

**GCE**

**History A**

Advanced GCE **A2 H506**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H106**

**OCR Report to Centres June 2014**

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.

OCR 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 2014

## CONTENTS

**Advanced GCE History A (H506)**

**Advanced Subsidiary GCE History A (H106)**

### OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

<b>Content</b>	<b>Page</b>
F961/01 British History Period Studies – Medieval and Early Modern	1
F961/02 British History Period Studies	10
F962/01 Medieval and Early Modern	15
F962/02 European and World History Period Studies – Modern	22
F963 and F964 AS History Enquiries	30
F965 Historical Interpretations and Investigations	55
F966/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1066–1715	59
F966/02 Modern 1789–1997	66

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

## General comments

Overall the responses showed that the standard of the question paper was fully in line with previous papers and presented an appropriate test for the candidates. As ever, certain types of questions posed difficulties for some candidates, but other responses proved that the highest levels of response were attainable to every question.

There were virtually no rubric infringements, and the vast majority of scripts contained two essays on which a comparable amount of time had clearly been taken and which were of comparable quality. However, in some instances the length of plans submitted suggested that too much time was spent on the planning and not enough time on the actual writing of the answer. Candidates had clearly, in the vast majority of cases, been well-prepared and worked to put themselves in as strong a position as they could to do themselves justice on the paper: a tribute to both centres and the hard work of the candidates.

## Candidate responses by question:

### 1) ‘Norman influence was the most serious cause of problems during the reign of Edward the Confessor.’ How far do you agree?

This was a popular question and the strongest answers often identified the problems in the opening paragraph before going on to analyse them. Strong responses emerged which both agreed and disagreed with the question. Most candidates distinguished between Norman influence and the strength of the Godwin family and were therefore able to offer reasonable analysis in terms of why Edward failed to deal with his problems. Edward’s own personality was brought in, but it was rare that all three were discussed competently. The strongest answers managed to make good linkages between the Godwins and Norman influence and showed knowledge of Edward’s background and an appreciation of its significance. There was however a significant pattern of limitation in that many essays displayed more knowledge of the Godwin family than of the Normans. While most candidates knew of Edward’s upbringing in Normandy and could also identify Robert of Jumièges as his preferred Archbishop, few knew more than that and it was a small minority who knew more than two Norman names. A large number of candidates framed their answer in terms of Edward against the Godwins – weaker candidates tended to go no further than that. Few candidates ignored the named factor completely, but too often reference to it was not backed up with enough concrete factual evidence.

### 2) ‘Saxon weakness was the main reason for their defeat at the Battle of Hastings.’ How far do you agree?

Answers to this question tended, not surprisingly, to be dominated by accounts of the Battle of Hastings, usually with a good level of accuracy. Where some candidates went astray was in their knowledge of what happened before Hastings, which they used to describe Saxon weakness. Harold did not fight the Vikings at Fulford, Edwin and Morcar did: and there were three weeks between Stamford Bridge and Hastings. Many candidates knew much more about the battles than about what Harold did between them. Some were too eager to blame Saxon weakness for factors beyond their control, such as the wind changing to allow William to cross the Channel. Better candidates compared genuine weaknesses – the nature and structure of the Saxon Army, Harold’s decision not to wait for reinforcements – with the strengths of William’s force to reach a balanced conclusion. Most answers were content-rich, but only the strongest answers offered analysis in terms of ‘how far’. The nature of the question encouraged an analytical approach,

and even weaker candidates were able to incorporate some analysis with regards to the relative importance of Saxon weaknesses in comparison to other factors such as William's strategy and good fortune. Some of the stronger responses adopted a more chronological approach; this made it possible to incorporate more regular evaluation, with students able to show how factors such as Saxon weaknesses, Norman strength and good fortune interconnected at various stages of the battle.

**3) To what extent were castles the most important factor in overcoming opposition to William I's rule?**

This was a reasonably popular question, with some strong answers which compared castles to other factors, including the disjointed nature of opposition to William, his personal ferocity when required, for example the Harrying of the North, and his willingness to use other tactics such as paying off the Danes. Weaker answers tended to confine themselves to descriptions of castle building and the way Saxons were overawed by these huge structures. The very best answers were those that integrated the role and limitations of castles with the opposition and used local examples to illustrate their argument. Less successful answers did not really discuss the named factor and talked generally about opposition to William, although sometimes this was limited to the Harrying of the North and not much else. Some candidates included swift military action and use of effective regents, but few considered the weaknesses of the Anglo-Saxons. Most candidates were fairly secure in outline on the role played by castles, but a disappointing proportion, probably a majority, struggled to name individual castles or support explanation of their role with specific examples. The pattern of weakness seen in Question 1 was therefore repeated, as candidates with insufficient specific knowledge of the named factor attempted to compensate with more general knowledge, often good, of other factors.

**4) 'The power of the nobility was the most important reason why there was civil war between the Lancastrians and Yorkists.' How far do you agree?**

This was a popular question and was generally answered well. Because it was not tied to specific dates there were a number of approaches: a few candidates covered the whole period, some very thoughtfully, commenting on the effects of the later stages of the wars in France, contrasting the power and weakness of kings and nobles from Henry VI to Henry VII; many candidates looked at the period from 1450 to the return of Edward IV in 1471, taking Warwick's death at Barnet as the end of the over-mighty noble; a very large number of candidates looked only at the 1450s, some with great success. A full chronological coverage was not deemed necessary, but it was expected that candidates covered a reasonable time-span. The better answers combined a good balance between factors and gave good synoptic links between the two which then provided them with a strong argument. Stronger candidates were able to bring in regular analysis regarding the importance of a powerful nobility in comparison to an under-mighty monarchy, with most concluding that a powerful nobility stemmed from failings from the king. The weaker answers listed each noble and how he/or she thought about the war, with little analysis against other factors such as minority, strong spouses or mental health. Some weaker responses were limited to simple narratives based on the disruptive ambition of Richard of York, with little mention of the king's weaknesses or the influence of Somerset. Several candidates thought that Margaret of Anjou was a noble, rather than royalty. Only the stronger answers could name individual nobles beyond York, Somerset and Warwick, and remarkably few candidates showed a detailed knowledge of either individual nobles to use as examples or the wider problems faced by nobles – though it was good to see occasional highly pertinent use of the experiences of the Pastons. It was disappointing to read a minority of responses which were excessively partisan in approach.

**5) Richard III's reign was short lived because he was ineffective as king.' How far do you agree?**

Most candidates, even the weaker ones, took the opportunity of the limited scope of the question to provide a basic argument by looking at the reign chronologically and then saying whether he was effective or not. The better answers took a more holistic view and looked at the contextual nature of the reign and integrated their opinion more maturely rather than just a simple assertion at the end of each paragraph 'so he was effective'. Most of the candidates were in agreement with the hypothesis offered: only a few tried to present Richard as an effective monarch, although several did acknowledge that he had performed well as Edward's right-hand man in the north. Almost all assumed that he killed the Princes in the Tower and that everyone hated him for that and thus he was ineffective: better answers sought to show how, irrespective of whether he was in fact guilty, suspicion undermined the loyalty of the nobility and gentry, rendering Richard less effective than he might otherwise have been. In that context some useful comments were made about the circumstances of and rumours surrounding the death of Richard's wife and son. Many candidates mentioned his northern nobles taking southern positions, though very few knew any names to support that. Accounts of Bosworth were generally accurate: the better candidates observed that the role of the Stanleys and of Northumberland was crucial and that if Richard had won he might well have gone on to be a very effective king.

The best responses tended to think in more detail about the better aspects of the reign, and that its brevity was the issue, not the king himself, as this line of argument tended to bring in a greater depth of analysis on more specific evidence. The stronger answers were also better-focused on effectiveness as opposed more generally to success. One successful approach was to stress his effectiveness, using specific examples of policies which were begun which showed him as a king with many positive ideas and the ability to implement them, had the reign not been cut short at Bosworth. Bosworth itself was usually mentioned, and sometimes well, but there were too many simplistic judgements that his decision to charge was evidence of ineffectiveness. In view of our limited knowledge of what happened at Bosworth, the real chance that his attack would have killed Henry and the difference that would have made, this was disappointing.

**6) 'The need to secure his throne dominated the foreign policy of Henry VII.' How far do you agree?**

This was a popular question and generally well done, although the phrase 'need to secure the throne' baffled a few candidates. Most answers were well-focused and candidates were generally aware that securing the throne involved marriage alliances, treaties which deprived pretenders of foreign support and recognised the legitimacy of the Tudor regime. Some good answers wove in financial security from trade and the French pension as well. The best answers balanced the aims of security against those of establishing his reputation and used his dynastic ambitions to bring everything together. Stronger candidates generally agreed with the question, and when looking at alternative foreign policy motives (eg trade/economics, etc) were able to link this back to a desire to secure the throne. Other strong responses split the period up into distinct time periods, explaining how motives changed as the period progressed, and as the Tudor dynasty became more/less established. Some responses struggled with the 'How far' part of the question and dealt solely with Henry's need for security and how it permeated his foreign policy. However, many candidates did include other factors such as his desire to avoid war and to make successful marriage alliances. Weaker responses often simply recounted the exploits of Simnel and Warbeck or lost their focus on the question and just listed foreign policy successes and failures. The traditional errors of weaker candidates were seen: confusing Brittany and Burgundy; not knowing who Simnel and Warbeck actually claimed to be; thinking Ireland was foreign; and thinking that Henry was king of Britain, not king of England. Others spent considerable amounts of time exploring domestic policies aimed at securing the throne, ensuring they were not always focused on the question set.

