose his successor but had failed and the blood line had triumphed.

Many candidates got in quite a muddle when discussing whether Mary could choose her successor (by 1558 she could not and had to resort to Elizabeth, as laid down in her father’s will and 3rd Act of Succession), but some did develop the problem of phantom pregnancies, the unsuitability of her husband in the eyes of her people and female rule as a hindrance. Only a handful mentioned the marriage treaty as a restriction on Mary’s choice. Few made reference to Mary’s reluctance to mention Elizabeth by name, but those who did added depth and conviction to their analysis. A few pointed out that Mary’s childlessness and the unsuitability of her husband in the eyes of her people decisively limited her freedom of choice. There was considerable reference to the role of the Council in the succession and many seemed, using Elizabeth in E, to think that the ‘people’ also wrongly had a role. They missed Elizabeth’s attempt to fudge the

issue, but some drifted to the choice of ministers and the succession. Only a minority were able to see that Elizabeth chose not to choose – a difficult concept. Elizabeth in E was particularly poorly handled by most. There was uncertainty as to who Maitland was or his proposal and purpose, despite the helpful steer which back to Source A and the exclusion of the Scottish line as aliens. Some confused the early date (1561) and talked of the Rising of the Northern Earls in 1569 as the context for Elizabeth's comments, the reason why she was rejecting the Marian claim (she did not in this source). Many asserted she had not chosen her successor, missing the decision not to choose. Others diverted into plots and the popular will as mentioned above. Along with Source B this was the least well-handled source for the question.

3 The English Civil War and Interregnum 1637-60

a) This led to a considerable number of responses which were weakened by incomplete reading of the sources and question. Many did not focus, or lost focus, on 'religious attitudes', merely mentioning 'religion' generally. Only some noticed the exclusion of Roman Catholics in reference to religious toleration in A. Very few read the Instrument of Government carefully with reference to 'the Christian religion as contained in the scriptures' and developed the significance of this with knowledge of Presbyterianism and sects within the Army. Only a handful knew who wrote the Instrument of Government. Indeed many saw A as unreliable, not useful or weak as it did not give the view of anyone because it was an inanimate object, a Constitution. Some dismissed it on the grounds of its early date – too soon in the protectorate and thus of little value for religious attitudes. Others tried to argue that the dates of the sources indicated how far and how quickly the tolerant attitude expressed in A had slipped by 1656. Almost all answers stated the view in D as extreme, not noticing the *different* views it contained, especially that of the Speaker and Mr Robinson. Thus answers tended to distort either the similarities or the differences in the two sources. On Source D the stock comment on diaries was much in evidence. As a result many missed that it was a recording of what did happen but that it was, perhaps, a selection. Many knew that Cromwell disapproved of the attitudes of the Major-Generals expressed in D. Surprisingly few knew what happened to Nayler – most thought he escaped scot free, far from the truth. Those who did described his 'torture' with varieties of lurid detail, such as 'a hole bored through his tongue' to 'a red hot poker' being used. Many thought that Burton was writing his personal diary and used this for provenance, and many also generalised about 'Parliament's views' in D – they constitute a series of different views, although many did see the contrast between an intention of relative toleration in A and some more hard line attitudes in D. Only some were able to link the Instrument's qualification of unbecoming conduct and disturbance of the peace with the Naylor case – did it come under this prohibition? In which case punishment was appropriate. Most candidates judged that D was better evidence as it showed views in practice, whereas A contained theoretical, legal or idealistic views, perhaps even propaganda. Some anachronistically thought that A was taking a very modern view in its enlightened concern that all religions would be acceptable in society, not just Christianity.

b) This question was handled competently by most candidates. There was some loss of focus when candidates discussed whether the sources suggested that the result, rather than the design, of the Protectorate's policies had been to heal divisions. On the other hand, some pointed out that although E concedes that the Major generals had failed in settling the nation, their intention, or design, had been to do so. Others jumped on the word 'failed' and took it to mean that they had never intended it in the first place. Although almost all understood the phrase 'heal divisions', many found it difficult to use all the sources to analyse the key issue. Some grouped the sources simply according to whether they did or did not suggest healing, rather than any other objective, such as a Godly Reformation or self-preservation in power. Thus some alternative views were a little more perceptive and convincing than others. Many candidates found difficulty in defining the difference between 'healing divisions', 'godly reform', power and 'religious toleration'. All these four aims could be logically argued by cross-referencing or grouping sources. For some Source A was 'no good' because of its earliness in the period, missing the point. Those who saw B as evidence of healing divisions (despite its vocabulary, 'discourage', 'punish', 'suppress', for example, which hardly suggests healing) and

took C and E at face value, became muddled when they also argued that moral reforms caused deeper divisions. On Source C many simply relied on the reference to royalists bearing the cost of Penruddock's Rising but with little or no explanation (if it was stated in the source it was proof enough – the examiner was supposed to make the relevant link). For some Source A was 'no good' because of its earliness in the period, missing the point. Others saw A as offering unequivocal support to the interpretation, despite the reference to 'Popery' referred to above. It offered only an initial attempt at healing religious division within the protestant communities. Not many candidates responded to the ambiguity of D and to the range of opinion contained within it, some of which seems to support the interpretation and some of which does not. A clearer line taken by some was to argue military rule as a means of maintaining law and order or even to support Cromwell's rule. This could then be contrasted with godly reform and religious toleration under the umbrella of healing divisions. There were some who used very sound knowledge effectively to inform their arguments, but many did not have sound contextual understanding of this period. Provenance was often not well handled. Thus B, C and E were for some all unreliable propaganda simply because they came from Cromwell. For others they were reliable for exactly the same reason. Source A, the Instrument of Government, suffered in the same way as in part (a) whilst D's ambiguity was lost on many.

F963/02 British History Enquiries

1 The Condition of England 1815-1853.

a) Answers were often undermined for the following reasons. There was some uncertainty on how to handle the provenance of the 'female, middle class' author of Source D, often with simplistic conjecture, e.g. 'she had never seen inside a factory'. There was also confusion over Mrs Jameson's attitude to female factory workers. Did she approve or not? Many responses were not good at explaining Ashley's position. Nonetheless most responses were able to discern the principal similarity between the two sources: that female labour in factories had a negative impact on women's performance of traditional duties associated with the home. Some were able to add that both authors were also fairly positive about female labour in factories. Weaker responses mistakenly assumed that both objected in principle to female labour in factories. This was a misreading of the sources. Jameson in D is resigned to factory work for woman, concerned only at the domestic cost, whilst Ashley in E is concerned only with the 13-18 group which have not had legislative protection 1833-46 unless in the Mines and that only recently. In D, Jameson notes women's 'comparative freedom . . . [they] work only at stated hours' and E begins with the assertion 'despite all the good alterations made since 1833'. However, there is a subtle difference, not seen in many responses, in that Jameson's comments cannot satisfactorily be presented positively. More effective responses were able to comment on the difference in the way the sources treat the nature of the work itself: E mentions the physical demands of the work; D doesn't provide any insight in this regard. As far as provenance is concerned, the majority of candidates recognised the potential weakness of Jameson in D as a middle class woman writing about the conditions of the working class. The reference to Parliament in the steer and description of E posed problems for some. As a Lord, it is logical to assume Ashley was addressing the House of Lords, but some candidates referred to him as an MP and contextualised the source by referring to Lord Ashley's need to persuade other MPs of the cogency of his views to win an election. More effective responses knew of his factory campaigns although not many were able to see his strategy and use the steer effectively – to use women as another means of eroding hours of work and to obtain sympathy for a 10 Hours Bill. Few candidates also picked up the difference between Shaftesbury's 'moral' approach and the rather different concerns of Mrs Jameson – the two sources appeared, superficially, similar in their approach to women's education and influence but were actually, on the wording and sense, notably distinct. Few noted that the first sentence of Source D could be linked to the 'cruel' aspect of female factory labour in Source E.

b) While the sources offered a range of views on the impact of the Factory Acts, many responses seemed hazy about the actual terms of those Acts. This was a disadvantage when assessing the way in which the sources responded to the Acts. Few contrasted and compared effectively the apparently similar approach taken by Source A and Source C. These sources were largely supportive of each other but also notably distinct in tone and meaning; this was not grasped by many responses. Few were able to see how Sources D and E offered a range of ways in which the implications of the question could be explored. Most of the sources could be used to either support or challenge the interpretation, something the majority of candidates missed. Grouping of the sources in relation to the question posed problems for some who were unsure whether D and E supported or disagreed with the interpretation. They were unable to acknowledge that these sources might contain evidence for and against it. The provenance of Source C, Greg as a reforming factory owner, was difficult to reconcile with its content for some candidates. Few candidates commented on this helpful steer reminding them that Greg ‘is usually considered fair and reforming’ in his approach to labour. They went on to argue that as a factory owner he would oppose the factory acts; but in fact Greg provides a persuasive argument for both views. Source A was frequently misinterpreted by weaker candidates, particularly regarding ‘the representations of Mr Sadler’s famous Factory Report’. Some saw him, wrongly, as in favour of the acts. They were confused by the Whig journal he was writing in because they considered the Whigs factory reformers so he must be one too. More effective responses suggested McCulloch in A, as an economist, would naturally claim the Sadler Report misrepresented conditions in the factories because the amendments it proposed had a damaging effect on the economy and these responses pointed to the harmful effects which he alleged were occurring. Some candidates effectively played down the significance of Horner’s evidence in B by contextualising the work of the factory inspectors: there were so few of them that an accurate picture of the impact of the Factory Act could not be constructed, and factory owners were adept at manipulating the process of inspection by implementing temporary arrangements to conceal bad practices. Others underused the helpful information in Horner’s 1837 report. Source E should have provided much useful material but weaker responses did not realise that Ashley’s reservations did not preclude strong support for factory reform. There was scope to make valid provenance points based on the dates of each source. However many responses became obsessed with this: making repetitive and simplistic remarks, concluding (for example) that D and E had to be the more valuable of the sources because they were produced after the 1844 Act, whereas A, B and C only referred to the 1833 Act.

2 The Age of Gladstone and Disraeli 1865-1886

a) Most candidates were able to recognise the negative view of the Licensing Bill in both sources. Few however grasped the nature of the approach taken by the Non-Conformists to this issue in B and therefore why they were discontented with Bruce’s measure. This Source puzzled some because it seemed strange that a supporter of temperance would object to the Licensing Bill. Their contextual understanding of nonconformity was not strong. There was much incomprehension as to the point of view of the Bishop of Peterborough and minimal understanding as to why a leader of the Church of England might favour a voluntary approach. Better answers identified the difference between the two sources - whereas the author of B thought the Bill did not go far enough, Magee in C felt it went too far in threatening people’s freedom. References to Irish Disestablishment, repeal of the education clause and the Ballot Bill in B distracted some candidates; these answers often contained tangential or less pertinent contextual information. Better responses were able to explain why Magee’s view was ‘atypical’ by comparing it to another ‘religious’ view in B. Logically, since Magee was a bishop, one would expect his views on sobriety to be similar to those of the British Temperance Advocate in B. However, few candidates could effectively evaluate C using this information, despite Magee’s ironic reference to his own views. There was usually much more contextual information related to B than C.

b) There were some better answers to this question. Many knew the reforms well. However, in most cases, some of the sources were handled more effectively than others. Weaker responses were unable to handle the spread of dates from 1868 to 1875 and this led to problems with structure and grouping. More effective responses realised that there were three possible interpretations rather than just two – that either one or the other ministry did more for working and living conditions but also that both could be very similar in what they did. Less effective responses struggled to group the sources appropriately. Many candidates assumed that since sources B and C objected to the Licensing Bill they supported the statement in the question. Such responses had little understanding of the way in which the arguments of Source B could be considered to be arguments in favour of the improvement of 'living and working conditions' although some responses had sound views about the links between alcohol and social degradation. The failure to grasp the implications of Source C made life difficult for some. Source A presented fewer problems because it clearly contrasted Gladstone's 'popular sympathies' and Disraeli's 'mistaken social theory' but some missed Source A as prospective failing to link usefully to own knowledge. If they missed this they also missed the attack on Disraeli's, mistaken social theory, a useful handle for more effective responses. Source D, which ostensibly presents a fairly shallow argument in support of Disraeli as opposed to Gladstone, was generally treated as being resoundingly in favour of Disraeli although some seemed to say that Cross was arguing that Gladstone had done more for people and that the Tories were not bothered. The subtleties of Source D were overlooked. Thus many missed that Source D was written by one of the more socially concerned members of Disraeli's cabinet and therefore not just a matter of special pleading by an interested party; the somewhat Gladstonian tone of the remarks in the first part of Source D on housing were not contrasted effectively by the inclination to intervene with regard to sanitation in the second part. The opportunity of linking A and D was missed by many – the idea of a degree of potential consensus between certain members of each party on social reform was not properly understood; the cartoon in Source E also offered a way of considering this possibility. The cartoon was not well used; candidates made only superficial use of the material, neglecting to consider more carefully the message sent. Some tried to read too much into the picture: its content is actually quite precisely focused. Some weaker answers tried to argue that Source E supported the interpretation – that in contrast to the landlord who spoke of harassing legislation, the slum landlord appears quite content. Few picked up on the irony of the title – injured innocents and a fair number took 'Injured Innocents' at face value.

3 England and a New Century 1900-1924

a) Answers here were reasonably comparative and candidates did not encounter too many problems because the contrast between C and D is quite clear. Whereas Hardie in C is critical of the impact of social reform, Lloyd-George is – inevitably – positive in D. Less effective responses however missed the focus of the question, talking of social reform in general rather than its impact. Better answers categorised their comparison by comparing views on the impact of pensions, insurance and wages (the latter not mentioned by Lloyd George). They were also able to pick out a similarity between the sources in this regard, for Hardie, in line 7, implies that the provision of pensions for the elderly was a good thing: 'Pensions have been given to the aged, at least', before going on to stress the limitations. Weaker answers tended to ignore the reference to the negative impact of the Minimum Wages Act in C, preferring to focus on the 'irritating conditions' attached to pensions; indeed, these answers usually drew a rather superficial similarity between the sources in that both mention the Insurance Act. The provenance of each source was not difficult for candidates to address. Hardie's largely negative views of social reform were attributed to his committed socialist outlook; better answers added that Labour might have felt aggrieved about the Liberals appropriating some of their ideas. Lloyd-George, as a prominent Liberal who had been instrumental in the implementation of social reform, inevitably supported the measures. However few really understood the gravamen of Kier Hardie's assault on Lloyd-George and few picked up the masterful way in which L-G dealt with his audience. Some missed the contrast in audience – both public but one to the Commons on industrial disputes (hence the focus on inadequate wages in the first place) and the other at a public meeting in a poor part of London. Some candidates were distracted by '[a] voice' in the

crowd. These answers became bogged down in ascertaining whether the unidentified voice came from a liberal supporter or not and its consequent impact on Lloyd-George's reaction – an odd line of argument. Nonetheless candidates usually pointed out that as speeches the objective of both Hardie and Lloyd-George was to persuade their respective audience. Most judged Hardie to be the better piece of evidence for impact on the grounds that Hardie was less prone to rhetoric than LG – a not very tenable proposition.

b) This question was generally answered well with some appropriate grouping. C and E, for example, both suggest that the capitalist classes were benefiting more from the social reform than the working classes. However more successful responses were able to group opposition and support according to political party, social class and interest group – thus more effectively in a position to pick up on references in 'support' sources like D to the 'opposition' of the 'Tory' press. A, C and E were often grouped together as sources that agreed with the interpretation; D was usually considered on its own as a source that disagreed. B was generally considered as showing both sides of the argument but some responses tried unconvincingly to include it with either A, C and E or with D without properly evaluating it. Very few responses recognised the similarity between B and C – Source C acknowledges the benefit of social reform, just as Roberts does in B. Some candidates interpreted the reference to the government's generosity in E as evidence of a positive view on social reform, missing the reference as critical - one of government window dressing for its social programme. The cartoon in Source A caused some difficulty. Candidates were not able to derive much from it bar a comment referring to Conservative opposition. It was not used well and often candidates were at a loss as to how to use it to develop their responses, missing the opportunity to discuss Liberal child measures and whether the Conservative view of well-dressed middle class woman at the seaside was really the right angle to take when stressing the importance of individual freedom for the mass of the population, let alone the pressure of the brewing industry to resist such reform. Although most responses grasped the implications of the left-wing attack on the reforms in C and E fewer understood the Conservative or Gladstonian positions visible in Sources A and B. A weakness for many was a tendency to look at the sources in terms of 'criticisms' of the reforms rather than as evidence for 'opposition' – few really understood the nature of the Conservative opposition, not using A or B to any real effect. Particularly poorly understood was the reference in Source B to Rosebery's comments on its impact on Empire. Few dealt with it beyond paraphrasing the comment, failing to explain a feared diversion of resources and the sapping of individual freedom amongst the metropolitan population. Indeed most thought Rosebery to be a Conservative rather than a former Liberal leader. For some Source B was difficult to place in the argument – the date was 1973, the author a child in 1910. This produced much stock comment on memory loss, hindsight etc. The nature of the socialist opposition, revealed in C and E, was also not well understood. Some struggled with placing Hardie – he favours reform but is critical of the Liberal government. Source E especially suffered from misunderstanding and was often omitted altogether by those who did not recognise that Wills was using sarcasm and reporting on Government spin when using the word 'generosity' or did not understand the detail of the Insurance Act as it related to labour exchanges.

4 Churchill 1920-1945.

a) Rather surprisingly this was less well answered than some other comparison questions, largely because many candidates did not address the stem of the question, the issue for comparison, which was views on Britain's armed forces. They compared generally – on diplomacy, appeasement, and the army etc. This meant that they muddled both the (a) and the (b) questions. There was a clear distinction between what was being asked for - the armed forces in (a) and diplomacy and alliances in (b). More effective answers were able to draw out the principal point of similarity: both agree that Britain's armed forces were inadequately prepared to face Hitler by 1937. However comparison of content was often superficial: both mention France; A mentions the League of Nations, B doesn't, all without context and explanation. This suggested that some candidates struggled to appreciate fully the views offered by the sources. More effective responses appreciated the context and irony of Churchill's

argument that the air force be strengthened in A given his earlier cuts to the force in less straitened economic circumstances. Weaker responses usually misinterpreted A as evidence of military strength; these candidates failed to realise that Churchill was alluding to the *potential* strength of the air force rather than its actual strength in 1933-34. These candidates were often unable effectively to address the provenance of this source, analysing it as though it was written in 1933-34 rather than in 1948. However, the majority of answers recognised the potential slant highlighted by the date of its publication: Churchill undoubtedly would be adopting an ‘I told you so’ attitude; good answers contextualised this attitude by locating it within post-war British politics. Surprisingly few candidates noted that Churchill would not have been well informed, despite the leaks which came his way, about military dispositions and therefore missed an open goal when comparing the Sources. Most candidates recognised the value of the chiefs of staff’s opinion represented in B in the context of this question. However, some candidates were confused as to whether these men were politicians, MPs or members of the cabinet. Similar confusion surrounded the audience of Source B. Some thought it was discussed in Parliament; others didn’t realise it was an inherently private document, in that it was for the cabinet’s eyes only in 1937. In terms of judgement Source B was usually chosen as the stronger source, sometimes on dubious grounds (‘WSC was a poor military leader’).

b) The comment above on the precise reading of questions pertains here as well. The question was focused on the realism or otherwise of gaining international support against Germany. Its focus was on diplomacy, particularly the creation of a Grand Alliance, the core of which would be Franco-British but also extending to the US, some eastern European countries like the Czechs and Poles, possibly the USSR and, before 1936, Italy. It was not a question on the armed forces as such (this was Q(a)); nor was it focused on appeasement. Many candidates, at various stages of their answer, changed it into this, to their detriment. Nonetheless candidates generally found it straightforward to group the sources. A and C, since they were both written by Churchill, were usually presented as one group which disagreed with the interpretation of ‘unrealistic’ in the question. Some candidates were able to cross-reference part of E’s content with this, which ostensibly supports this view. However for many, E usually formed a group on its own because it offered views both for and against the interpretation. B and D were usually grouped as sources supporting the interpretation. However this simple grouping led many to miss the subtleties in the sources. Thus better answers noticed Chamberlain’s initially favourable opinion of the Grand Alliance in D alongside the Chiefs of Staff’s view in B that some political and international action was needed as compensation for relative military weakness. Some candidates argued that A and C actually agreed with the interpretation. This was achieved by evaluating their content, principally by noting the ineffectiveness of the League of Nations (especially in light of Hitler’s attitude towards it) and the depressed state of the European economy (combined with most countries’ war-weariness). It might briefly be supplemented by some comment on the USSR. They challenged Churchill’s reasoning on the grounds of a failure to appreciate the context of the 1930s in all but Germany’s increasing aggression. Candidates could also mention that the final Grand Alliance was a wartime construct. Some forgot this arguing that Churchill was right given what later happened. It weakened their argument considerably. Weaker responses tended to treat E with some ambivalence, unsure whether it was for or against. As for provenance, most candidates handled D well: it was a private letter and so inevitably held some reliability (notwithstanding personal rivalry between Chamberlain and Churchill). However one would have thought that Source D (answering Churchill’s suggested plans in Source C) would have been perhaps the most useful source of the five for the question. It was surprising how many answers made very little use of Source D. There was also much mistaken invocation of the Czech crisis in both Sources C and D. Candidates failed to spot, or did not know of, the dates. Both sources were mid-march 1938. The Czech crisis was September 1938. A and C tended to be dismissed as typical (what is typical?) of Churchill’s arrogant single-mindedness. To some extent, these answers threw the baby out with the bath water. More effective were those who used the conditionality of Churchill’s speech in Source C – the repeated use of ‘if’ with a contextual response to each ‘if’. Most answers, as noted above, recognised the value of B, although some found aspects of its provenance confusing as they had done in Q(a). Source E was handled less well, many not knowing whether it was primary or

secondary and how this might affect their evaluation. They needed to be careful to distinguish what was being said here. Packwood is merely providing factual information on Churchill's broadcast. What follows were his selection of actual responses, supportive and negative as to the possibility of some association or alliance with the US. Many simply ignored one or the other views (usually the supportive one). Others failed to spot that the supportive view was from only one response and thus hardly typical, particularly when the American context of isolationism is considered. The negative view came from 'others' and could usefully have been supported from the all too recent events at Munich (the date was mid October 1938). Many candidates thought hindsight was actually beneficial when considering the veracity of the view on offer. This may also be applied to A. Clearly, as A proves, hindsight is actually a dangerous thing, and candidates should appreciate the potentially negative impact it has on historians' views. The way in which Churchill invoked the spirit of the League in A and C was not noticed by many candidates, thereby depriving them of a useful way of contrasting his approach with that of Chamberlain. The fact that Churchill and his critics both overestimated the usefulness of France was also usually missed. The way in which Chamberlain, from own knowledge, and the Chiefs of Staff, explicitly, were concerned with Imperial Defence, whereas Churchill was concerned with the League and western Europe was also missed by many, despite the usual brickbats aimed at Churchill the 'warmonger' and Churchill the 'imperialist'. India featured surprisingly often, and irrelevantly, in many responses. Some candidates used Churchill's time as Chancellor to reasonable effect but too many went on about his supposed experience in military matters.