**7) 'Wolsey's lack of noble support was the most important reason for his fall from power' How far do you agree?**

The key to this question was the phrase 'lack of noble support' and most essays demonstrated a real effort to address the named factor. Most responses dealt with a full range of factors including the divorce, the lack of noble support, foreign policy and the failure of the Amicable Grant. The 'How far' aspect of the question was recognised and engaged. It was pleasing that while the majority of responses took the line that Wolsey survived or fell according to the king's pleasure, most also explored longer-term weaknesses in his position, comparing them to the importance of the issue of the divorce. Better candidates were therefore in a position to weigh up the relative importance of the divorce, foreign policy failures, the humiliation of the Amicable Grant, the hostility of the Boleyn faction and the wider hostility of nobles to Wolsey's treatment of them and, in that context, his background. Many candidates wrote in general terms about Wolsey's humble background and about his 'anti-nobility campaign' in the courts and over enclosure. Some mentioned the Eltham Ordinances: thus revenge was commonly seen as a reason for Wolsey's dismissal. Several candidates mentioned the Boleyn faction but few knew that this group included the Duke of Norfolk because Anne was his niece. Some made good use of the link between the king's loss of confidence in Wolsey and the opportunity for noble enemies to attack him to the king.

Most solid answers followed a formulaic approach, looking at the nobles, looking at Wolsey's unpopularity and then the impact of Henry autocratic approach to policy, and coming to the conclusion that the nobles were not the most important reason and it was either Henry, or a combination of Henry, Anne Boleyn faction and the Amicable Grant that led to his downfall. It was surprising how many candidates attempted an answer without reference to the divorce at all! The role of the king could have been developed slightly more in most answers, and some weaker answers, in agreeing with the question were very imbalanced, and ignored Henry completely.

**8) 'Thomas Cromwell's reforms in the 1530s were limited in their impact.' How far do you agree?**

An impressive number of candidates brought in the historiographical aspect of the answer, to a question on which there are some very clear arguments between historians. However, it must be stressed that historiography is not required for AS and that a top mark was attainable without it in this question as in any other. Indeed the use of historiography is only as good as any other argument. There were patterns of shortcoming. Many candidates knew the theories of Elton and knew that they had been 'proved wrong' by Haigh, Guy, Starkey and so on. More than one answer put forward the view that in effect 'Elton said this and then Starkey said that, Starkey is therefore right.' Moreover, description of a line is still only description. Some candidates assumed that showing awareness of the existence of two views equalled evaluation.

In terms of content, the question was generally answered well. Candidates tended to make reference to Cromwell's reform in Wales, as well as his work with regards to the dissolution of the monasteries. Stronger candidates often looked at the Privy Council in depth, assessing the significance and impact of Cromwell's reforms in comparison to those of Wolsey. Better answers dealt intelligently with the word impact: scope, durability, sheer importance to the king, and with Parliament, Privy Council, law, finance, religion, Wales and Calais. A few responses struggled to define 'impact' and confused the term with success. Weaker answers tended to be very narrative and to struggle in terms of expressing and supporting a view of their own.

### **9) Assess why there was so much unrest in the reigns of Edward VI and Mary I.**

Answers to this question were unequally divided between those from candidates who wrote about religion and those who did not. More candidates did, not that it made much difference to the quality of the answer. The difference lay in how well candidates attempted to assess rather than describe the reasons for unrest and, sadly, too many answers were descriptive. This is a type of question which many candidates find hard. They can describe why, but struggle to assess why: to compare the reasons and rank them. Nonetheless, there were some very strong answers which followed themes through the reigns – religion being a good example, but also uncertainty about the succession, economic problems due to foreign policy or debasement, or sometimes both – and sought to make comparative judgements about those themes. Stronger candidates were able to link these factors specifically to unrest and rebellion, such as the Western Revolt, Kett's Revolt, Wyatt's Rebellion, the Devise and the anti-enclosure riots of 1549, and were able to explore the difference between underlying factors and triggers, as well as identifying consistent causes. This allowed them to keep within the bounds of analysis rather than stray into narrative, which was what was seen in the majority of answers, where a chronological approach was taken and as a result the analysis was uneven or non-existent. Most candidates did give a range of reasons for unrest - political, economic and religious. A significant proportion of responses were dominated by the period of Somerset and were particularly thin on Mary. Some candidates even gave the impression of having so much to describe in Edward's reign that they ran out of time, but there was a limit to the extent that such knowledge, unless used evaluatively, could be rewarded.

### **10) How protestant was England at the death of Edward VI?**

There were some excellent answers which provided good evidence and applied excellent analytical skills to attempting to answer the question. The best candidates used the context of what came before and after, as well as the difference between 'top down' and 'bottom up' reform. In doing so they considered the difference between official religion - as set out in the two versions of the Book of Common Prayer, the 42 Articles and the simplification of clerical dress and church decoration – and what people actually believed and practised Sunday by Sunday. Good use was made by some of the link between the destruction of the Chantries and rejection of the beliefs they embodied. Many made the point that images and other signs of Catholicism made a rapid return in 1553 and so cast doubt on the success of Protestantism. The Western Rebellion was identified by many as proof of opposition to Protestant reforms, although this was weighed against Kett's rebels who wanted to quicken the pace of Protestant change. Stronger responses made reference to the reign of Mary I in order to support their argument that many of Edward's changes were simply "cosmetic", with Mary's relative ease in re-establishing Catholicism deemed as proof that England was not particularly Protestant by the end of Edward's reign (an argument which could be used the other way round in 1558-9). The answers which focused on the success of Protestantism tended to be less well-handled. The approach proved problematic for some: either they used it as a vehicle for a chronological survey of Somerset and Northumberland's religious policies and struggled to focus on the situation in 1553, or they found it difficult to move beyond the situation as regards official policy and doctrine to the attitudes of the ordinary population.



### **11) How much opposition was there to the religious changes of Mary Tudor and Cardinal Pole?**

This question was not as popular as the alternatives, and was generally not answered as well. There were however some strong responses, producing interesting discussions about the executions of Protestant martyrs and also about the number who went into exile rather than accept the changes made by Mary and Pole. Only the strongest answers were aware of the specific contributions of Queen and Archbishop. Most candidates commented on the speed with which Catholicism was restored after Edward's death as a sign that things would be easy for Mary. Most candidates who wrote about Wyatt's Rebellion followed the line that it was anti-Spanish rather than anti-Catholic: only a few recognised that it might possibly be both, and it was therefore not handled effectively by most candidates. Beyond Mary's burning of 300 Protestants, weaker candidates struggled to identify precise examples of support for or opposition to Mary's religious changes. Mary's failure to restore the monasteries was interpreted by some as a success, as it reduced the potential for opposition from those who had benefited from the dissolution. Weaker arguments tended to be simplistic in dealing with the burning of Protestants, and based their arguments around these to suggest that there was a great deal of opposition without analysing any evidence that there was if not support then at least acceptance of the regime. A regular error was to suppose that Foxe's "Acts and Monuments" was produced in Mary's reign but successfully suppressed until Elizabeth's, this suppression being used as evidence of Mary's wider success against opposition. There were some very one-sided answers which went to the other extreme, with Mary and Pole encountering no opposition at all and with the Oxford Martyrs being executed for reasons other than religion.

### **12) How far did Puritanism change from 1558 to 1589?**

This was significantly the least-commonly attempted question in this section. The stronger answers considered not only the changes in the different Puritan groups but also in the political circumstances in which they were trying to operate. Archbishop Grindal featured less often than might have been anticipated, but those who used him as an example did so intelligently. The more moderate answers listed all the protestant reforms and policy throughout Elizabeth's reign, the better answers looked at them from a puritan-based view and considered how their influence increased or receded depending on the context of the time and related that to foreign policy and factions within court. Many weaker answers simply described three different kinds of Puritans and how Elizabeth resisted them. Relatively few took the wording of the question into account by discussing how far Puritanism changed. Answers often polarised between strong and weak due to the level of factual detail used in support.

### **13) How serious a challenge was factional unrest to Elizabeth I's government?**

There were some excellent answers to this question. The vast majority of responses fully engaged with the question and dealt with how serious a problem factional unrest was at various points in the reign. Better answers recognised that the political context was different at different stages in the reign, so that faction in the 1560s and 1570s was a different matter from faction in the late 1590s. The aims and methods of Robert Dudley and William Cecil and their relationship to Elizabeth were different from those of Essex, Robert Cecil and the ageing Queen. The strong responses developed the implications of the distinction between the beginning and end of her reign and also highlighted how even if there was factional unrest, Elizabeth was rarely challenged by it and mostly used it and exploited it to strengthen her position. Weaker answers simply had either Elizabeth controlling her ministers all the time or them manipulating her. Candidates were generally not only familiar with the main factional divisions within the period but also identified issues that brought about factional division, for example the 'case studies' of the marriage issue and problems in Ireland, how to deal with Mary Queen of Scots, and whether or not to intervene in the Netherlands. Generally candidates concluded that factional unrest was not a major challenge, as Elizabeth was able to skilfully play off rival factions against each other in order to promote loyalty to herself.

**14) 'Elizabeth I dealt successfully with the issue of marriage and succession' How far do you agree?**

This was a popular question. The best answers commented intelligently on the importance of marriage, with its diplomatic connotations, and the importance of the succession with its dynastic implications. It was clear they had good content knowledge of the subject. However, this led to many formulaic essays, listing potential suitors and then analysing how she dealt with each one, with a failure to come to an overall judgement which limited the response to a level 3 reward for AO1b. Succession was not dealt with as well as marriage in this type of essay. Stronger candidates were able to explain how the issue was more complex, and were able to weigh up the benefits of Elizabeth's failure to marry (in terms of international diplomacy) with the drawbacks. When addressing succession, the multitude of plots against Elizabeth were seen by many as proof of her lack of success, although this was weighed up against the relatively smooth succession of James (although some candidates gave credit to Cecil rather than Elizabeth). A significant number of candidates were confused about whether Elizabeth named her successor with many saying she had dealt with it well when she named James VI of Scotland. She never named her successor openly, even though she may have been aware of Cecil's negotiations. The importance of Royal prerogative and the cult of the Virgin Queen, whilst almost universally mentioned, were only rarely fully analysed and used to answer the question. There were several patterns of weakness. One was imbalance between the two issues. Some responses had nothing to say about marriage, and after a few general remarks passed to the succession. Of these, a proportion dealt mainly with the Mary Queen of Scots issue. Some thought the only factor to consider in relation to the succession was the possibility of children. Some of these weak responses told the story of Elizabeth's potential husbands one by one. Others, and there were too many of these, could barely name a suitor, and either generalised or tried to build an entire argument round the implications of marriage to Philip II or Robert Dudley. There was also an inability to evaluate the degree to which she was successful. Some saw her as either completely or not at all successful. Other candidates wrote successive paragraphs explaining, or asserting, that she was one and then the other, without reconciling the contradiction.