F964/01 European and World History Enquiries

1 The First Crusade and the Crusader States 1073-1130

a) Many wrote a general textual analysis without focus on the key issue of reaction to the fall of Jerusalem. Candidates were better on content than provenance but in both cases the judgements that followed were not always developed, not a considered judgement as to why one might be inferior or superior to the other source. Better answers developed the clear cross-references of 'joy', 'song', 'Holy Sepulchre', 'thanks to God'. Few commented further, so points remained undeveloped with only very basic context used. Some struggled to find points of comparison beyond the main difference (religion versus slaughter and plunder) as they stated the general description of a religious response in a source without differentiating elements of it (visiting the Holy Sepulchre; types of prayer; rejoicing; restoring Jerusalem to God). Nonetheless there was also some excellent attention to the detail of the content – e.g. in effective use of knowledge to discriminate between prayers of thanks for the fall of Jerusalem (in B) and prayers of supplication (in C) for remission of sins after slaughtering the inhabitants or seizing their property. There were two clear differences in C, 'slaughter' (brutality and violence for its own sake) and 'loot', but most only saw 'material gain'. Very few linked 'slaughter' in C to 'humiliation of paganism' in B. On occasion some linked this to Urban's appeal at Clermont as context. Many inaccurately thought Fulcher an eyewitness at the fall of Jerusalem, but there was some excellent knowledge of the provenance of both sources, well-developed. The idea of Raymond (B) being more religiously driven than Fulcher (C) was picked up well and supported. Some candidates struggled however with the 'similarity' of the two authors in terms of location, perspective and date and making judgements here was less notable. Few judged B the better evidence preferring the more balanced and wider ranging views of Fulcher, although not many examined his purpose in so doing.

b) Most candidates were able to make some use of the sources to create an argument for and against the interpretation, but they did not always use the key terms in the question, drifting to 'reasons for going on Crusade' rather than the way the Crusaders themselves saw the Crusade whilst on it, an important distinction. Thus most candidates, at some point in their response, drifted to motive for going (for many a well-rehearsed argument) rather than how they saw and experienced the crusade. The idea that Crusaders could simultaneously see the Crusades in different terms as a righteous occasion for blood-letting and also a pious act of devotion for one's own salvation, in fact the violence could be an act of piety, was partly picked up. Thus the

Crusades having multiple strands without apparent contradiction to the Crusaders, was variously picked up and supported by candidates, some more explicitly than others. The more discerning responses delineated between the attitudes of noble and non-noble crusaders (C and D on the mainstream soldiers thus contrasting with the power and ambition of a great noble family in E), recognised the personal views enshrined in A, whilst recognising their universal appeal, acknowledged the reliability of D, despite its provenance, given the evidence in C and E, and understood that killing Muslims was regarded by many at the time as a religious act and not simply bloodlust. Those who were able, in these and other ways, to stretch beyond the more obvious points of evaluation created, in some cases, very sophisticated answers. They noticed the limitations of Urban's views for a question on 'how Crusaders saw the Crusades' and were aware Urban spoke in wider terms. However here was serious repetition of comments from the answer to Q(a) when discussing B and C. Weaker responses merely paraphrased individual sources sequentially and generally or described them within overall groupings for agreement and disagreement. Many using part quotes picked an illogical phrase which therefore had no sense for the question e.g. 'redeemed it by his death', 'forty silver candelabra' 'let his beard grow'. Such juxtaposition is a very far cry from source analysis. Source E was least effectively used. Most saw it as Baldwin simply indulging in material gain and missed the distinctly hostile comments of Guibert of Nogent. Some better responses realised it was talking about power and attitude to Outremer custom, linking this through their own knowledge and the source to the 'better' example of his predecessor and Baldwin's own record at grabbing territory. No candidate was seen who linked the reference to eagles and paganism – a clear reference to the religion of imperial Rome and a critical point from Guibert. The best responses created a three-, four- or even a five-sided argument, by linking and using sources for religion, material gain, bloodlust, power and prestige as themes for argument. Provenance was often listed discretely, but when integrated with context and content some quite sophisticated evaluative arguments resulted. A few Centres adopted the approach of using two sources together, comparing their reliability and utility before moving to the next set. This worked well until sources were seen to have a dual use, and then answers became a little repetitive. Some responses went through the motions of doing this, but were less convincing.

2 The German Reformation 1517-1555

a) Some very good responses were seen here. All but the very weakest answers managed to find effective links of content on first impressions, some making the distinction between a first impression on meeting and one formed through an advancing reputation, notorious or otherwise. Thus learning (although having a book in an inn is not necessarily comparable to translating Old Testament texts), affable and welcoming characteristics with flashes of anger, locations, desire for fame v. reticence, and authority were all issues compared on first meeting, and there was some very interesting development of both content and provenance. However on authority reference to Luther's view on princes, Pope and Emperor were not always explained appropriately and some candidates became confused on his attitude to the princes, knowing that some supported him at a later date. The quality of the answer often depended on its contextualisation – those who discussed the 95 Theses and disputations other than briefly as part of Luther's reputation were less convincing than those who linked the sources to Luther's disguise as Junker Georg in the Wartburg castle and his return to Wittenberg in 1522 to deal with Andreas Karlstadt. A fair few responses failed to understand Luther's disguise. Those who were confused interpreted this as an indication of his arrogance (as claimed in C) or his willingness to fight for the cause. Again much digression into the Knight's War ensued. There was considerable comment on objectivity regarding B and its spontaneous or otherwise nature, but some misrepresented the provenance and content of C. Many missed some of its balance seeing only its negative comments, so overstating the hostility of the author. The best responses made use of Dantiscus's preconceptions and purpose to seek out Luther, setting off from Spain and writing to a Bishop, inferred as Catholic. Many developed his humanist label often with reference to Erasmus, but few discussed the stance or tone a diplomat might take or their reaction to someone like Luther. The very different circumstances of the two meetings and how this affected the limited nature of B's impressions was not fully picked up. The result was that

judgements on the two sources were not as well developed. Thus the idea that C was a hostile author was seen as limiting its value in revealing the true qualities of Luther. In fact it is balanced and judicious in its appraisal of him. Judgements thus varied, but were usually supported by some context and analysis.

b) Most managed to create a two-sided argument for and against the concept of 'hero', but those who genuinely focused on 'of religious reform' were fewer. Some preferred to branch out into Luther as the hero of German nationalism or a social hero, which was not in the sources. Better responses focused on Luther as either religious reformer or heretic. Occasionally a response focused on 'challenging authority' rather than the question set. Some answers drifted off entirely into social and economic or the nationalist issues mentioned above, losing sight of both the title of the paper 'Martin Luther 1521-1524' (by referring to later events like the Peasant's War) and the question itself – a hero of religious reform. A better version of this at least examined religious hero versus national or social hero but found the latter difficult to find in the sources. Most grouped A, B (in part) and D for the Interpretation versus C and E against. The best candidates saw a dual use for sources B and C, even D, which could be very effectively used for both sides of the argument – usually 'hero' v. 'heretic' or 'self-seeking troublemaker'. There was good use of evidence on humanism, Zwingli and the Swiss and some very perceptive use of D, although weaker responses sometimes did not understand its irony, missed the potentially useful detail and took it at face value (or even thought it a catholic tract). Few made good use of B by developing the bravery Luther showed in returning to Wittenberg in disguise under the Ban of the Empire to save moderate reform from the clutches of the radicals. Source A was also often poorly used given its references to what made Luther a hero for some, although there was much effective evaluation here on the spread of the Lutheran message and its typicality. Other responses made much of either its indication of Luther's appeal to intellectual and artisan groups or its untypical nature, the comments of a unique individual. There were chunks of irrelevant knowledge added on the Peasant War, sometimes the Schmalkaldic League and even Philip of Hesse, especially by those determined to see him as a nationalist or social hero. The most effective knowledge usually centred on Luther's contributions to religious reform and his interaction with Erasmus. Indeed a linkage of C and E, both Humanists and both critics of the 'hero' aspect of Luther's reform message, proved a useful way of evaluating for some. Somehow the printing press crept into many answers, but this did not seem to be linked with D (the obvious linkage) or possibly A (whose woodcuts and art were known to few), which would have been valid.

F964/02 European and World History Enquiries

1 The Origins and the Course of the French Revolution 1774-1795

a) The tone of the two sources was widely compared and responses were consistent (e.g. measured v anxious). Attempts at contextualization revealed a very sound base of knowledge overall. Most popular were explanations of the function of the Assembly of Notables referred to in Source B. Most candidates speculated as to the date of A, reasonably supposing it to be before the Assembly of Notables, B being during and after. One considered that Source A 'could be an honest evaluation in early 1788 or a more blasé writing in late 1788 trying to keep calm and carry on'. Better responses were able to see that a time difference possibly of nearly a year was significant at this time, and that the writer of A was not necessarily lying about how bad things were. Quite a few thought that B was a 'better' source because of what happened in July 1789. With both sources, the Enlightenment was mentioned widely in order to contextualise 'radical ideas and writing' and 'political writings'. There was more variety in respect of purpose, particularly regarding Source A because although most identified him as an educated member of the Third Estate, there was less consensus as to whether he was sympathetic, hostile or neutral towards the idea of revolution. Partly attributable to this point, a significant number of responses were unable to offer a convincing analysis of reliability with many taking the safe route (e.g. Source A: 'He was a Parisian writer so would have finger on pulse' or Source B: 'unreliable because they would be out of touch with the people'). Better answers were able to comment on

reliability using context of the Cahiers to support. Only a few suggested that Source B was more reliable because it was more prescient with regards to the events that followed in 1789. There was much speculative evaluation about the motives of each writer – some was valid; other comments less so. There were generally few problems of identifying similarity and difference, although many missed that Mercier in A was referring only to Paris whilst the brothers were referring to the whole of France ('various provinces and cities'). Several candidates had a problem with memoir and thought that the Prince(s) was/ were looking back so 'had no need to lie' etc. The dates and tenses being used should have told them that it was a memorandum.

b) Three interpretations and groupings were generally seen – economic, the Enlightenment and the Ancien Régime's social structure, although there were other points identified – royal weakness and, less convincingly given the sources, war and foreign policy. Individual sources were often used in more than one grouping with D and E both being used frequently in groupings relating to economic factors and those relating to the abuses of the Ancien Régime. A number of candidates grouped Source C as 'economic', inferring the disastrous financial cost to France, but this was not always explained effectively. Not many spotted that there was information on economic factors in Sources A ('unrest on poorer areas'). Similarly many tried to use D solely for economic factors. A careful reading would show it was largely discussing the social inequities of the Ancien Régime. The Enlightenment generally won out with few candidates indicating who in the population would have been affected by the new ideas as compared to the numbers affected by economic factors like food prices etc. There was some confusion as to how to group issues – the tax system and its failings were by some seen as part of the economic problem (a fairer and less corrupt taxation system would provide more money for the treasury and therefore lower all-round taxes so people could face the price issue more easily). Others put it as a feature of the Ancien Régime's social structure and saw that as a separate issue. The best responses tried to synthesise the three together - if the economy had been sound and food prices within reach, the political factors would have been less of an issue to the vast majority. The Enlightenment was not, contrary to many candidates, a development of the 1780s or the result of homecoming veterans of the American War. Many candidates saw the three Estates as being homogenous. Therefore all Third Estate were poor/illiterate; all nobles rich and reactionary etc. Ambivalent evaluations without a conclusion leave the examiner without a clear sense of what the candidate means.

Context was used effectively, and showed sound knowledge, e.g. almost all students knew the background behind Thomas Jefferson and his part in American independence. The reliability of this source was widely questioned because of this. Candidates were split on the reliability of Source D - some adopted the 'well he would say that wouldn't he' approach whilst others gave the source credibility due to the Marquis having been a first-hand witness to the events of 1789. Others struggled with their preconceptions. They thought his nobility predisposed him to reaction and couldn't cope with his apparent approval of middle-class values and condemnation of the nobility for lack of these. As ever responses struggled with the provenance of Source E, the historian Vovelle. It was fair to say that he would take a wider view but hardly any picked up on what he went on to say – that the 'economic and social crisis was the *background* to the meeting of the Estates General'. Few made the point that modern historians can analyse economic matters in greater detail and would thus be prone to stress points that may not have been so obvious to contemporaries.