**15) How serious were the financial problems that Elizabeth faced?**

There were some very good answers where students really engaged with the key phrase "how serious". They displayed an excellent understanding of how the financial problems differed in their severity depending on the context of the time they arose and also how every financial problem was linked to the issue of inflation. Candidates were generally well versed on the financial problems that Elizabeth faced, and thus had the pre-requisite knowledge required to assess the severity of these. Candidates often referred to the large debt that Elizabeth inherited, as well as the severe rate of inflation later in the period, culminating in the Oxfordshire rebellion. The failings of the taxation system and Elizabeth's reliance on unpopular monopolies were used by many candidates as proof of the severity of the problems that she faced. Better candidates knew that Northumberland and Mary had worked to remedy the debasement carried out by Henry VIII, although weaker answers still cited it as a cause of problems for Elizabeth and appeared not to know about the re-coinage of the early 1560s. Stronger answers considered the consequences of selling off crown lands; weaker answers simply said it had happened. Not every candidate recognised that there were political implications in Elizabeth's financial problems. The vast majority of responses dealt with a full range of financial problems and the full scope of the reign. A few misunderstood the scope of the question and brought in marriage and succession and religious policy to contrast with finance.

**16) To what extent was James I successful in handling religious divisions in England?**

This was quite a popular question with some strong answers which considered James' attitude to the Puritans, the Arminians and the Catholics as well as his support for the mainstream Church of England. Better answers dealt with the Millenary Petition, the Hampton Court Conference and the Gunpowder Plot and then moved on, but some weak answers got no further than 1605. The Hampton Court Conference and Bancroft's Canons were generally seen as limited successes, as too was the Gunpowder Plot (as it involved a small minority, with prominent Catholics dissociating themselves). Most responses dealt with the full span of the reign and with a range of religious groups. Some were structured group by group, but most chronologically. Better candidates recognised that the religious issues in the last third of the reign were different due to the rise of Arminianism, although few could say much about it beyond that it looked and smelled Catholic and that it supported the monarchy, and the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War, which made James' wish for the Spanish Match so offensive to many of his subjects. Many candidates spoke in depth about James' foreign policy towards the end of his reign, and able candidates were able to analyse the effect this had on the handling of religious divisions within England. The best answers went even further in assessing the short term and long term impact of James' actions: whilst he may have been successful and brought about stability in his reign, his policies, and particularly his support for the Arminians, stored up future issues for his son.

**17) Assess the reasons why James I's financial difficulties were not resolved.**

This was well answered on the whole and most essays were informative and engaging, reflecting the students' obvious fascination with the exorbitant spending and behaviour of James I. There was good linkage between his views of Kingship and the increasing role and criticism of Parliament, many candidates hinting that this was to cause more problems in the future financial crises faced by Charles I. Candidates were aware of the problems that James inherited from Elizabeth, but most followed a similar line in blaming Parliament's refusal to him sufficient funds, drawing particular attention to the failure of the Great Contract in 1610. Stronger candidates went further in their analysis, and inevitably linked this back to James' own failings and financial profligacy, explaining how this was the root cause of his failure to resolve his financial difficulties. Most responses fully engaged with the question and gave a range of reasons for financial problems not being resolved, above and beyond James' extravagance. They tended to show good linkage and judgements about relative importance. However, some came down too simplistically on one side or the other, seeing James as an extravagant fool or Parliament as obstructive and the financial system hopelessly outdated. A key passage in many essays concerned the handling of the Great Contract, in that it showed the extent of candidates' understanding of the nature of the problems. Few developed the reasons, and perhaps mitigating factors, for James' extravagance. Another pattern of limitation was to analyse a series of reasons individually but to fail to develop this evaluation to make a judgment between them.

**18) The events of 1640-42 were the main reason for the outbreak of Civil War in 1642.' How far do you agree?**

Answers to this question were generally strong, perhaps because the wording of the question demanded some concentration on the last two years before the War of the Three Kingdoms broke out: in the past questions on the causes of the war have often sent weak candidates back to 1629, or even 1625. There were very few such answers this time. Naturally some coverage of the Personal Rule to clarify the issues being disputed between 1640 and 1642 is important, but knowing about the impeachment of Strafford and Laud, the Triennial Act, the Grand Remonstrance and the 5 Members Coup is also essential.

As expected with a question of this type, selection of relevant evidence was the main problem, and many candidates who obviously had spent many hours learning the complexities of this period of history struggled to achieve a good balance in their essays: whilst there were many instances of excellent analysis of individual events, putting them together in order to provide a comparative analysis proved too difficult for many candidates. Candidates generally agreed with the question, explaining that the prerequisites for civil war were not present until 1640-2. Most candidates spoke at length about Pym, and the extent to which his actions brought about civil war. Whilst more able candidates were able to link this to the question and use it to argue about the relative importance of the period 1640-42 in comparison to earlier, weaker candidates tended to drift into descriptive, albeit fairly well informed, narrative or list of factors.

## F961/02 British History Period Studies

1. This was a popular question within this section and produced a wide range of responses. There were some very good responses that recognised that it was necessary to address the strengths and weaknesses of the radical movement as well as Pitt's methods of dealing with them. Successful candidates realised that there were two elements to the question that needed to be addressed. Firstly the focus should have been on 'radical threats' which meant that it should be on the evidence of the 1790's and then on evaluating 'how serious' the threats were. It was encouraging to see that there was less evidence of candidates getting muddled between Pitt's and Lord Liverpool's governments, although there were still some who wrote about the Luddites and Peterloo. However, detailed knowledge of the radical challenges was often lacking and many candidates relied on sweeping generalisations.
2. This was the least popular question of this Study Topic. There were a number of candidates who provided a balanced comparison between the two periods and had a clear understanding of the meaning of 'liberal'. However, there were a significant number of candidates who would have benefitted if they had made an attempt to define 'liberal' and then used it as a basis for their analysis. Moreover, some candidates did not provide a balanced comparison at all but instead focused their evidence on the latter period, 1822-30. Knowledge was often generalised and there were few candidates who were aware of some of the more 'liberal' elements of the earlier period. The stronger answers adopted a thematic, comparative based analysis considering issues such as the economy, finance, law and order, religion and politics. At the lower end candidates often ignored the last two features, which was a pity as they provided an interesting perspective on the question.
3. This was the other popular question in this section. There were some very good responses that provided an answer focused on the issues of 'party leader' and used evidence from both the 1830's and 1840's. However, there were many candidates who either veered away from Peel as a party leader, or wrote more generally about his achievements, particularly when he was Prime Minister 1841-46. These answers focused largely on his social and economic reforms or solely on Ireland and made little attempt to link the knowledge demonstrated to the actual demands of the question. Some candidates used their introduction to explain what might constitute a good party leader and then used this as the basis of their answer. Others, having made this promising start, then failed to maintain a line of argument to support this approach and drifted back to describing the reforms. There was some confusion shown about the outcome of the 1841 election and how far it supported the view that Peel was effective.
4. This question was popular within this Study Topic and there were some good answers. Some candidates showed a detailed knowledge of Gladstone's legislation and were able to assess his achievements in relation to the question. However, some weaker candidates focused their analysis on success and failure rather than on 'how limited'. Stronger answers considered a good range of his reforms, whilst weaker candidates sometimes confined their answers to a narrow range which limited the overall judgement that could be reached. There were also a number of weaker responses where candidates described the legislation and then bolted on some limited analytical comments, usually with the preface 'so it can be seen that...'

5. There were some good answers to this question which demonstrated a sound knowledge and understanding. Stronger answers compared Disraeli's qualities with other factors and then provided an evaluation of which factor was the most important. However, some answers tended to provide generalisations about Disraeli's qualities without providing detailed examples; for example, candidates used Disraeli's opportunism to demonstrate his qualities but failed to provide any specific evidence of this opportunism, such as the 1867 Reform Act, as evidence. Many argued that it was the absence of alternatives that allowed Disraeli to emerge as leader and argued that the length of time that it took for him to emerge as leader was evidence of the Conservatives reluctance to appoint him as such. There were also some answers that used evidence from outside the period, such as the purchase of the Suez Canal shares - candidates need to read the question carefully as there were a number of responses that used evidence from the period after 1868, particularly Disraeli's achievements from his 2nd Ministry 1874-80.
6. This was the least popular question in this Study Topic. The question required candidates to focus on the reasons for the domestic reforms of his second ministry and weigh up the importance of improving the 'condition of the people' against other factors. Weaker candidates struggled with the concept of 'improving the condition of the people', although it is a very common concept and one with which they should be familiar. Many answers weighed this up against issues such as pragmatism and Disraeli's desire to outdo the Liberals' reforms. Some argued that it was not Disraeli who was responsible for the reforms and that credit should be given to the Home Secretary, Cross. There were also some responses which simply described the reforms and provided either bolt-on analysis or made little attempt to link candidates' knowledge to the actual question and thus limited their answers to a maximum of Level IV for AO1b.
7. This was a popular question and there were some very good answers, in which candidates weighed up the relative importance of the principles of foreign and imperial policies across the whole period. Most candidates began their answers analysing the given principle 'Fear of Russia' and then analysed other principles, mainly focusing on trade, balance of power and, in some instances, fear of Germany. The latter issues allowed candidates to argue that fear of Russia may have dominated the earlier period, but changed to fear of Germany as the period progressed. The key for success in this question was to provide evaluation of the relative importance of the principles. Unfortunately, this is where some candidates who had good knowledge of the events failed to capitalise. Some candidates did not provide evidence or analysis across the whole period and this limits the conclusions and judgements that can be made. As in previous years, candidates seem to be very knowledgeable up to 1880, particularly of issues such as Russia and the Eastern Question, but less so after 1880.
8. This was a popular question and a significant number of candidates made a reasonable attempt to address it by looking at the evidence of support in issues such as politics, education and culture with some encouraging evidence. However, although many candidates knew a great deal, they were often unable to maintain a consistent focus on the question, and analysis was often limited to a brief comment at the end of a paragraph or the argument was only implied. Many candidates did not demonstrate a clear grasp of the importance of the words 'consistently popular' and, therefore, provided a general survey of the period 1880-1902 and did not fully analyse the period. Nonetheless, most candidates recognised that the Second Boer War 1899-1902 was a turning point in this question and provided some good analysis to show that it was not consistently popular. At the same time, some candidates made the Boer War the focus of their answer and, therefore, were unable to provide assessment for the whole period. There were also a number of answers that were little more than lists of evidence for and against popularity, with the same evidence used in both parts and no judgement as to whether an event, such as the celebrations at the relief of Mafeking, should be seen as evidence of 'consistently popular' or not.

9. This question caused the most difficulty for candidates in this Study Topic. Many, including those who scored highly on their other response, misunderstood this question. The focus of the question was 'popular support' but instead many candidates answered the question 'Why did Britain go to war?', with the result that they wrote about issues such as the balance of power, or even events after the declaration of war. Some candidates did try to link the causes to why it was so well-supported but on the whole many responses were not effective and had only minimal links to the direct wording of the question. Answers which simply focused on why Britain went to war were limited to the lower mark bands. A number of respondents appeared to realise that they were not really focusing on the precise demands of the question and tried to rectify this in a weak last sentence of a paragraph or a conclusion which attempted to give the impression that the question had been answered. The influence and role of the media in promoting patriotic feeling was ignored by many candidates. However, there were some strong answers which were able to focus on 'so much support' and use issues such as morality and the invasion of Belgium as well as the growing anti-German feeling promoted in publications such as the Battle of Dorking.
10. This question was quite popular but, overall, not very well answered by many candidates. Most candidates were able to identify some factors but many focused on 'other' factors and demonstrated only very general knowledge, if any, of the development and reasons within the Labour Party itself. The weakest answers saw it as an opportunity to write all they knew about the failings of the Lloyd George coalition and assert that these caused Labour to grow. Many responses focused on a relatively small number of issues and those who discussed the Liberal split and subsequent decline were often very general in their knowledge and seemed to assume that all Liberal voters would now vote Labour. There were a significant number of responses which focused on Labour's first government in 1924 and many candidates wrote about its achievements, which led to irrelevance in relation to the question. Those who wrote about the extension of the franchise in 1918 also seemed to assume that the women who were given the vote would vote Labour.
11. This was a popular question and there were some good answers which looked at a range of factors, such as Trade Unions, workers, the attitude and actions of the government, mine owners and economic factors. Stronger answers provided links between the factors and evaluated their relative importance. However, there was also a lot of description in weaker answers, going through the events leading to the Strike and providing only occasional analysis. Other answers failed to include sufficient evaluation of the importance of the various factors and simply asserted that X was the most important and, therefore, could not go above Level III. Stronger answers often placed the General Strike in the context of a general worsening of economic conditions. However, some candidates did not appreciate that the question finished at the point that the General Strike started and, therefore, wasted their time discussing the events and aftermath of the Strike.
12. In this Study topic this was the least popular question. Although there were some well explained responses to what was a straightforward question, it was not well answered by many candidates, often because they did not know enough about Attlee. Discussion of the role of Attlee tended to be in general terms and was usually subsumed in a wider discussion of the Labour party and its support for the Beveridge Report. This then led some candidates into a lengthy discussion of the Report. Some candidates over-emphasised the influence of the situation in the 1930s and the role of the war and then provided relatively detailed evidence for the circumstances in 1945. There were candidates who provided imbalance in their answers by almost ignoring Attlee's role and concentrating on the weaknesses of Churchill's campaign. Where Attlee was ignored, answers could not go beyond Level IV for AO1b. Many responses focused heavily on the weakness of the Conservative party, whether linking it back to the 1930s, the perception of Churchill as a war-time leader or his comments about Labour and their similarities to the Gestapo. There were some candidates who, wrongly, went on to use the evidence of the Labour government 1945-51 as supporting evidence as to why Labour won the election.

13. There were some strong answers to this question that revolved round discussion of economic problems compared with those of a political, social and cultural nature. The strongest responses were able to make judgements about relative importance of the factors discussed. However, often the detail provided by candidates of the UK's precise economic problems were mere generalisations in contrast with the evidence for other factors, particularly on nationalism. In the weaker answers there was a tendency to narrate rather than analyse, with some simply telling the story of the Suez crisis. As with many history examination questions candidates should think carefully about the time span of the question and provide evidence across the whole period. This question had no dates attached to it and, therefore, it should have been assumed that it concerned the whole period of the Study Topic, namely 1945-90. There were some candidates who did not go beyond 1970 and there were a significant number who only provided evidence for the period 1945-56. Knowledge of nationalist movements and the views of the USA was often stronger than of economic weaknesses and this resulted in imbalance in some answers, with the named factor being dismissed in a few sentences before candidates concluded that it was nonetheless the most important.
14. This was the least popular question in this Study Topic and there were a significant number of weak answers. Many candidates did not focus their analysis on the issue (that 'Britain's attitude to Europe changed') but rather provided background evidence from the 1940s and 1950s to explain what Britain's attitude was by 1960. Some responses proceeded to use the same information used in the previous question, but did not tailor it to the demands of this question. There were also some candidates who discussed the role of De Gaulle but did not link his attitude to the actual question set. Many candidates provided relatively little detailed evidence from the 1960s and, therefore, could not provide supported analysis for the question. The stronger answers often focused on the economic position of Britain as the main reason, often linking that to the decline of the Empire, but some did suggest that British attitudes to Europe had not changed completely and that there had been involvement in some developments since the Second World War. There was also some discussion of the attitudes of the two main parties towards Europe and the changing nature of the Conservative party in the 1960s which meant that it had become more business orientated.
15. This was a popular question in this Study Topic. The most successful answers were those of candidates that attempted to establish what constituted a 'world leader' and then used their criteria to evaluate the evidence of Thatcher's foreign policy. However, the less successful answers tended to provide analysis of the successes and failures of Thatcher's policy and ignored the issue of whether she was a world leader, which limited their responses to the lower mark bands. The weakest answers simply described the events with some weak analysis or assertion. As in previous examination sessions, some candidates seem unable to place Thatcher's period in office in the context of world events ; some thought she was in power during the Suez crisis and others that Khrushchev was leader of the Soviet Union when she came to power! There was a wide range of issues for candidates to consider and most focused on the ending of the Cold War, the Falkland Islands, and relations with America and Europe.
16. This was the most popular question in this Study Topic and was often well answered. Many candidates provided a balanced assessment of the weaknesses of the Conservatives and the strengths of Labour with better answers making sustained judgements. However, there were some candidates who used the evidence of the 1950s, particularly the Suez crisis, as evidence for this election [and did not show appreciation for the fact that there was an election in 1959 which the Conservatives had won] and did not focus their analysis on events nearer to 1964. The number of candidates who thought that Macmillan was Prime Minister in 1964 was also surprising. Weaker answers often focused heavily on the scandals, which allowed detailed descriptions but led to limited analysis of why it resulted in a Labour victory. There was some awareness of the economic stagnation



and some suggested that this contrasted with Labour and their link to ‘the white heat of technology.’ Stronger answers often contrasted Wilson and Home, but also noted that despite all of Home’s and the Conservatives’ failings, Labour won only a narrow victory.

17. This question was answered reasonably well by many candidates - in the past this topic has seen some very weak and generalised answers and it was pleasing to see the overall improvement in both the analysis and range of material discussed. However, the number of candidates who did not include Northern Ireland in their analysis of Heath’s failures was surprising. Candidates who achieved the highest marks were those who fully appreciated the significance of the word ‘complete’ in their analysis of Heath’s policies. Many candidates simply explained his failures and successes, or provided answers that broadly agreed with the assertion in the question and, therefore, did not analyse any achievements. Where there was some discussion of achievements, it usually centred around Britain joining the EEC, although stronger answers noted that the terms of Britain’s entry were not particularly favourable. Most discussion concerning failure focused on the economy and the relationship with the Unions. However, there was some confusion of events involving the miners in the 1970s and 1980s.
18. This was the least popular question in this Study Topic. Most answers were fairly competent though there was a tendency to focus on the Conservatives and some candidates showed weak knowledge of Labour party history in the 1980s, with little reference to the move to the left, the leadership of Foot and the formation of the SDP. Many candidates also tended to write in general terms about ‘Thatcher’s election victories’ rather than providing specific evidence and analysis related to specific elections in 1979, 1983 and 1987. Those candidates who did refer to elections tended to concentrate on 1979, when Labour weakness and the winter of Discontent featured prominently. In discussing 1983, answers were often dominated by the Falklands war, although this was often balanced against the economic failings. Many answers made only limited reference to 1987 and knowledge of the economic improvement or the defeat of the miners was limited or not clearly explained as a reason for victory. Some candidates successfully argued that Thatcher was able to win elections despite high unemployment and inflation, which suggested that Labour was seen as unfit to govern and this was linked to the ‘longest suicide note in history.’ The key issue in the question concerning whether it was ‘Conservative strength’ or ‘Labour weakness’ was often ignored in any evaluation and judgement.

## **F962/01 Medieval and Early Modern**

### **General Comments**

The responses to the paper showed that it was set at an appropriate level and candidates were in a position to access top grades on all questions. There were hardly any rubric infringements, and most candidates produced two essays of a comparable length and standard. There was a minority of candidates who neglected the common courtesy of writing legibly, and need to be reminded that this is one aspect of clear communication.

Most candidates structured their essays in a way which showed they were aware of the requirements of the task before them. There were a small number of rambling repetitive responses but the straight descriptive essay was very rare, which again is evidence that both centres and candidates know what is needed for success.