2 The Unification of Italy 1815-70

a) Candidates successfully managed to pick out some of the similarities between Sources B and D, e.g. the revolutionary status of Mazzini in B and that of the disciples in D, the pessimism of both in regard to Italian attitudes to unification. They also successfully managed to pick out some of the key differences such as the fact that the disciples were frustrated with Mazzini, stressing the fact that many Italians were not prepared for revolution and that they responded badly to the revolutionary organisations promoted by Mazzini in B. Fewer picked up on the timing aspect – that Mazzini was eager to accelerate development in B whereas in D his former

disciples advised waiting ‘until the people are ready’. Some candidates however had difficulties with the context of the sources, in particular the reference to ‘social superiors’ as the key to attitudes in Source D which caused some confusion as to meaning. Responses tended to consider Source D as more reliable than source B on the rather questionable grounds that it was written by more than one person after the failed attempts at revolution such as the Roman Republic. Few considered the possibility that Mazzini might have been untypical in his pessimistic comments in B. This source was not wholly easy to evaluate. Surprisingly few candidates thought of not taking Mazzini literally at his word. However many commented on the tone of Source B as bitter. More astute answers noticed the fact that Source B was published before Mazzini’s successes with the Roman Republic and after the failed revolutions of the 1830s as a possible explanation for the pessimism whilst Source D was much later, in 1858. Weaker answers made stock provenance comments claiming that Mazzini would not have criticised himself in Source B but they could find no resolution of this apparent contradiction.

b) Candidates managed to group quite well, although some were insecure. Such grouping was consistently A, B and D versus C and E. Occasionally, B was used to support the proposition, as was D if handled carefully (a rejection of his methods but still a celebration of his potential). An attempt at analysis was made by most. Some candidates interpreted the question as to whether others inspired the nationalist movement more, leading to discussion of Garibaldi’s relative importance rather than keeping a focus on Mazzini’s influence. Fewer candidates picked up on the provenance of C and E though the other sources were evaluated more effectively. With regard to the provenance of Source C, Trevelyan’s role as a historian was mostly evaluated in stock fashion. Contextual knowledge about Trevelyan was not particularly strong. A lot saw him as obviously impartial because he was a historian. Few seemed to see Trevelyan as anything other than an historian and therefore wholly reliable for all the usual reasons. Some did however read his words carefully and identify the marked yet measured point of view from the tone/language used (his limited influence in distant provinces; the wariness of the French towards him; the image fostered by his enemies of a tyrant; his especial impact on idealistic young men etc.). There were obvious opportunities to contrast Trevelyan with d’Azeglio in A who condemns such misguided idealism. On Source E few picked up Guerrazzi’s resounding ‘It was Mazzini who gave us the idea’ or extended it to discuss idea versus reality. Own knowledge was used quite effectively concerning Mazzini’s achievements or lack of success. Only a minority of candidates broadened the contextual scope of their enquiry to take into account the successes of Garibaldi and the shift from Italian unification through revolution to centralisation directed from Piedmont and Cavour and militarised on the spot by Garibaldi, all of which rather stranded Mazzini.

3 The Origins of the American Civil War 1820-1861

a) There were some well-developed comparison skills in evidence here but the question proved taxing for many. Whilst all could see the similarities, many had problems analysing the difference between the sources and clearly didn’t have the understanding to spot the state v territory distinction. They were clearly limited by a lack of in-depth understanding on issues beyond state’s rights. Few grasped this territory/state distinction. Quite a number thought Michigan was a southern state and became very confused by Source B. Some failed to notice the real significance of the timing of the sources, not realising the Bill had been passed by the time of source E. Whilst others, not grasping Douglas’ selective amnesia, only evaluated E with the comment that ‘... the issue was still controversial...’. Some candidates were confused as to whether the view of Source B was Southern or Northern in origin and whether Douglas in Source E was a Southern or Northern politician. There was also confusion over which Compromise Agreement was being referred to in Source B. Many students focused on the moderate nature of the Free Press in Source B and Douglas’ tone in E as a candidate for election in the debates with Lincoln.

b) All candidates were able to group the sources effectively, although there was much discrete discussion within the groups. There was little variation of grouping, most consistently opting for B and E suggesting there wasn’t a threat that could not be resolved peacefully versus A, C and D

which did see a threat to the Union over the Kansas Nebraska dispute. Some excellent contextual knowledge was seen on this dispute, most of which pointed to the threat argument. However, such knowledge was often used too liberally and as a result synthesis suffered and responses became imbalanced towards own knowledge. On the ‘threat to the Union’ interpretation many responses identified the more extreme views presented by Atchison in Source A, using Source C as a supportive reference to ‘force’ and Source D as evidence for the physical threat to the union. However some seemed to make blanket suggestions that Atchison’s views were typical of all southerners at the time, not noticing the significance of provenance and then linking violence irrelevantly to events beyond the period. On the counter view of a ‘lack of a real threat to the Union’ answers were less secure because understanding of Sources B and E were shakier. Source B was sometimes misinterpreted as a southern source and not many picked up on the ‘preposterous’ aspect of southern demands. In Source D Douglas’ justification for his Bill was not well understood (his rather fudging comments on police regulations and enforceability confused some). Knowledge was generally well used, particularly on events surrounding Bloody Kansas. However in terms of provenance a significant number of candidates made generalised comments. For example many suggested that the two newspapers (B and C) exaggerated for sales and were thus of little import for the question (if indeed they did link such comments to the actual question), whilst the speeches in A and E shared similar faults. Thus Douglas in E, was clearly not reporting the truth as he was in a debate with Lincoln. Source D evoked many different interpretations for the use of violence, but candidates generally suggested that the source was neutral as the reporter was not present at the time or was British. Some interpreted the ‘Union’ bond in the cartoon as a sword and didn’t pick up on its significance for the potential break-up of the Union despite their view that both sides were mortally wounded by said sword. There was some interesting comment on northern/southern stereotyping. Some shrewdly saw the cartoon as more sympathetic to the North in its portrayal of the ‘twins’ but didn’t know how to use this for the question. Some candidates struggled with Source C because it was a southern source writing about northern attitudes rather than southern. Quite a few misread source B’s reference to ‘preposterous’ as being about the South’s attitudes to Kansas-Nebraska rather than to any further demands. Some candidates were confused over the terms of the Nebraska Bill and the States rights referenced in Source B and many used source E as a means to argue Douglas’ view in Source E as either in favour of slavery or against it. Thus whilst there was a broad grasp of the question and how to group the sources for it many responses fell down over the detail.

4 Dictatorship and Democracy in Germany 1933-63

a) Candidates found both parts a little more difficult than they may have expected from such a familiar period. Part (a) challenged because of the focus on evidence for Hitler’s methods in 1933-4. Candidates found it difficult to infer from C and so make links with Source E. There were few problems with identifying similarities or differences, but linking these to the key issue was beyond quite a few. Comparison skills appeared weaker than on most other options and sequencing was more frequent. Where comparisons were made, they were not always precisely drawn. There were very wide interpretations as to what Hitler’s ‘methods’ might include – many candidates understood propaganda to be something different to a method, which led to some rather uneven answers, and several which said there was no evidence here at all. The provenance of sources C and E proved very problematic. The genre of E was not clear to many candidates. The guesses as to what the ‘Table Talk’ was ranged from a TV or radio interview through to someone taking notes of a private meeting to Hitler actually talking to his table, and the evaluations thus fluctuated wildly. Some candidates simply stated that the Table Talk was unreliable as Hitler was boasting about his achievements or was losing the war so he had to increase the support of the German people and those around him. Its private nature was not well understood. Source C was perhaps even more challenging – a large number of candidates saw this simply as ‘propaganda’, simply because of the mention of Goebbels, and went no further than that. Others tried to break down who Erich Ebermeyer was, with only a small number using the description of him as coming from a liberal family – most candidates thought he’d been indoctrinated or brainwashed because of his comments. Some thought the

Ebermeyer family were Hitler's natural supporters, and some interpreted the term 'legal family' to mean that they were non-Jewish, and not connected to the legal profession. Indeed it would seem that the label liberal is not well understood. A large number assumed he was a child, because of the reference to his parents, and tended to discount his testimony on the basis he was too young to form a valid opinion, and had probably been brainwashed. The source's conceptual understanding and tone should have revealed its adult nature to candidates. Much was made of Source C as a piece of propaganda rather than an honest reaction by a family that would not normally be Nazi. Some even felt that it was Ebeymeyer doing the propagandising. Knowledge of individual events relating to the general topic was sound, but chronological understanding was shaky for some and this militated against effective comparison. For example, some students placed Source C after the Enabling Act. Its context was the run-up to the Enabling Act ('prior' to the convening of the Reichstag as the steer helpfully commented). Many had no idea of the context of a Source C and the significance of the day of Potsdam in March 1933. More effective answers focused on the legal methods Hitler used to consolidate power drawing on ceremonies and the importance of legitimacy.

b) Here the problem was the concept of 'consent' and what was meant by it. Better responses pitted 'consent' (legitimacy, the role of Hindenburg, popular policies, Enabling Act, restraint so as not to offend, winning the army over etc.) against use of force (camps, the Night of the Long Knives, threats to other parties etc.). Most effective were those that pointed out that even winning consent in elections was underpinned with violence or the threat thereof, including the passing of the Enabling Act (the subtext of C – 'processions', 'solid lines of cheering millions'). Weaker responses were less effective because of their lack of grouping and comparison. Many had no real understanding of what consent might mean – a few put it in terms of political and popular support, but a large number classed it simply as having Hindenburg onside, and simply stated all popular support as being propaganda and brainwashing. A lot got caught up on the difference between achieving power, which they saw in the sources, and consolidating power, a step that would come later, which they could not, quite rightly, see in the sources. They struggled – where to put propaganda; what about the apparent 'consent' of the police and Interior Ministry in Source B (which some perversely wanted to see as consent); was the tone of Source A propaganda and aimed at winning support (i.e. consent, which was seen as much the same thing) or was the tone threatening and therefore non-consensual? To support arguments there were numerous references to developments and events from post-1934, and only a few tried to make these relevant by suggesting that these kind of events were the logical outcomes of the policies in A and B. A lot of students got caught up in the provenance of A and E, but failed to look at the content. Many read A as being completely aggressive rather than a mixture of yearned for tradition and stability with a threat to those who would not confirm or fit in to 'respect' for 'our great past'. Few noted that it was an election speech. Source B should have been straightforward in its evidence for force but a fair number used it as a launch pad for irrelevant narrative about the Final Solution. The problems with C outlined for Q(a) were typically repeated here. Source D was also hard for students to understand – many saw it was anti-consent, because of the author and provenance (a Sopade Report), but did not go into the actual content, and so very few saw any evidence of consent at all. Some thought the source and author was pro-Hitler as opposed to the views reported. Others used it to add on knowledge about the Night of the Long Knives rather than analyse the significance of the source in the light of the question. Source E was often broken down to simply discuss Hindenburg and Hitler's relationship with the Army. A number used this to bring in an extended discussion of the Munich Putsch, without making a clear link to the actual question. Nonetheless quite a number did it well, recognising the ambiguity of some of the sources and producing some mature analysis and evaluation. When it came to evaluation many candidates tended to make suppositions, usually in regard to provenance and often without any reference to the content. This is a shame since often they seemed to have quite a lot of contextual knowledge but clearly didn't know how to apply it to best advantage.

5 The USA and the Cold War in Asia 1945-75

a) This proved relatively straightforward for most who commented well on clear similarities and differences of content (less so) and provenance (more so). For Source C virtually all commented on the purpose of Diem's speech and used this to make a developed comment on reliability although some were vague as to the precise audience (the US Council on Foreign Relations, not as some thought, perhaps being misled by the New York location, the UN). They were less effective, rather surprisingly, on Source E's provenance. Few considered its purpose and merely copied the steer out without explanation – the significance of former government ministers, as businessmen the importance of their comments on the economy or as patriots their views on what should have happened post-independence and the Geneva Accords. The majority of candidates commented on provenance much more than on content. The question's focus was on the situation in the South under Diem 1957-60 and there was much in the sources to compare – the independence inheritance both politically and economically, the Geneva Accords (seen by Diem as implanting Communism; by the Manifesto as a source of potential peace), foreign aid, the use or abuse of resources, the religious sects, unification, the extent of freedom and the role of Diem himself. Candidates however preferred to focus on provenance and little contextual knowledge was utilised to help evaluate in many responses. Many were critical of Diem's speech to the US in C contrasting quite effectively the nature of Diem's government outlined in E. Some usefully used the dates to point to change. Many made the point for E that the Caravelle Manifesto was more reliable as it was written by a group of businessmen rather than one person, although only some pointed to the veracity of their comments being underscored by their later arrest and imprisonment. Responses however did not always comment on the status of these individuals as ex government ministers which could have provided some additional credibility to analysis.

b) The sources were generally well understood, though a number dismissed A and B on the grounds that they were more about initial intention than quantifiable evidence of the success or otherwise of US aid (a legitimate point to make provided it was seen as setting out the framework for what the US intended to do and was related to the key issue of whether this was to achieve an independent democracy). Grouping was generally acceptable, most pairing A, C and partly B for the view that US support for Diem aided independent democracy to 1960 with D, E and partly B countering this, demonstrating that the US aim was to contain communism with essentially military aid with democracy and genuine independence having little to do with it. Some commented that the sources demonstration of US aid and influence was such that Vietnam stood little chance of independence in the period. Some effective responses argued that the USA rode roughshod over the Geneva Protocols after Diem Bien Phu to create a spurious and corrupt regime and a pseudo- country. Using A (where Eisenhower was laying down the guidelines for Diem) and B (a more private source which talked of military aid and police to back him) it was argued that the USA never intended to hold free elections because they knew that Ho would win them on the nationalist platform of reunifying a very nationalist country and former ally of the USA in WW2. These candidates only just managed to make the sources fit this but it did enable an effective deployment of Duan in Source D. The differences between A and B, despite their similar dates, was also commented on by better candidates. Some inevitably wandered out of the time zone and into the war. There were many attempts to bring in Rolling Thunder, My Lai, Agent Orange and war disillusionment which were rarely made even vaguely relevant. Better responses were able to use their knowledge to extend and comment on the sources with information on the Buddhist/Catholic issue, electoral malpractice, corrupt government, Madame Nhu etc. Some responses had problems getting to grips with the concept of democracy, arguing that D was evidence of Diem being democratic. Comments on D tended to be stock on the undoubtedly bias of a communist with no awareness of the purpose of the source or of its potential accuracy given the provenance. Some found E more challenging and were more comfortable with the second half but some responses quite effectively drew connections between the account of the business men in E and the criticisms of the regime by Le Duan in D.

F965 Historical Interpretations and Investigations

Most Centres seemed to understand what was required by way of marginal annotations and summary comments. There has been a distinct improvement in this respect since this unit was introduced. A few Centres are still inclined to put AO1a etc. in the margin, failing to appreciate that such a reference is not sufficiently precise. There is also a strong tendency to describe as ‘evaluation’ what turns out on inspection to be merely explanation.

Though much of the marking was spot on, a number of Centres are inclined to award their candidates excessively high marks. There seemed to be two main reasons for this. First, an award of 5 or 6 under AO1a and b seemed to be the usual mark given by some Centres, provided that the essays were fairly literate and showed some accurate knowledge. There was sometimes little recognition of the need to reserve the higher marks for those whose knowledge, standard of literacy etc. are better than ordinary. Second, over-generous marks were often awarded for essays which contained little **supported** evaluation, as opposed to unsupported opinion or uncritical exposition of the views expressed in Passages or sources.

There is indeed much really good practice in both marking the work and clearly in the support given to candidates in encouraging careful analysis and criticism of the passages and in driving investigations by evidence. Thus higher level skills appropriate to the more flexible and thoughtful demands of modern work and life are being exercised and there are insights into the nature of historical judgements that would not always be found in traditional essays. The unit remains immensely worthwhile and has helped many candidates to work at a high level, to develop independent research and to understand the subject more fully. Centres have shown a huge amount of commitment and hard work in assessing work. Comments have been very full, in the main; there has been much evidence of internal moderation, and the majority of marking has been realistic, fair and shown very high levels of professionalism.

There are some points which may need clarification and which often result in a centre’s marks not being accepted.

- 1 **The real basis of the mark scheme.** The mark scheme is an explanation of the essential assessment objectives. These are stated clearly in bold above the explanation of the different levels and it is these which must be the focus of all marking. The highest scoring element is **AO2**. To emphasise : **AO2b** requires candidates to analyse and evaluate, in relation to the historical context, how aspects of the past have been interpreted and represented in different ways.
The interpretations of aspects of the past which should be evaluated and interpreted are the four passages in the question. The judgement about the four interpretations should be of the whole interpretation given, not just part of it; it should be supported by use of knowledge and by using evidence from the other passages if appropriate.
AO2a requires candidates, as part of an historical enquiry (to) analyse and evaluate a range of appropriate source material with discrimination.
This requires selecting sources relevant to the investigation, to link them to the topic of the question, to test them as evidence and to recognise that not all sources have the same value and accuracy and some evidence is more convincing than other evidence. The focus of assessing this A0 is how candidates use evidence, not whether they produce a good essay which refers to evidence. The analysis and evaluation of sources is at the heart of the assessment of this part of the coursework.
- 2 **Which Interpretations?** In the Interpretations question and this requires candidates to assess interpretations. Though it may seem obvious, the interpretations they have to assess are the four lengthy and demanding passages. They are there to be analysed, that is their view of the issue in the question to be understood and explained. When this essential preliminary has been done, they should be assessed. This can be done in two

ways. Firstly, by using contextual knowledge and secondly by using evidence from the other passages. The question says ‘Using these four passages and your own knowledge’, so, obviously, to answer the question, knowledge must be used. For level 1a this should be excellent knowledge, very well used; for 1b there should be very good use of knowledge and for Level II there should be good use of knowledge. AO1a marks should be awarded for the use of knowledge not merely its deployment. The task is not to write an essay on the topic in the question by dipping into the passages and also using knowledge, it is to use knowledge to test the identified interpretations in the passages. An excellent answer will engage with the passage fully, not merely pick a bit out and comment on it. Also the question is not of a ‘gobbet’ type where the passage is considered for what it says generally and then assessed. The essential element is to identify the interpretation of the issue in the question offered by the passage.

- 3 **What has to be done with the sources?** In Investigations, the focus is on the critical evaluation of sources, not the deployment of different sources to support an argument about the issue in the question. No matter how scholarly the argument or how deep the research is, if the chosen sources are not evaluated, then the essential assessment objective clearly stated in bold above the levels is not being met. This cannot be emphasised strongly enough. This is not the place for essays on the topic in the question which use sources and own knowledge to assess a general viewpoint or different arguments. Marking should be based on the extent to which sources are critically evaluated – that is assessed as evidence.
- 4 **Incorrect ‘Default’ marking for A01a and A01b.** A01a and A01b require candidates to select and use knowledge and to ensure that that knowledge is used in an argument based on evaluation of the passages and the sources that is relevant to the question. Thus 6 and 6 are not default marks to be awarded whatever the quality of knowledge or the relevance of the argument. A mark in Level III for A02 cannot really go with a mark in Level 1 for A01. If good knowledge were being well used, then the mark for A02 would be higher.
- 5 **When candidates choose their own topics for Investigations.** Assessment in centres should comment on the quality and range of supporting knowledge. In cases where candidates choose a range of topics for the Investigation, then centres should ensure that they have the knowledge and expertise to assess that knowledge. There were examples where obvious errors and lack of understanding by candidates had not been recognised by the marking. It is clearly unfair that candidates who opt for topics of their own choosing, sometimes of more obscure topics, are treated differently from those who opt for titles on the same broad topic as has been taught for the Interpretation which has been part of a taught unit and which the markers know well. It is, of course, potentially rewarding for a candidate to investigate, say, seventeenth- century Japan, but the centre must be able to mark it to the same level as a taught topic.
- 6 **Order of Merit.** Centres are required to establish a clear and accurate rank order of merit; however, this is an order of merit of the actual work done for the unit, not an order based on the perceived ability of candidates based on their study of the subject as a whole. Put bluntly, it does not matter whether the author of the work is generally seen as able or limited by the centre, but how well the work he or she has submitted for this unit has met the assessment criteria. In some cases, work given similar marks was so different in quality that the only rationale for these marks being given must have been an assumption based on knowledge of the candidates’ other work that they must be of similar ability. A ‘reality check’ of internal moderation is extremely important here.
- 7 **Independent Coursework.** It must be stressed that this is independent coursework. Passages must not be studied in class and their interpretations established by the teacher in a class discussion. Precise contextual knowledge must not be suggested by teachers,

and there must be a check that collusion has not taken place. It is obvious when very similar points are made about passages and identical quotations appear and when obscure factual knowledge is used by several students, that this is not independent work. The integrity of this unit depends on centres recognising the limits of possible existence which are clearly set out in the Coursework Guidance booklet.

- 8 **Rubric error.** There were more instances of candidates not observing two clear rules. The first is that not all candidates in a centre must do the same Investigations question; the second is that the current year's Interpretations questions must be attempted and not questions from previous years that have been discontinued.
- 9 **Administration.** Thank you to the majority of centres who did work very hard to get the administration right: moderators were very grateful. However, despite all previous pleas, there were a higher number of instances of arithmetical and transcription errors which resulted in the return of work by centres than last year. Such errors delay moderation and involve unnecessary work for all concerned. It is mandatory that the coursework authentication form be returned and the OCR cover sheet should be used for all candidates as well as the record of study form. Coursework dispatches should not contain any information for the moderators' attention. It is not appropriate, for example, to write a letter about previous performance or to say if a candidate's first language is not English. If a centre wishes to draw attention to any matters affecting candidates, then this should be done by applying for special consideration for candidates using the guidance provided by OCR.

Reports must draw attention to problems and matters which should be improved, but the unit as a whole was characterised by much valuable and worthwhile work throughout the mark range and some outstanding and impressive submissions at the top. Evaluation is a higher level skill; the analysis of complex passages is a demanding requirement and the selection and deployment of knowledge to test interpretations and sources is often complex and challenging to master. It is entirely appropriate that at A2 candidates should be offered authentic stretch and challenge, and impressive that so many rise so well to the demands of this unit.

F966 Historical Themes

General Comments

Once again, the impression was that many candidates knew the key skills and delivered well, though there was also a feeling that there had been some regression as to the real quality and consistency of synthesis (see below: points about listing of leaders, rulers, events within paragraphs acting as if synthesis-based). Also, in some scripts there was a tendency to synthesise one answer and not another. On occasion, long answers were read, replete with knowledge, but too descriptive and often thin in areas of real argument and analysis; explanation suffered and synthesis was thin, often confined to bolt-on statements and to conclusions (which needed to be long to secure a decent reward for attempted synthesis).

Overall, there were probably fewer candidates taking a chronological approach this year compared to those seen in the past, although there were still several that were heavy on narrative with limited explanation or evaluation. The best of these had occasions of bolt-on synthesis without meaningful comparative arguments. As usual, direct comparison/thematic approaches worked better.

As in previous series, pre-packaged answers, set up to offer approaches to past or to possible questions, created problems. It is still the case that a good number of candidates will use themes such as political, economic, social, maybe cultural or military, in response to certain questions, yet this themed approach can get in the way of clear argument and explanation. This was a feature of quite a number of answers. Flexibility is important.

Some answers started with a good and strong overview of key issues and factors yet went on to ignore those in much of what was written, at best returning to them at the very end.

The best responses delivered the best synthesis, built around persistent comparison and contrast, using knowledge selectively and illustratively, explaining as the answer developed.