### **Specific Question Comments**

#### **1) ‘Pope Urban II’s main aim in calling the First Crusade was to reinforce papal control over the Church.’ How far do you agree?**

Responses to this question varied greatly in approach. The best were excellent, and showed both a good range of knowledge and an ability to compare and evaluate the named factor against others. This was done with equal success by those who agreed with the question and those who chose another factor. There were some excellent responses that demonstrated a clear understanding of the Investiture Crisis and the Great Schism, as well as Urban’s attempts to deal with both before the First Crusade, which thus provided a rich background to the evaluation of the different factors. There were some patterns of difficulty. Many candidates struggled to address the named factor of ‘papal’ control, talking instead about a general union of Christians or positing the possibility of the pope trying to become a head of state in the East. Another tendency was to answer this like a general motivations question. This was equally problematic. Some candidates eschewed an introduction and went straight into the first factor. While this is to some extent a legitimate approach, it did weaker candidates a disservice and meant that it was difficult to discern a planned approach and argument in the answer. Answers to this question also frequently included quotations or descriptive passages about the views of historians. Historiography is not a requirement of this module and while it can enrich evaluation, full marks can be attained without it. Moreover, for weaker candidates it can lead to a tendency to describe ideas rather than to analyse and evaluate factors or points.

#### **2) To what extent was the survival of the Crusader States in the twelfth century due to Western aid?**

This question required the named factor to be evaluated against others. Some excellent responses emerged, and they were equally successful whether agreeing or disagreeing with the question. All the very good answers, however, provided detailed exploration of the different kinds of western aid, even if they rejected it as the principal cause of survival. These answers were also able to explore several other factors, commenting in depth on the relative importance of more than one of, for example: Muslim disunity, Christian leadership, the military orders, and castles. There were several patterns of limitation. Some candidates were thin on specific supporting knowledge and produced very generalised comparisons, usually concluding with an assertion that one or other of the factors was the most important. There were some candidates who did not know enough about the named factor and tried to push past it and write about the factor they did know about, though this was not common, and it seemed generally that this was a question that candidates were expecting – as indeed they should have been. In fact those who tried to turn away were usually reduced to description, and were rarely convincing even on

the analysis of that factor, for example, describing in detail the careers of the rulers of Outremer. Some candidates struggled with “to what extent”, finding it difficult to move beyond description and analysis of individual factors to the links between them and their relative importance. One common failing was to interpret Western aid too narrowly. This often took the form of focusing exclusively on the Crusades, particularly the Third Crusade, and ignoring the support that was given between them.

### **3) Overall the Third Crusade must be judged a success.’ How far do you agree?**

This was clearly a question which candidates were expecting, and which produced some excellent, highly detailed and varied answers that covered a range of reasons and weighed up the overall success of the crusade adeptly. Candidates who agreed with the question were no more or less successful than those who disagreed, the differentiator being the quality of their knowledge and evaluation. The vast majority of the candidates were aware that a key factor in assessing success was the fact that at the end of the Crusade Jerusalem remained in Muslim hands, and assessed it according to their ability. Many of the best answers developed this impressively well, evaluating Richard I’s decision not to take the city in the context of his appreciation of the wider strategic situation – the relative strengths of his and Saladin’s forces, and the overall size of the Christian population which meant that the city might well have been impossible to hold even if it had been taken. For this he was often given great credit. It was perhaps surprising, in this context, that so few candidates commented on his refusal to visit the city as a pilgrim under the terms of the truce, surely evidence that he considered himself to have failed. There were other factors, too, to consider as successes, and most candidates commented on the taking of Cyprus and the ports, which left a much more manageable and defensible area in the hands of the crusaders. Most, too, were aware of the damage done to Saladin’s reputation by Richard’s victories. There were however some patterns of failure. Some candidates listed points on either side and did not make a decision supported by evidence and reasoning. There were, as well, a significant number of candidates who drifted from assessing whether the crusade was or was not a success to assessing why. This led to considerable distraction and tangential evidence, such as exploration of the reasons for the poor relationship between King Richard and King Philip, or the potential contribution of Barbarossa and the significance of his death.

### **4) To what extent did Renaissance artists draw on Classical influences?**

There was a very mixed response to this question. The definition of ‘artists’ caused some difficulties and irrelevant discussion. Candidates were not necessarily expected to confine themselves to painting and sculpture and the artistic aspects of architecture were deemed relevant. However, some candidates included writers and the more technical rather than artistic elements of architecture. There was also at the lower end of the mark bands much confusion about the meaning of ‘classical influences’, where some definitions included Christian art, defining Christian as classical. Other candidates relied on the assertion that paintings could not be influenced by classical influences because Greek or Roman paintings did not still exist at that point. The very best answers compared the impact of classical influences with religious ones and also new innovations, and used a wide range of examples from different Italian city states as well as from the Northern Renaissance. This led at the upper end to some very impressive discussion of the interlocking factors at play in the Renaissance. The great majority of candidates understood what the question required and answered according to their ability. Limitations tended therefore to be those of knowledge and technique. Some answers were thin and generalised. Some found it impossible to move beyond the analysis of influences to an evaluation of their relative importance and a consideration of “to what extent”. Some candidates misread the question and thought they just had to list the classical influences rather than analyse to what extent they were important.

**5) To what extent did the Renaissance develop differently in Florence and Venice?**

Most candidates were able to identify similarities and differences in the development of the Renaissance in Florence and Venice. Most were reasonably confident in terms of the impact of Florence on the Renaissance, and some handled the two cities equally well, but it was rare for a response to be stronger in its treatment of Venice. Examples were often well chosen and detailed. It was heartening to see that some answers handled the explanation of the context to these differences well, and did not merely list paintings and their content alongside a basic explanation of differences. The economic similarities and differences were particularly well handled, and it would be good to see this broader contextual understanding widened in the future. At the lower end of the spectrum of responses candidates had difficulty explaining specific features that made Venice, in particular, similar to or different from Florence - there was a tendency to list the differences between Florence and Venice and ignore the similarities. Some found it hard to develop links between the characteristics of the cities and the characteristics of the renaissance in them, providing lists of each without any successful evaluation and with only weak and assertive attempts at analysis. Some weaker essays considered the two cities in separate sections.

**6) How far did humanist ideas challenge traditional ideas about politics and society?**

This question was completed by very few candidates indeed. There were nonetheless some truly excellent answers that, arguing for either side of the debate, used detailed examples and demonstrated a clear understanding of the social and political context of the Renaissance as well as the nature and content of humanist thought. For a candidate who was confident dealing with the concepts of the Renaissance this was a question which really gave scope to show what they could do. However, it was clear that some other candidates did this question out of desperation rather than choice, and they struggled to contextualise the humanist ideas they were discussing. Such answers were characterised by a list of humanist thinkers appended to broad sweeping assertions about Renaissance society. This question was a challenge unless centres had examined the wider context to the Renaissance, rather than merely concentrating on the art history element of the specification.

**7) To what extent were improvements in navigation the main reason for voyages of discovery?**

There was some very detailed knowledge of navigation and ship technology, as well as good arguments focused on royal patronage and the best essays were successful in evaluating the relative importance of the named factor against others in an answer which enabled candidates to demonstrate a high level of both knowledge and technique. Answers agreeing with and rejecting the question were able to attain equal credit. There was the standard limitation for some candidates who were able to analyse several factors but not effectively evaluate them against each other, and some candidates only discussed either Spain or Portugal, rather than the voyages of discovery as a whole. Others had a very poor grasp of navigational improvements and how they prompted the voyages of discovery. There was some fairly general and irrelevant discussion of weapons technology, but this led to a loss of focus on the question of the reasons for the voyages rather than reasons for success. A number of candidates chose a complicated and broadly unsuccessful tactic of evaluation, counter-evaluation, and sometimes counter-counter-evaluation in each paragraph – this led to confusion and in most cases a lack of convincing argument. Additionally, categorising factors as ‘enabling’, ‘push’ or ‘pull’ factors seems not to have aided all students in constructing well-argued or focused essays.

**8) To what extent was the desire for wealth the main motive for the development of a Spanish empire in the Americas?**

There were many successful responses to this question. Candidates were able to discuss 'wealth' in detail and set it against other factors that motivated the voyages of discovery. Most responses successfully stuck to analysing the development of the Spanish empire in this period and some produced some highly organised and well-argued answers. There were a fair few stock responses that asserted rather than explained and evaluated the factors, and religion, in particular, suffered as a factor for stock or weak analysis. That said, many candidates attempted to assess religious motives against the desire for wealth and attempted to create a tension between the two in a way that was helpful to their answers. There was some effective use of the complaints by clergy about the exploitation of both Native American and black slaves which showed a sensitive appreciation of some of the issues. When answering this question some candidates chose complicated structures involving attempts at the evaluation and counter-evaluation of factors at the end of each paragraph. This was rarely successful and tended to look like equivocation rather than a firm or substantiated judgement. Some candidates were even less convincing, in that mutually contradictory paragraphs were juxtaposed without any attempt to explain or even assert a link between them. Others have clearly been taught a framework of 'push' and 'pull' factors which may well be a useful tool for learning about the factors and the period but did not seem to help their analysis in an examination situation.

**9) How important were individual explorers in the development of the Portuguese Empire?**

Relatively few candidates completed this question. The best answers used case studies of individual explorers to assess this factor against others including (but not exclusively) the impact of patronage, geography and religion. Some essays showed excellence both of knowledge and in evaluation. Most candidates had a good basic knowledge of the achievement of several explorers which they could use as a solid foundation for their essays, whether or not they concluded that they agreed or disagreed with the question. Again, those who were able to go beyond a stock evaluation of the impact of religion tended to be the better candidates. An ability to move beyond description and analysis of individual factors to supported evaluation of their relative importance was a limiting factor for many. A significant minority misinterpreted the question as demanding an evaluation of individual explorers against each other. Whilst a good number of these answers demonstrated detailed knowledge, analysis and understanding, they had not answered the question as set and so their marks were affected. This is further encouragement to candidates to read the question extremely carefully in an examination situation. Another common mis-reading was to see individuals like Henry the Navigator as explorers as opposed to patrons.