As stated however, quite often synthesis was confined to brief references or to the conclusions, while many answers often started with some comparison and ended with such, but eschewed this in the bulk of the text. Often, comparison was bolt-on or left to link words like ‘similar were...’ or ‘different were...’

As seen in the past, there were a number also that essentially listed for example German leaders, Irish leaders and or Tsars and Communists within the same paragraph without doing enough by way of linkages and explanations or evaluations. They needed cross-referencing and cross-overs, linking words to bring out and explain similarity or difference.

Generalisation was a feature of some answers: a sense of understanding but little really good support.

As is to be expected, description was a feature of weaker answers, often with limited argument or counter-argument and little meaningful explanation. But it is the case still that even better answers could overdo the descriptive/chronological routes and not deliver sufficient and persistent synthesis. Chronological approaches still exist: noticeably in German Nationalism, Britain and Ireland and Russia in particular. The reverse is true of the Changing Nature of Warfare where, increasingly, thematic approaches are seen and are working well, no matter the period range to be covered.

Quite a number of candidates did not cover the whole period and unevenness and imbalance were quite common, seen for German Nationalism, USA Civil Rights, at times, too, in Warfare.

As ever, some candidates ended up answering a prior question, often unloading pre-packaged answers; tell-tale signs are the use of words such as ‘help’ and ‘hinder’ or words from past titles, for example.

Turning point questions continue to prove troublesome to many. It is true that it does not always work when a thematic approach is adopted; often this can mask the arguments over turning points. Then again there is a danger of simple listing if another approach is adopted – unless synthesis can be guaranteed within each turning point paragraph. A number of candidates still like to write about negative turning points but this often does not help argument or counter-argument. The best and focused responses do handle turning points well and provide the necessary cross-assessment within soundly developed thematic sections.

Also, within the body of the answer, we still see those candidates who like to write a lengthy summary paragraph after a themed paragraph and so impede the flow of argument and explanation and often weaken synthesis.

Timing was not too much of an issue but some candidates did write too much on a first answer, so squeezing their response time in the second answer.

While planning is helpful, some spend far too much time on elaborate plans and run into timing problems as a result. Candidates could usefully be trained into creating brief, focused essay plans.

Many wrote vast amounts and often with some style and skills, demonstrating strong synthesis and evaluation. Such answers scored well or very well in AO1B. Many answers were good – sticking within Level III and II for AO1B. – because arguments were apparent but needed further development of synthesis to push them higher. Some answers were also very short and irrelevant – offering little to the actual question set.

Candidates could be reminded that there is as much value in a compact, succinct, well-developed answer as in a very long one. Often the latter can lose direction.

As remarked earlier, there were those who did write much but followed an essentially chronological and descriptive route; even with some analytical and explanatory comments, such answers cannot score highly because they lack the vital ingredient of comparative analysis and evaluation. These chronological routes did lead to lots of description (narrative) without explanation. Whilst some did manage to achieve adequate synthesis and evaluation with this approach, most were limited to description with bolt-on (often appearing rote-learnt) standard phrases that attempted to show judgement.

Some candidates offered merely a list approach and made no links between each ruler/event/leader which led to a failure in assessing real change/importance. More cross referencing was required, especially when the question deals with a named factor.

Comparative routes were offered and these worked well in providing sound analysis and synoptic judgement.

There were several occasions where candidates either misread or misunderstood the question and therefore its requirements. This led to answers falling short of Level III, even with some good analysis. Another issue was where candidates delivered pre-packaged answers without much attempt to relate the material and ideas to the actual questions set. These approaches were particularly noticeable in Themes on Ireland, Russia and American Civil Rights.

In addition, as we know, questions on the development or nature of Russian government still elicit far too much on economic policies and indeed social without real thought about the meaning of ‘government’ and this continues to hamper a good number of candidates.

The use of abbreviations continues to be a source of concern – often, candidates make clear they are going to use such (e.g. AA, CRs, Govt, even TP for turning point, Alex for Alexander, etc.) from an early stage. This is particularly noticeable with Russia.

Literacy levels were generally satisfactory or more in many cases but there were examiners reporting that poor spelling, punctuation and expression were impeding the flow of candidates' arguments.

F966/01 Historical Themes

- 1 This question was not particularly well answered. Whilst candidates showed a reasonable awareness of how government strengthened in the period 1066-1216, they struggled to specifically link this to the outbreak of rebellion. Those responses that did focus on the issue of rebellion, rather than the strengthening of government were often slightly vague and generalised. Comments were often made about the Great Revolt of 1173/4 and the revolt of 1215 showing the importance of strong government, without investigating the precise link. In addition to this, candidates often wrote slightly generic responses, with each section of the essay focussing on a different reason for revolt and little sense of a common strand running throughout. Answers would have benefited from knowledge of a range of reasons for rebellion and then evaluating reaction against strong government against them. However, there were some strong responses that were able to weigh up the relative importance of different factors, and amongst these stronger responses the general consensus was that either weak government or baronial greed remained the major cause of rebellion throughout the period.
- 2 This question was only answered by a fairly small number of candidates. Whilst the quality of responses was not particularly strong, candidates who attempted this question in conjunction with Question 1 tended to do slightly better on this question. Many candidates suffered from a failure to define the reasons for the changes before starting out on description of the changes. The major problem faced by candidates was defining the term 'local government' as a significant number devoted quite sizeable amounts of time to changes in central government that had little effect on local government. In weaker responses candidates also tended to focus primarily on the changes made to local government, rather than the specific reasons for these. There were however a number of candidates who answered this question either moderately well or better. Common themes that were assessed included the desire to increase revenue of central government, as shown by actions such as the Inquests of the Sheriffs (largely to fund the continental possessions) as well as the need to maintain law and order/ control over local officials in order to ensure that the law could continue to function effectively.
- 3 Of the three questions within this option this was by far the most popular and the best answered. The nature of this question lent itself particularly well to a thematic response, with candidates generally exploring Lanfranc's typicality through the themes of: relations with the king, relations with the pope, relations with suffragan bishops/ the Primacy Debate, and in certain cases his attitude to canon law/ Church reform. Within each theme, Lanfranc's attitudes/actions were compared to those of his successors, allowing most candidates to make some sort of evaluation, and in many cases incorporate a degree of synthesis into their responses. Although knowledge of Lanfranc was fairly strong, some answers were limited by a lack of knowledge of the other Archbishops of Canterbury. A common trend was to compare Lanfranc's positive relations with William to those enjoyed between Hubert Walter and Richard I, or Ralph D'Escures and Henry I without including any examples in order to back this up. An encouraging trend was the fact that most candidates were able to refer to additional Archbishops of Canterbury to those mentioned on the specification.
- 4 This was the most popular question in this section and was done by the vast majority of the candidates. Many sought to explain why religious change was the main cause of rebellion and didn't realise that they had to weigh this up against other causes of rebellion, whilst other candidates simply explained the different causes of rebellion with minimal focus on 'main cause.' There were also very few candidates who noted that religion played no role in unrest in the period before 1536, although there was an attempt by some to suggest that it was a cause of the Amicable Grant because Wolsey was involved. A

standard approach was to explain the religious causes of 1536 and 1549, and then point out that there were other causes before '36 and though most of the rebellions after 1549 had dynastic or faction as their main causes, some of these rebellions had religious change as subsidiary factors. Disappointingly, Ireland was often tagged on as an afterthought and treated with little detail. Candidates do seem to find it difficult to answer questions that require comparative evaluation and often fail to move beyond the list approach to causes. Knowledge was often patchy, particularly in terms of providing specific evidence of religious grievances from either the Pilgrimage of Grace or Western Rebellion, whilst knowledge of events and demands of the Northern Earls was particularly superficial.

- 5 This was the least popular of the questions in this section and produced the weakest answers. Most candidates lacked the specific knowledge needed or did not understand what was meant by 'leadership' and often gave general answers about why rebellions failed, focusing on that word rather than leadership. Candidates do need to read the question carefully and answer the actual question set. As with the previous question, comparative evaluation of factors provided a significant challenge for many and few were able to balance poor leadership against other factors. The general account was to suggest that some of the leadership – Aske and Kett – was particularly effective but that the government forces were too strong. Many candidates relied on a heavily descriptive approach of what happened during rebellions, perhaps in the hope that in doing this they would cover the issue of leadership. Some answers drifted towards why the frequency of rebellion declined, one reason given being poor leadership, but again focus was limited and touched on the demands of the question only in passing. Stronger answers did try and weigh up leadership against other factors, but the comparison was often confined to a few sentences, rather than dominating the analysis.
- 6 Some candidates produced some very good answers and this was probably the most successfully addressed question in this section. However a significant number appeared to think that they had to explain why the Pilgrimage of Grace was the most threatening rebellion. Most candidates did not cover *government* and wrote about the general nature of the threat. The strongest answers established some criteria in their opening paragraph against which to make their evaluation and were able to link their material back to this. Those who adopted a thematic approach and compared issues such as size, location and aims across the period were able to make interim judgements about the threat to the government posed by rebellions and then make an overall judgement. The problem for some was either that they did not know enough about the Pilgrimage to allow in depth comparisons, or that they knew too much and covered other rebellions in a superficial manner.
- 7 Many candidates wanted to explain the reasons for the changes rather than evaluate the actual statement in the question. There seemed to be some confusion about what change and continuity actually were and there was a lot of arguing against oneself in this question. There was also some reluctance to recognise any conflict between England and Scotland apart from set battles. However, stronger answers adopted a thematic approach and considered issues such as dynastic, religious, economic and military conflict. Most candidates had sufficient factual knowledge to support their arguments, although the period after 1560 was often treated rather superficially in comparison to the reign of Henry VIII. It was surprising how few were able to write in any depth about the reign of Henry VII and the issue of Perkin Warbeck and the marriage of Henry's daughter.
- 8 The candidates who were able to define skilfully were more successful in answering this question, but too many wanted to turn it into a question about success and there were many answers where the two words were simply seen as interchangeable. Once again the problem of comparative evaluation was a difficulty for many candidates who simply wrote paragraphs about each monarch and therefore found it very difficult to display synthesis. Some candidates seemed to know little about Spain and instead, particularly in the latter

period wrote about improving relations with France. Perhaps, most surprisingly, there were many candidates whose treatment of Elizabeth, particularly after her early years was very superficial. In the main, candidates wanted to explain the change in relations between England and Spain rather than set out criteria for *skilfully* and use these to compare Elizabeth's dealing with those of her predecessors.

- 9 Candidates seemed to find the question very challenging and were often unaware of times when invasion was a particular issue. *Effectively* was also a difficult word for most, who wanted to turn it into an essay on success, once again showing the importance of key words in the actual title. Many focused on the reigns of Henry VII, suggesting that as a usurper he was under threat, but this often led to long accounts about the Pretenders and how they were dealt with, whilst others focused excessively on Elizabeth and the Armada. There were very few candidates who were able to deal with the challenges to Henry VIII, particularly the French invasion of the Isle of Wight. Also, there was no apparent knowledge of attacks on Ireland which was mostly treated as foreign itself. Few mentioned Calais and/or Boulogne, and reference to raids from Scotland , which were often not included at all, were limited where they were included to full-scale battles. Instead many often wrote general summaries of relations with France and Spain, ignoring the fact that Scotland, too, was a foreign country.
- 10 This was the most popular question in this section, but produced a range of responses. In weaker responses candidates tended to produce a highly descriptive account of the problems of the church and did not focus on the issue as to whether the condition changed. However, stronger answers adopted a thematic approach and often considered issues such as discipline, the quality of the clergy, including the papacy, education and doctrine. These answers were usually able to compare the position in 1492 with that found in 1610 and make valid judgements, with most arguing that overall the condition had changed, even if there were still some substantial problems that needed resolving, often pointing to the problems of some of the later Popes or the difficulty of carrying out some of the changes desired by the Council of Trent. Weaker responses sometimes adopted a more chronological approach, which limited synthesis, but they also tended to rely on rather generalised knowledge.
- 11 In many instances turning point questions provide the greatest challenge for candidates, but in this instance there were a significant number of very good, and sometimes excellent, responses. Once again this was because many candidates adopted a thematic approach and then compared Trent with other possible turning points within the thematic approach. As with the previous questions, candidates usually considered issues such as doctrine, clerical discipline, education and the quality of the clergy, including the Papacy. However, where some candidates fell down was in considering topics such as the Jesuits or the New Orders as a turning point, when they needed to be much more specific and focus on an actual event, such as the publication of Luther's 95 these or the Sack of Rome, which appeared in many answers. Once again, most candidates had sufficient factual knowledge and in some answers, the depth of knowledge got in the way of the argument.
- 12 This was the least popular question in the section and candidates who tackled this often produced a very unbalanced answer, with the majority focusing excessively on Philip II and showing very little knowledge of other rulers. Although most adopted a thematic approach, the responses often had a very limited comparative element, or when attempts were made to compare Philip with other rulers relied on generalisations. There was some knowledge of Ferdinand and Isabella, Charles V and the Wittelsbachs, but few candidates were able to progress beyond this, although occasionally there was reference to Mary Tudor, but little knowledge was shown of the Valois monarchs.

- 13 There were a number of strong answers to this question as candidates were able to adopt a thematic approach and consider a range of issues that either led or restricted France's move towards a unified state. However, in weaker responses candidates struggled with the 'To what extent' aspect and these answers rarely evaluated the different issues, but did identify at least some of them. However, stronger answers showed a wide range of factual support and were able to range across the whole period, although the reign of Louis XII and the weaker Valois monarchs was often treated superficially.
- 14 In order to score well candidates did need to produce a balanced answer and this was not always the case. Perhaps predictably, the balance was poor, with only limited amounts of analysis about the non-civil war period. Candidates were usually able to identify reasons why there was a civil war in the period after 1562, but found it much more challenging to explain why issues such as the nobility or religion did not cause a civil war in the earlier period. Most answers focused on the strength of the monarchs as a factor and this was usually done reasonably well, but issues such as the economy or factional issues were handled less well. Religion presented the greatest challenge as some struggled to explain why it took until 1562 for civil war to break out given the religious divisions there were in society at an earlier date.
- 15 At A2 it is reasonable to expect candidates to be able to differentiate between economic and financial problems, but most simply treated them as one issue. Most candidates were able to describe the financial and economic weaknesses of France, particularly noting the expenses of the Habsburg/Valois Wars and the religious wars. They could also enumerate the various methods employed to deal with the debt, but were less enthusiastic in evaluating the success of these measures. Candidates also found it challenging to establish a series of themes which would allow a higher level of synthesis. However, there were some who displayed an excellent conceptual and factual grasp and were able to support their arguments with precise examples, which resulted in a convincing analytical answer.
- 16 Although this was a popular question it was the least successfully attempted as candidates struggled to understand the terms of the question. However, the strongest answers, and there were a number, were able to distinguish between theory and practice, but this was not always taken into account, showing the importance of reading the question carefully and focusing on the key words and phrases in the title if high levels are to be achieved. Those candidates who adopted a thematic rather than chronological approach produced the stronger answers, considering issues such as the nobility, finance and religion. Mostly the candidates wanted to show that Louis XIV succeeded in finding what had eluded Richelieu. Many candidates knew a great deal about the period and provided relevant material, but found it more challenging to relate it to the precise demands of the question and this limited the level achieved. The weakest answers adopted a chronological survey and often spent a great deal of time describing the work of Richelieu and less in dealing with the reign of Louis XIV.
- 17 This was the most popular of the questions and produced some strong answers. Candidates who identified a range of themes to consider and then focused on the term 'effectively' produced the strongest answers. Weaker responses often identified themes, but failed to compare the two monarchs or link their material directly to the term 'effective' and finished up simply analysing each reign. Some tried to explain why Louis XIV was more successful than his father. Unfortunately, most were prone to assume Louis XIV had to be seen to be more effective than his father, rather than producing a balanced discussion and some struggled to offer convincing analysis across the whole period.
- 18 Although many candidates knew a great deal about the topic, particularly on Louis XIV's wars and Richelieu's period in power, the big weakness was the failure to state the aims and link the material back to them in order to reach a judgement. In some cases the aims were left to the imagination or were only implied, weakening the thrust or direction of the

argument. In many essays the focus was on the methods used rather than an evaluation of their success. In weaker responses candidates struggled to infer the need to contrast Louis XIII and Louis XIV, struggling especially with the later years of the period and failing to appreciate it was possible to contrast this period with the reign of Louis XIII. Some candidates also became too involved with domestic policy and failed to realise the concern of the question was with foreign policy.

F966/02 Historical Themes

- 1 The best answers were thematic, explaining how social developments, economic and political changes and military policy contributed to the development of nationalism and compared these to the role of industry, picking up the links when this overlapped. The weaker answers described developments which contributed to nationalism, but didn't compare their contribution to that of industrialisation. The links between industrialisation and the success of Prussia in military victories was often overlooked, although World War I was a strong feature in most answers. There was generally little on the link between industrialisation and the growing power of Prussia in the earlier part of the period. The issue of industrialisation was handled reasonably well, though some candidates generalised when some illustrations of the size and scale of changes would have helped. Associated economic areas were covered, including the Zollverein, and links were made to the big political issues. Most candidates were able to draw examples from across the period and links made to nationalism were usually sound but often there was not enough synthesis and comparative evaluation. However, some candidates focused entirely on industrialisation and this was acceptable. Better candidates often exploited the links between industrialisation and military success or militarism (army reforms, navy etc.); however some tried to separate industrialisation from trade expansion (Zollverein etc.), not all that convincingly. One point that was generally missing was the importance of population growth and movement as Germany industrialised and more could have been made of the political and social dimensions.
- 2 This was the least popular of the questions in the Study topic. A thematic approach produced the best answers; assessing the impact Prussian ambitions had on the political, economic and social unity of Prussia and comparing that with the various nationalist movements in place at the time. The analysis of where Prussian aims coincided with those of nationalists after 1860s was often good, but there were some candidates who were unclear as to what they thought Prussian ambitions were. Weaker answers tended to describe what Prussia did rather than focusing on the question. Many candidates adopted a chronological approach or else looked at two phases, pre-1871 and post-1871, but without that much genuine synthesis. Attempts were made to examine Prussian ambitions and to argue about those – military, economic, power politics, unity – and also to assess rising and developing German nationalism. Often the two were seen as inextricably linked, usually through ideas of a Prussian political agenda, the Prussianisation of Germany and the continuing power and role of the Prussian elites. Stronger candidates had plenty to develop, sometimes taking the view that Prussian ambitions were the guiding influence earlier in the period and nationalism became more potent under Wilhelm II. Candidates tended not to stress Prussia's social and political conservatism for most of the period or the liberalism associated with most of the earlier nationalist movements.
- 3 In the better answers wars were compared to political and economic developments. However, there was some tendency to dwell too much on the Wars of Unification and the First World War, quite often in descriptive modes. That said, there were some strange omissions, a few having a blind spot for the Franco-Prussian War and some not making anything of World War One. These also included an analysis of how united Germany actually was anyway. The best answers picked up on the links between economic developments and the success of Prussia in wars. The question seemed to lend itself to high levels of synthesis and a lot of students demonstrated synthesis well through this question. Yet there were some answers in which candidates diverted from wars to other factors. Perhaps, rather surprisingly, more synthesis was needed to aid argument and assessment. Quite often there was not enough linkage of wars and other factors and conclusions did not cross-assess these factors sufficiently strongly. The full range of the period was often not engaged with, more so where there was a strong focus on the Wars

from 1864. The Wars of 1866 and 1870-1 received too much attention in some answers, so unbalancing coverage and argument attempts.

- 4 Many candidates found the focus on the ‘organisation of armies’ very difficult to handle. Although a significant minority did include relevant material such as the introduction of corps, general staffs, etc. they did not seem to understand the significance of these developments in the conduct of war - more rapid movement, concentration of the battlefield, easier coordination of forces, etc. In a number of answers divisions were confused with corps. There were some weak references to Napoleon’s corps system or the Prussian General Staff under von Moltke, but too often organisation was treated in a general manner. Some interpreted this part of the question to mean the organisation of war by the state, for example the marshalling of troops, conscription, and the ability to mobilise economic resources. Thus, they were answering a different question that has been asked in the past. However, once candidates moved on to other factors they were on firmer ground. Weaker responses often failed to compare the earlier and later wars effectively and missed obvious opportunities to discuss organisation, especially in World War I (e.g. Schlieffen Plan) and World War II (either Western or Eastern fronts, or both). However, most were able to discuss other factors and considered issues such as generalship, strategy and tactics, communications and weaponry.
- 5 This question was generally tackled successfully by those candidates who had adequate knowledge. Some candidates lost focus by addressing other factors and some even went so far as to suggest that developments in weaponry, particularly tanks, were worthy of inclusion. There was good material from the Napoleonic, Crimean, American Civil and European wars of the 1859-71 period. Some candidates were also able to bring in good examples from colonial wars. In discussing the key issue candidates were usually able to cover some, or all of the following: Telegraph, semaphore, wireless and radio, field telephones, horses, steamboats and steamships, piston engines, combustion engines, lorries, other vehicles and planes.
- 6 The biggest problem was that few candidates actually knew what tactics were and often muddled tactics with strategy. Knowledge of actual battles was also essential to appreciate tactics in action, but this was lacking in many answers. The best answers reined in description, used their knowledge carefully, and developed considered analytical themes and issues. Some responses were spoilt by a lack of coverage of the whole period, with a number failing to adequately exploit twentieth century wars and, therefore, synthesis could suffer. Weaker answers chose categories of weaponry that had limited chronological scope, (e.g. machine guns and tanks). Some candidates provided heavily descriptive answers, focusing on firepower, the effects of developing weaponry and how these were fuelled by industrialisation, however, aircraft were largely ignored. Best answers had range, both over time and over weapons systems. Some candidates considered other factors linked to weaponry.
- 7 This question produced some very good answers from a lot of candidates. Defining pacification was helpful at the start of the essay. However some candidates did not fully understand what ‘pacifying’ means, whilst others muddled various British administrations. The best answers adopted a thematic approach spanning the whole period in each paragraph. The best comparisons looked at the various areas of land, religion and cultural identity and Anglo-Irish relations and weighed up effectiveness before and after 1867. Good candidates picked up on the foundations laid down by the constitutional nationalists in the first half of the period and explained how that made pacification harder once an independent state was the only question left to solve. The vast majority did not appreciate that suppressing the 1798 rebellion was the most important single act of pacification achieved by any British government. Many took the simplistic view that the Union was somehow ‘doomed’ from the outset. Conciliation and coercion featured; examples of both were given; political, legal, local government, religious and economic areas were often covered but unevenly in many responses. Those candidates who adopted a chronological

periodisation (pre- and post-1867) found it very hard to demonstrate synthesis and comparative analysis. Relatively few candidates adopted a purely descriptive approach. It was the chronological approach which was most in danger of becoming descriptive.