**10) 'Military power was the main reason why Isabella was able to consolidate her authority in Castile to 1479.' How far do you agree?**

This was the most popular question in this section and some excellent answers emerged. It was clear to virtually all who attempted it that military factors were significant and that there was a need to weigh them against other factors. The question was answered with equal success by candidates who agreed with the proposition set out and those who disagreed. The principal discriminator between answers, therefore, was the ability of candidates to move from analysis to evaluation and their level of knowledge. Most who disagreed chose Isabella's personal characteristics as their chosen factor. This tended to be a shrewd choice, as firstly they knew a good deal about her, and secondly they found it easy to link her role to the other factors, and see her as co-ordinating all the reasons for her success – including, of course, marrying Ferdinand, who was given much of the credit for military success both for his skills and the forces he was able to contribute. Other factors were well explained by many, such as Joanna's disadvantages and the actions and responses of the nobility, often, pleasingly, including effectively-used

knowledge of individuals. Those choosing military power as the key factor tended to find it easy to link the military power of nobles to their answer. Those choosing Isabella focused on her relationship with the nobles. The significance of gaining the support of and control over towns tended to be slightly less well handled, and confused some candidates. It was interesting that most candidates accepted Isabella's right to be queen unquestioningly and wrote as if she were fighting off an attempted threat to her deserved position. While consideration of this was in no way central to the question, it did over-simplify some analysis.

### **11) How far did Ferdinand and Isabella achieve their aims in ruling Spain after 1479?**

This question, while a classic one to ask, and clearly anticipated by many candidates, did not prove so easy to answer. There were some excellent responses in which the aims and the relative success in achieving them were clearly identified and knowledgeably and effectively evaluated, usually to a conclusion of overall, but not entire, success. For a strong candidate, this was a good question. More modest candidates, by contrast, did not find it so straightforward, and there were several patterns of failure and misunderstanding which led to the marks for answers to this being on average lower than those to question 10. One was the identification of the aims of Ferdinand and Isabella. Some candidates could not differentiate between aims and policies. Moreover many, especially the less knowledgeable, failed to differentiate between the aims of the two. In many areas, not least religious aims, this led to significant oversimplification at best, or confusion and inaccuracy. Religious aims tended to confuse, as many candidates became side-tracked, confusing, for example, the economic costs of some policies with success in attaining the aims. Another error was to drift into discussing why some aims were more successful than others, producing analysis which was at best tangential and could receive very little credit. There was one mistake, however, which was not made. Weaker responses might conflate Ferdinand and Isabella, Aragon and Castile, but there was no tendency to treat this as a stock question on the unification of Spain. Candidates clearly read and attempted to answer the question set.

### **12) To what extent was the power of the nobility the main problem Charles I faced in his rule of Spain?**

This was the least popular of the questions in this section, although some candidates demonstrated that it was possible to answer it with great success. They tended to take the line that the power of the nobles was a very significant issue, that Charles faced a major challenge in gaining acceptance, but that in fact much of the power of the nobles was applied on his behalf in the suppression of rebellions at the beginning of the reign, and that thereafter, while the nobles needed to be considered, their power was not his greatest problem. One point that very few candidates developed was the behaviour of the nobility immediately after the death of Ferdinand and the fact that Charles faced a reaction against the strong rule of his predecessors when he arrived, belatedly, as a young foreigner. A consideration of other factors to set against that of the nobles' power included Charles' absences, religious issues and finance, considered by nearly all candidates as his principal problem. Many candidates struggled to follow this pattern of success. There was a minority for whom the difficulty lay in displaying sufficient knowledge. More suffered from the limitation of finding it hard to move beyond analysis of factors to sustained evaluation to a judgement. Others went astray in their interpretation of the needs of the question. There were some who simply denied the factor and considered others, and there were some who, feeling apparently that they needed to agree with the question, concentrated exclusively on the opening years of the reign, and the origins of the rebellions, to support a very unbalanced case.

**13) 'Criticism of the abuses of the Church was the main reason for the spread of Luther's ideas in the Holy Roman Empire to 1529.' How far do you agree?**

There were some excellent essays which had a very good knowledge of how Luther's ideas spread and were able to come to an effective judgement. Few candidates agreed that criticism of the abuses of the Church was the main factor, and many argued effectively for the role of Luther himself and princely power within the Holy Roman Empire. Some agreed with the named factor, with as much success as those who did not. Generally, the level of knowledge and understanding displayed was impressive. Candidates answering this question tended to have moved away from a rather reductive approach to the Catholic Church and have developed more nuanced ideas about the impact of the printing press, which was good to see. The very best candidates had a very detailed knowledge of Luther's works as well as the wider socio-political context that he operated within. They demonstrated a good level of understanding of Luther's theology beyond the 95 Theses, and the importance of pamphlets, sermons and hymns. This was also encouraging. There tended to be rather less specific knowledge of Church abuses, and most candidates could do little more than list such things as pluralism, non-residence and simony without showing any supported understanding of why these should have affected the spread of Luther's ideas. Another factor which tended not to appear was Luther's national and patriotic appeal, his "German-ness", though the disunity of Germany and the individual power of princes was mentioned by nearly all. There was some stock analysis of the motives of the princes, the absences of Charles V, and of the degree of unpopularity of the Catholic Church, and candidates with a good learned list of factors for Luther's success were able to attain moderate marks. Again such candidates demonstrated that they knew they were expected to analyse not just to describe, and did so to the best of their ability..

**14) To what extent did Charles V's relations with the princes in the Holy Roman Empire change?**

Few candidates answered this question and those that did were stronger on outlining the relationship between Charles V and the princes in 1519 than arguing how far that relationship had changed by 1556. Others were more focused on the reasons why the relationship changed than the extent of the change. There were very few really strong answers to this question. That said, there were very few really poor answers, and it appeared that weaker candidates had done themselves better justice by reading the questions and realising that they were in a better position to answer 13 and 15. They were probably right, and are commended for reading the questions carefully. While this is a perfectly legitimate question to ask, and a few very strong answers demonstrated that some candidates were well-prepared for it, it approaches the topic from an unusual angle and those unable to think clearly struggled. There was some unfocused discussion of the princes and their relationship with Charles that examined their response to Lutheranism rather than the question of change/continuity. Generally the answer was focused on the relationship with Charles but the question of change and continuity was not well covered. Some attained some success by thinking about Charles' strength at the beginning and end of his reign. Fewer were able to see how religious changes had impacted on his relationship with the princes as individuals or a group.

**15) Assess the reasons why Charles V was at war for much of his reign.**

More candidates chose to complete this question and there were some very strong answers which showed an excellent understanding of Charles V's problems throughout his reign. It was hard not to feel sorry for him after reading some of them! Due to the breadth of the question (allowing for discussions of Germany, the Ottoman Turks and France) there were generally fair responses submitted. Successful candidates chose to examine the personal and dynastic rivalries, religious ideologies, conflicting priorities and financial problems of Charles (amongst other factors). Candidates seemed to have a clear understanding of dynastic rivalries in particular. They handled the Habsburg-Valois Wars fairly consistently well. There was less in-depth knowledge about the situation with the Turks and the examination of the German conflicts was fairly peripheral. Some candidates suffered through producing a list of wars and reasons for

them rather than exploring the period thematically, which generally encouraged better analysis. For many, the limitation was the difficulty they found moving beyond analysing different reasons to assessing them, for which they needed supported evaluation to a judgement on which were the most important.

**16) Assess the strengths and weaknesses of Spain at the time of Philip II's death.**

This question had a mixed response. Some candidates seemed to relish the opportunity to evaluate Spain's situation on Philip's death and provided well-written analyses of various themes such as finance, religion, political stability. Others found the specific focus on Spain in 1598 tricky and instead looked at developments across the period of Philip's rule. While it is necessary to look back in order to assess the situation in Spain in 1598 this should not form the basis of the whole answer, and a significant proportion of the more moderate answers lost focus on the date and therefore the question. Other less successful essays tended to list Philip's problems, especially the financial ones, and some lacked balance on the strengths as well as the weaknesses of Spain in 1598. Some candidates gave the impression that the picture was one of uniform disaster. There was little evidence from most of specific knowledge of finance, and few figures to support the claims being made. Religion tended to be seen as a strength, often in a simplistic contrast to finance as a failure. While Philip enjoyed control over the church, the negative aspects, such as his over-taxation of the clergy, the costs of the campaigns against the Moriscos, and the state of religion in the localities, could have enriched a study of Spain under a king known as the "Sword Arm of the Counter Reformation".

**17) 'Calvinism was the most important reason for the outbreak of rebellion in the Netherlands.' How far do you agree?**

Candidates seemed to find the factor 'Calvinism' difficult to analyse or explore in relation to this question. Indeed there was a disappointing lack, among most candidates, of knowledge of the religious factors which were so important, and this was true not only of Calvinism but also of the tensions between the "Spanish" and "Burgundian" approaches to religion. While there were some excellent responses that handled this very well, there was much confusion and misconception about what Calvinism was and how it was involved with both the Revolt and the Grandees' actions. There was a tendency for weaker candidates to attempt this question and to struggle with the named factor before providing a list of other factors. It appeared that after the initial problem with the named factor they then found it difficult to get back on course. There was much stock analysis of Philip and his difficulties but also some more nuanced discussion of the problems that he inherited and created. Again, weaker candidates found Philip hard to assess, and seemed to think that he undervalued the Netherlands and that, by contrast, the reign of Charles V had been problem-free and his relations with the area uniformly good.

**18) 'Maurice of Nassau was the main reason for the survival of the United Provinces.' How far do you agree?**

This question was generally well answered. Most candidates remained focused on the period of the United Provinces rather than straying earlier. Some had an impressive knowledge of the political and military actions and abilities of Maurice of Nassau. This went beyond an explanation of his use of geography and was good to see. Most also set the factor of Nassau's leadership against other factors to provide some form of evaluation or comparison. These factors included the impact of Oldenbarnevelt and Philip's weaknesses as ruler of Spain. Candidates could attain equal success whether they agreed with the statement or not. There were some patterns of failure. Most who knew enough content were able to move beyond description to the analysis of factors. However, a fair proportion found it hard to move beyond that. To attain the top grades in this sort of question it is necessary to offer a supported judgement between the factors. There was a minority who tried to disguise their lack of knowledge of the named factor by ignoring it. Even if they didn't agree with the importance of Maurice of Nassau's role, students still needed to consider it.



## **F962/02 European and World History Period Studies – Modern**

### **General**

The standard was high with many good and strong answers read. Those answers were well-focused, developed and supported in their arguments, with a clear sense of the needs of analysis and judgement. In general, where candidates failed to reach the higher levels, this was due to a lack of developed judgment and explanations of the relationship between the various factors. Descriptive answers were seen also and there were some that were too chronological in approach. The best responses followed analytical structures.

It is important that candidates are clear in their understanding of what is meant by analysis and judgement and so try to deliver both. That way, they will secure higher Level awards. Most had some idea of the importance of analysis and tried to create an answer around analytical themes. Some topic questions (not least on the League of Nations' role in Question 11 and foreign policy areas in Question 18) lent themselves to a more chronological approach; much then depended on the balance between simply describing actions and events and actually analysing them.

Overall, the sense obtained was that answers were better in structure and candidates more aware of how to use knowledge to analyse, assess and argue than in previous sessions. Some good argument answers were read, not least in Questions 7-9,16-18 and 28-30.

Judgements were quite often bolt-on at the end of paragraphs or reserved for a conclusion – many of the latter were quite extensive and lifted rewards in Levels. Those responses that effortlessly analysed and offered judgements throughout, using knowledge to illustrate and support, did (very) well. However, some candidates still struggle with questions starting with 'Assess...'

There is a need to be well focused on key words or, indeed, dates in titles because these need good development to attain the higher levels. This applied in Questions such as 1, 3, 18, 19-20, 24 and 27. Some candidates still do not do enough with the named factor in a question, at times leaving it to the end or else burying it too much within other factors. Links between paragraphs are often absent, hence listing occurs – candidates who can find ways to link paragraphs usually improve the quality of overview and evaluation in answers. Abbreviations are also too readily used by some – (eg) V.T., LN, Reps, govt, WW1, PG (Provisional Government) - sometimes (still) almost from the inception of an answer and it would be helpful if Centres would remind candidates that this is a formal examination and also not accept abbreviations in work done throughout the course.

However, overall, many questions were well answered. Detail deployed in support of answers was often impressive and the structure of answers was generally sound. Almost all candidates succeeded in offering some kind of answer to the question asked, with only a very few ignoring the question.

#### *General pointers for improvement:*

- Closer attention to the exact question asked, particularly when it comes to terms such as “effectiveness” or “success” or “how far.”
- In all, not enough candidates offered a clear argument that was sustained throughout the essay: quite a number would introduce a clear argument in the introduction and then not refer to it again until the conclusion (with the interim being a list of factors/issues). A fair number of candidates contradicted their stated argument in their answer.

- There needs to be a better sense of how to link paragraphs to avoid listing and overuse of such phrases as ‘Another factor...’ or ‘The first reason...’, ‘The second reason...’
- Many answers included judgements that were bolted on to paragraphs, without any real supported evaluation; or only attempted a developed judgement in the conclusion.
- Surprisingly few candidates attempted to explain linkages, and often those explanations of linkages offered were too brief.
- Too much conversational writing, directly addressing the reader/examiner (particularly the infuriating use of questions addressed to the reader!!), use of the first person.
- Quite a lot of (irritating) inappropriate abbreviation used! (see above)

### Question Specific

1. Answers were good or very good in many cases, blending the military (successes, image, hold over his army) with domestic politics and seeing the role of Napoleon himself, his policing system and controls over the press and the fashioning of a powerful image, all growing over time. The best answers had a good focus on ‘only’. Most focused on the domestic and the issues of his powers as Emperor, the controls over the press and the use of the police and spies; some interrogated the constitutions and the role of plebiscites, looked at political patronage and the uses of the legal apparatus; some argued as to his use of the principles of the French Revolution. Religion and education were also prominent in many answers. The uses of the Constitution, his Emperorship, the wooing of the aristocracy and church to build up support and isolate opponents featured as did some examination of the nature and strength of opposition, in Paris and in the provinces, noting the intensification of silencing after 1808-10, arguably as his power became less secure and the military triumphs began to dry up. The ability to argue and counter-argue was a feature of many answers.
2. Again, some good and strong answers read. A few candidates drifted off into the period after 1807. Divisions were handled well with apposite examples and comments on the over-dependence on Britain, the self-interest of some rulers, and Napoleon’s ability to divide his potential enemies. Other reasons were adduced, usually Napoleon’s generalship (the military genius debate), the calibre of his commanders, the size and skills of his armies, his uses of military and economic powers (resources grew with conquests) and indeed luck. Strategies, tactics, firepower, the uses of resources and the pursuit of high ambition featured well in many responses.
3. The key word in the question was ‘Consistent’ and this often needed more focus. Much was written about British power, at sea, through her economy, her ability to overcome the Continental System and her role in Portugal and especially Spain, with good analysis of the ‘Spanish Ulcer’. Russia featured well and the changing political-diplomatic landscape after 1812 and the success of the final Coalition were assessed. There was some good analysis of military tactics, strategy, use of resources, over-stretch, over-ambition, the belief in invulnerability and the longer-term corrosive effects of the Continental System. Chronology worked less well here. Some answers made too much of the Continental System or else of the Russian campaign, so creating imbalance. A few answers went beyond, on to Waterloo. In addition, some candidates made effective use of the consequences of military setbacks within France.
4. Answers to this question were often characterised by a chronological approach and, as a result, they often tended to list features, becoming over-reliant on description. As ever, better answers were more analytical, even thematic in approach. These often addressed successes and failures at different stages of the reign. Quite a number looked at the reign in phases, following a chronological route. The Charter, the Hundred Days and their impact, court and Chamber politics, the role of ministers, the mix of controls and freedoms, unrest, economic and foreign policies all featured in many answers. Survival and the return of stability were seen as important success areas. Louis’s own abilities as a ruler were assessed on occasion. Most candidates argued that Louis was successful.

5. Again, lists often predominated: religious policies were quite often neglected or dealt with summarily, but some candidates were able to assess the nature of the coronation, education, possible clerical influences, and even the rise of anticlericalism and republicanism. Other factors were adduced: long and short term mistakes and problems, Chamber politics, ministerial changes, growing and articulated opposition, economic crisis, and the St Cloud Ordinances. Charles' personal mistakes in policy areas and in failing to build up good support, and so his culpability, were deemed important. Better answers worked from themed sections, less good created year-by-year coverage.
6. Most candidates were able to assess successes, influence, a sense of aims achieved and growing personal and national importance in the 1850s against the subsequent failures in the 1860s. Relations with Britain, interventions in Italy and Mexico, the problems over the rising power of Prussia and the skilful Bismarck usually featured, with recognition that Napoleon III's rather idiosyncratic approach to diplomacy ended with him and France isolated in Europe and vulnerable in the war of 1870-71. Some students offered a list of successes and failures, with such answers being dominated by narrative. Better answers set out the aims of Napoleon's foreign policy and then engaged with them through specific examples. Generally, answers would have benefitted from a sharper focus on aims, more explained linkages between issues/events and more of a sense of the context of events.
7. Lists of factors were seen but there were more-developed and sophisticated answers which did argue and assess, often with a wide range of knowledge in support. Part of the success here lay in ranging across the period, as well as linking and evaluating different factors. The role of the federal government, Manifest Destiny (linked to the sense of 'new nationalism' and indeed the 'Second Awakening'), trade and new routes and opportunities, the Gold Rush, the effects of the Civil War, developments in transport (above all railroads), new trading companies, willingness to take on and defeat Native Americans, spirited and acquisitive individuals as explorers or indeed as Presidents, often featured to varying degrees. Successful candidates focused on the role of the federal government and developments in transport as facilitators of movement, combined with new opportunities, ideology and persecution as supplementary factors.
8. This was quite a challenging question but some good responses were seen. Often areas of tension were listed: better answers linked these and evaluated them in importance. References were made to: the 1820 Compromise, the need for the 1850 Compromise and its internal weaknesses, linked to growing North-South divisions and ill feeling, slavery, abolitionism, the problems over new lands, States' rights, the spirit of the Constitution, Kansas-Nebraska, Dred Scott, 'bleeding Sumner' and the rise of the Republican Party, severely at odds with the Democratic Party, were issues that were most commonly considered. Most candidates took the view that the Compromise was bound to fail, though a few tried to argue that it had the potential to succeed but was undone by the wilfulness of powerful minority opinions in the North and South.
9. There were lists again here but better answers tried to compare and assess North-South features closely and directly, often using apposite knowledge. Some answers veered into Lincoln-Davis or Grant-Lee comparisons, answering a previous question, and some had imbalance in coverage between one side or the other. Leadership, generalship, political and military skills, strategies and tactics, diplomacy (especially in respect of Britain), economic and manpower resources, railroads and transport, States' rights in the South, Lincoln's determination to preserve the Union, the impact of the Emancipation Proclamation and of Gettysburg, the nature of warfare in later 1863 and 1864, usually featured.