- 8 This question was answered well by those who understood who constitutional nationalist leaders were. Many candidates however strayed into arguing that active participants in the Easter Rising (e.g. Eamonn De Valera) were constitutional nationalists and that the 1918 election victory was a victory for constitutional nationalism rather than a crushing defeat. Of the obvious leaders, Redmond was generally underplayed and Dillon was hardly mentioned. O'Connell and Parnell, at times Butt, figured prominently in most answers. Most candidates ended up with a leader-by-leader approach, listing them and their actions (and contexts), somewhat limiting the degree of synthesis that could be achieved. Some responses wanted to write the standard comparative response on constitutional and revolutionary nationalism. Some good responses distinguished between constitutional nationalism and revolutionary nationalism and compared the effectiveness of the two. An awareness of how the legacy of the former influenced the latter produced the highest levels of synthesis. A thematic approach where candidates assessed its effectiveness in various areas (e.g. galvanising mass support, co-operating with Westminster) was most effective, but unfortunately there were many who were unable to establish a range of criteria against which to judge effective. Good answers sometimes commented on the achievements of constitutional nationalism politically, socially and economically. Whereas, a chronological approach often led candidates to fall into the trap of comparing the leaders to each other rather than remaining tightly focused on the question.
- 9 Some candidates struggled with this question as they did not have a clear understanding of the term 'Protestant Ascendancy'. Those who did understand it could cope well with the land reform factor, often in some detail and at some length, although in some answers land reform was dismissed quite quickly and not compared with other factors until perhaps the conclusion. Some candidates just described land reform or the need for land reform without focusing on the question, especially if they approached it chronologically. However, some were less secure on alternative explanations, notably the Ascendancy's political decline. Religious changes figured in most answers. However, the rise of other social groups at the expense of the Ascendancy was not much considered; middle class attitudes, especially Catholic, could have been assessed; corresponding responses from Protestant lower and middle classes would also have been useful; nor were changes in local government and indeed changes in the attitudes and actions of Westminster governments that prominent. More could have been said of nationalism as of Ulster. At times, coverage of the whole period was not a feature with answers petering out in the later nineteenth century. As with all essays on this paper, a thematic approach produced the best answers. The best responses picked out the various factors that influenced the fall of the Protestant Ascendancy, i.e. their loss of political power, the rise of the Catholics, the attitudes of Westminster and the rise of Ulster extremism. They compared these very effectively and made good judgements. However, Centres should be reminded that tagged on comments at the end of paragraphs along the lines of 'therefore there was much change/continuity across the period when it came to land reform' does not constitute synoptic writing.
- 10 There were some excellent responses to this question with themes such as ideology, nature of leadership or the mechanics of government being deployed. Many, however, were not at home with these concepts and either attempted to engage the answer via policy – which does not answer the question – or in a ruler by ruler approach which damaged any synthesis present. Furthermore, the focus on the October Revolution caused a lot of problems. Centres have obviously prepared candidates to engage in change and continuity debates; the problem was that many of them could not assume a flexible position which argued that the events of 1917 ushered in a period of significant change regarding the government of Russia. There were also problems when candidates set out to list key events but without much cross-referencing and synthesis. Those who did better did

try to assess political and governmental areas – ideologies, political author and power, structures, parties, democracy or its lack, representative rule or its lack, constitutions. Repression featured as did forms of control, whilst a small number of candidates did assess the problems of nationalities. But the necessary argument and counter-argument often suffered because of unevenness or under-use of synthesis. Some candidates set out to answer a previous question about the role of wars in shaping developments in government. It is also worth pointing out that a major problem for some candidates was their tendency to forget that the Provisional Government was the victim of October, not the Tsarist regime. The Provisional Government, when it was discussed, tended to be summarily dismissed for being short-lived thus making an estimation of the true significance of October very difficult. The consequent tendency was to try to argue that there was a high degree of continuity between Nicholas II's regime and full-blown Marxism-Leninism. The very best answers, however, saw October as ending a liberalising trend that had begun in 1905, if not under Alexander II, and reached its apogee under the Provisional Government. Most candidates, however, simply dismissed the Duma period as continuing autocracy. Good answers also picked up on the impact of the Civil War, or the reforms of Alexander II, or the totalitarian approach of Stalin with a nod to Khrushchev. Weaker responses merely listed turning points exclusively with little synthesis. It was also frequent for candidates to not cover the whole period and fail to discuss completely, or at best only make passing comment on events after 1917.

- 11 The problem with this question was the focus on 'impact'. Although many candidates have a very good grasp of the developments in economics and society across the period they were less at home with 'impact'. Again this was an obvious opportunity to engage in a change and continuity debate, but because of a lack of understanding of the structure of Russian society and its economy it was difficult for many to access the impact that policy had on the state. This question was also one where a ruler by ruler approach led to a collapse in synthesis. Finally, there was evidence of juxtaposing different events, one Tsarist, the other Communist in an effort to meet the demands of the higher levels of the mark scheme. Most candidates did address both economy and society in their answers as per the requirements of the question. However, the economy was by far the strongest section of most. At times, there was so much to say that candidates forgot there was an argument and a counter-argument to deliver and allowed their answers to become swamped by statistics. There was some description in some responses. More analytical and themed responses fared better, but still did not always argue and assess enough. Much was often written about repression and forms of social control often at the expense of other significant areas. The same was true of excessive focus on political areas, including representation. The economic changes were usually handled well; illustrative detail helped establish the extent and character of changes. Social coverage was more varied; Education, literacy, schooling featured in many answers, but was completely absent from others. Often less was said about social groups such as peasants and workers. Very occasionally women and youth were included, whilst religion featured in some responses. Living and working conditions did get some treatment but needed more illustrative detail. Overall, more could have been made of the extent and nature of social changes. Again, the named ruler in the question title often did not get as much attention as expected. Most candidates ultimately argued against the assertion in the question, with better answers coming from those who used close comparison of several leaders inclusive of Lenin against specific strands of the economy and society. Again, weaker candidates took a "leader by leader approach" and were limited to Level III. Again a significant number of candidates looked at other rulers, but essays tended to start with Lenin followed by a series of vignettes on some of the other rulers with very little comparison.
- 12 The best answers were thematic and defined success, concentrating on the different tools of repression (e.g. secret police and show trials) and also reform as a tool for dealing with opposition. They evaluated how effectively each ruler used each of these. Good comparisons were made between Alexander III and Stalin and their 'uniformity of

approach' on repression which contrasted with Nicholas II's vacillation between being repressive and reforming. Many Candidates covered aspects of the defeat of opposition quite well or well, not least repressive agencies and methods. Controls were often examined – social, economic, educational – and quite a lot was written about the use of reforms or indeed concessions to ward off opposition groups and critics. However, some candidates spent too much time on contextual issues (such as wars and their aftermath). Some use was made of the successes of opposition as a means to assess why generally opposition failed. Surprisingly, many answers did not say that much about the actual opposition – its extent, its character, its social and geographical make-up and there were a number of candidates who showed little understanding of who the opposition was. When answers did offer a wide coverage of the period, this enhanced the quality. Alexander III usually received good coverage as did Stalin. Once again with questions on the fate of opposition, more could have been said about Lenin and the defining event of the Civil War. Some candidates moved into external opposition, invasions, wars and foreign policy at the expense of domestic opposition, although this was credited. All the better responses had a sense of the difference in the scale of 'dealing with opposition' before and after 1917. Some looked productively at types of opposition, which led them, properly, to look at the Civil War. The best answers considered the scale of opposition as a good criterion for judging effectiveness. Similarly to Question 11, some weaker responses adopted a "leader by leader" approach rather than a thematic comparison of Alexander III against his counterparts and this prevented or made synthesis very difficult. Stronger responses identified features of opposition early on and compared leaders directly throughout each theme. Similarly to Question 10, the latter half of the period, which dealt with Khrushchev, was often glossed over or even ignored.

- 13 This question challenged candidates to adapt their knowledge and not simply reproduce material on various civil rights leaders. In most cases, therefore, the question elicited a thematic approach with discussion of the role of the government – presidents and judiciary especially – and popular anti-civil rights movements, most notably the KKK. Some stronger responses also distinguished between *de jure* rights and the *de facto* situation. Regional factors were underplayed in some answers, although some did discuss the similarity and difference between the north and south. A number of candidates wrote about 'help and hinder' and so rather missed the focus of the question, suggesting that they were trying to apply a previous essay to the actual question set. There were a significant number who did deal with opposition, but rather too briefly, before moving on to extended assessments of how civil rights were gained and causes were furthered. Where opposition was dealt with, often there was little about the KKK and other white supremacist groups, the focus being much more on Presidents, Congress and the Supreme Court. There was a tendency to follow chronological lines in many (of the weaker) answers. Some stronger answers pointed up how far by 1992 there were still features of opposition and certainly discrimination. Stronger responses weighed up both arguments and made detailed comparisons between different features of opposition. The latter part of this period was generally treated less well (post-1965).
- 14 The best answers highlighted union and workers' rights separately and evaluated the impact of various turning points on both of these. Synthesis was shown in the best answers by linking the fluctuations in the wider economy with the developments in workers' rights and union rights. The best answers also highlighted the impact of developments on different groups in society pointing out the varying degrees of inclusion of African Americans and ethnic minority workers and women at different times. However, often candidates described features of the 1890s and did not seek evaluative comparison with other periods, events, actions. There was knowledge but not enough analysis and evaluation. Where there was comparison, the 1890s were contrasted with the New Deal era and the 1960s. Again, often much time was spent on the PATCO events of 1981. Those who tried a more thematic approach gained reward because this had some merit by way of comparison and contrast though judgements were often rather weak because there

was not the sharpness of technique to ensure their prominence. The better answers had adopted a thematic approach rather than comparing turning points in a discrete fashion. Some answers were a little hampered by ignorance of the 1890s; others, plausibly, saw the 1890s as of marginal significance and not really fitting the phrase ‘turning point’. As above, alternative turning points that emerged were: the 1877 railroad strike, the ‘red scare’ 1919-21, the New Deal, especially the Wagner Act, the ‘Great Society’ period of the 1960s, and the PATCO dispute in 1981. Here, weaker responses took a list approach and dealt with events as stand-alone turning points with bolt on synthesis and link to the named factor. Some candidates did adopt the chronological approach, and it was this question where this was the most evident, often focussing on too narrow a selection of turning points, normally 1890s, New Deal and Air Traffic Controllers. There was lots of knowledge deployed but this made for highly narrative, descriptive answers.

- 15 Some candidates found this question hard to address. There was a focus on women’s campaign for civil rights rather than gender equality. The best answers defined gender equality and unity and highlighted where this overlapped with the civil rights movement but many got side-tracked and didn’t really use this as an opportunity to show synthesis. Some candidates interpreted the question as whether it was unity in the women’s movement which led women to gain rights, rather than focussing on what the question asks i.e. how united were women in their support of gender equality? A thematic approach yielded the most analytical responses with candidates considering suffrage, reproductive rights and work place rights. Chronological approaches tended to lead to more narrative responses. Some candidates did not focus on the specific details of this question, and appeared to have answered past recent questions. Quite often coverage was limited to the twentieth century and to certain phases (1920s, 1960s and 1970s above all). There was some tendency to description. Divisions were set against unity factors: contextual; leadership; socio-economic; attitudes, including from federal authorities as well as employers; the effects of the World Wars; prohibition; the vote; employment; abortion and property rights; feminism. There were some strong answers but, as ever, many candidates did not give much of a balanced coverage of the period, often the bulk of discussion focusing on the 1960-80 period with some referencing to the 1920s and 1930s, occasionally the late nineteenth century. Stronger responses identified different strands of gender equality and compared the different groups of women with regards to their aims, methods and how this affected unity. Most argued that women were much divided in support of the issue and lots of knowledge was deployed to support arguments. Weaker responses were very general in the knowledge deployed and lacked specifics. In all, most answers focused on the twentieth century, with only few referencing the earlier part of the period. The best answers spotted the ambiguities in ‘gender equality’.
- 16 There were very few answers to this question, but when it was attempted, only a small number of candidates defined ‘mass media’. Essays were often dominated by reference to a few key events, such as the Zinoviev letter, which was then described in great detail. Those that did define ‘mass media’ generally produced better answers, but most candidates struggled to cover the whole period or adopt a thematic approach, which made synthesis very difficult.
- 17 There were insufficient answers seen to this question to comment.
- 18 This question produced the best answers in this Study topic, but even here thematic approaches were not always present, which again limited synthesis. Stronger answers did make an attempt to differentiate between Liberal, Conservative and Labour governments, but as with Question 16, the focus was sometimes narrow and supporting material often superficial or not well-linked to the actual question set.

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