10. The problem here was a ready recourse to writing about the causes of war in Europe in 1914 without much on the Balkans or much linkage. Often other causes predominated. Those who did manage something on the Balkans picked up on Sarajevo, Serb nationalism, Austro-Hungarian fears (linked to the 'blank cheque'), militancy and rising tensions, and occasionally the Russian dimension. Nothing was said of the Balkan Wars or of the fragile state of the Ottoman Empire, or else such coverage was very perfunctory. Much was often written about German ambitions, rivalries, alliances, arms race, Anglo-German tensions and Belgium.
11. Competent answers were read, often as lists of factors. Machine guns, artillery, barbed wire, the failure of the war of movement at the start, the attitudes of generals, the impact of vast resources (men, munitions, domestic economies), and the relative failures of new inventions (tanks, planes) usually featured here. Some contrasts were drawn with the return of mobility in 1918 and better answers used that contrast to highlight the earlier problems of warfare that had made it so defensively minded. Less developed answers relied too much on generalisation or too much description.
12. At times description took over here from analysis and explanation. A few candidates looked at structural issues (Covenant, procedures in the Council, no peacekeeping force); most saw idealism as a problem and the absence of the USA as crucial, but struggled to link these issues to the actual question. A few noted the ambitions of Japan and Italy and their ambivalence over the League, using it, then abusing it. There were some sound answers here with good knowledge, though analysis and evaluation were not always quite so strong. Some candidates made good arguments over Japan's leadership and ambitions, of events in China and of expansionism using a powerful set of armed forces; often, less was made of relations between Japan and the USA and few explored the deterioration of 1940-41, leading to Pearl Harbor. Occasionally, Japan's place within the League of Nations and the latter's responses to Japanese actions appeared. The majority of answers focused more on Italy and Abyssinia and on Hitler's increasingly expansionist foreign policy, with many candidates pointing up how far Anglo-French Appeasement aided his goals. Most answers stopped in 1939 but a few did get as far as 1941. There were also those who wrote about why the League failed or else wrote too generally about the causes of World War Two.
13. Generally, this was done well or very well. If there was a listing of factors, these were usually linked and assessed as to importance. A few answers focused too much on how the Provisional Government appeared (Nicholas II's problems) and went too far back in time (even to 1905). The majority kept to 1917 though some candidates produced a narrative of events without analysis. The very nature of the Provisional Government as temporary, its genesis in the Progressive Bloc, the relations with the Petrograd Soviet, the massive economic problems, the decision to continue the war, the failure to deliver on promises, not least those for elections, the failure to deal with the Bolsheviks, errors made by Kerensky, Lenin's leadership, Trotsky's role, the Kornilov affair, and the MRC role featured in most or all answers. Most candidates argued that survival was highly unlikely in the febrile atmosphere of 1917 and that Lenin was a dangerous opponent.
14. This was quite a testing question but most answers dealt with the problems and some were very well argued. The strongest answers identified the problems in the opening paragraph and then assessed how successfully each was managed. The problems centred on establishing the Bolsheviks in power and indeed establishing a dictatorship, winning the Civil War after making peace with Germany, trying to stabilise the economy after the deleterious effects of wars and beginning a socialist revolution. The moves to a one party state, the removal of other parties, the abandonment of any forms of democracy, the creation of the Red Army, the contrasts of War Communism and the NEP, the 'Ban on Factions' and the creation of the USSR featured in most answers. Most answers also tried to assess 'How successfully...'; however, some stopped in 1921 and therefore offered only a partial answer.

15. Much was written about Collectivisation and the Five Year Plans. Often impressive details and figures were adduced, though that frequently led to a lot of description. These details were however usually assessed as to scale and impact. There were references (or more) to the fate of the kulaks, propaganda and the workplace (Stakhanov). But most answers did not assess enough the social impacts: on peasants, on workers, their families, on the relatively new and empowered managerial and technocratic groups, on living and working conditions, on education. To reach high in the Levels, such assessment was needed. The best answers linked agricultural and industrial policies and social as well as economic impact areas.
16. The rise of socialism was usually covered well enough; it was assessed as to forms, structures, impact, appeal, support and links to trade unions. Unrest, violence and disorders were also assessed but less well. The nature of coalition governments, the place and appeal of liberalism and the place of nationalism featured too. References were made to foreign policy, not least in North Africa. Some insightful answers also assessed the position of the monarchy and the attitudes of the elites and church hierarchy. Problems over the North-South divide and the legacy of a flawed unification featured though these needed good linkages to the question's needs. Most answers did focus on stability, although weaker answers were general in their support for the points made. For some, there was an almost natural link to Q 17.
17. This question was generally done well; however, at times description intruded too much (above all over events in 1922) although most responses were analytical and evaluative, assessing a range of factors. The best argued consistently, avoiding simple lists of factors. Background factors, pre-War and War-time, often featured, at times precluding enough focus on 1919-22. Political, economic and social context factors were usually assessed with some care. More could have been made of socialism's perceived advances and of fears over communism. Fascist violence was explored but, as so often, the strengths of Fascism as a political-parliamentary movement were exaggerated. That said, Mussolini's skills, appeal (to different groups and regions, to the elites) and his opportunism, allied to luck, were covered. Many saw the role of the King and his advisers as crucial. Most answers had a range of factors and made links. The effects of the First World War, the 'Mutilated Victory', the return of soldiers, growing unemployment and serious economic crises, the rise of communism alongside socialism and the weaknesses of liberal government were assessed, along with Mussolini's skills, appeal and links to the elites. Longer and short term causes were usually assessed well and links made.
18. Some answers strayed into the 1930s or used material that belonged in that decade. Most were sound and many strong in their analyses. The best answers were thematic, while weaker answers were often narrow in range and at times offered little beyond the various battles. Thematic answers usually worked better than those that looked at successes followed by failures. Surprisingly, many said little about the processes involved in the consolidation of power (Acerbo Law, Matteotti murder, Aventine Secession, progress to one party state, OVRA, informers, terror and press controls, for example). Most attention was given to assessing the strengths and weaknesses of social and economic policies as well as outcomes in foreign policy areas. The battles (lira, births, grain, etc), social changes via education and youth movements, and the propaganda usually associated with these areas gained most coverage, with good knowledge to support ideas and arguments. Most candidates tried to balance apparent or real successes against shortfalls or indeed problems being stored up for the next decade. The strongest answers often commented on the illusion of success or the propaganda triumph for Mussolini.

19. This question seemed to encourage essays which described the Nationalists' attempts to establish power rather than assessed how successful they were. And a few of the weaker answers strayed into the 1940s. Some simply wrote about Jiang Jieshi's life rather than focusing on the question as set. Common themes were: the nature and extent of Nationalist authority; the leadership of Jiang; the problems of the warlords; the relationship with the Communists; policies and their limitations (economic, education, women, for example); innate corruption; the failure of promised reforms. Better answers argued and counter-argued around 'How successfully...' adducing evidence of success, often limited, and looking at inherent problems and indeed longer-term weaknesses. Descriptive answers lacked the necessary analytical dimensions.
20. There were much better and less descriptive answers to this question, but some students seemed so convinced that it was the weaknesses of the Nationalists that they had little to say about Communist strengths. Better candidates were able to adapt their information to the question's demands and were still able to conclude that the Nationalists were to blame. Factors that were adduced included: Communist strengths based on Mao's leadership, wide and popular appeal (especially in the countryside), better organisation and the build-up of powerful and loyal forces; strategy and tactics in campaigns; the war against the Japanese; Nationalist failings in leadership, overdependence on urban centres, lack of appeal, corruption, perceived closeness to Americans and the lack of American support at crucial moments. Less good responses were thin on the Civil War and themes such as Nationalist and Communist military strategy and tactics.
21. There was some confusion here about both the period in question, with quite a bit of pre-1957 material, and also what Mao's other motives might have been, which led to some very unbalanced essays. Quite a number of candidates argued that the named factor was the prime or (only) reason and said nothing about the ideological dimension involved. Some focused rather too much on the developing cult of personality surrounding Mao and arguably exhibited most amongst the young in the Cultural Revolution. Better responses tried to assess the desire to hold on to power set against motives such as modernising China, the place and impact of the Great Leap Forward, building strength for the Party (quite possibly for Mao himself, of course), rooting out bad ideas and those opposed to change (and to Mao), refreshing Communism, appealing more to the young, undertaking cultural realignment, changing the ethos and direction of education, purging western ideas, and reinvigorating the sense and the spirit of revolution.
22. A major problem here was that many responses said too little about political problems and too much about economic. Although there is a clear link between the two, the focus had to be on the political. Economic coverage needed to be kept brief. International relations and foreign policy were acceptable areas but had to be linked to the political. Often this concentration on the economic (aftermath of the War, hyper-inflation, recovery, new currency and all) unbalanced the answers. The better responses tried to assess the nature and depth of political problems. The Constitution, place of the President, multi-party politics, the nature of the P.R. system, weak and frequently changing coalition governments, the threats from the Left and the Right, the unrest involved, and the relative calm after 1924, featured. Some candidates highlighted regional issues, not least the tension between Berlin and some State governments. Reparations, and Stresemann and his recovery plans (usually linked to foreign policy) appeared often. Many made much of Stresemann. The effects of the Versailles Treaty, the international isolation and then acceptance into the international community (Locarno, Kellogg-Briand) also featured. The best responses assessed superficial success set against continuing underlying problems. They addressed clearly domestic political problems linking these carefully to the international context but keeping the former to the fore. Weaker responses said too much about (eg) Putsches or the Treaty of Versailles.

23. Some candidates wrote about the 1929-33 far too much and some situated Hitler and his government in that period. A few candidates wrote almost exclusively about consolidation of power after January 1933, while some included the War economy with much about Speer. Recurrent themes in good responses (and there were such) were: the public works schemes (correctly identified as borrowed from the Schleicher chancellorship period), the great success in dealing with unemployment, Schacht's role and the New Plan and trade deals, mefo bills, the 'guns versus butter' debate, Goering and the Four Year Plan and its variable delivery, the needs of a militarised economy, and the lack of war readiness in 1939. References were made to mobilising labour, KdF schemes and the place of women, but some answers ventured too far into the social arena or else spent too much time on anti-semitism, no matter its linkage to economic areas. Some useful points were made about promises to groups such as the farmers and the *Mittelstand*.
24. Some candidates spent too much time pre-1950 or else focused too much on Adenauer himself. Some looked at the reasons for economic success whilst others provided a narrative of events. Better responses tried to assess the nature and extent of economic success, not least industrial and with the benefit of both USA, ECSC and then EC help, trade, currency strengths, better industrial relations, sustained and impressive economic growth, low inflation levels, more prosperity and 'feel good' factors, new machinery and technical ideas. Apart from Adenauer's role, Erhard featured quite strongly as did the development of party politics, stable governments, removal of the Nazi past, benefits from those leaving East Germany and East Berlin and the successful foreign policy. Some well-developed, well balanced answers were read.
25. Candidates needed to keep within the parameters of 1945 to 1948 (up to the Berlin Blockade). Some went well beyond. In addition, some wanted to write about the role of Truman and the USA so deflecting from the real focus on the Soviet Union and Stalin. There was also a significant number of candidates who did not understand the term 'motives' and this resulted in responses that answered the question only by implication. Better answers were seen, however, and motives that were adduced included: Stalin's personality and personal ambitions; ideological drive to extend Communism, which was often linked to the goal of creating new, pro-Soviet ruling elites on Eastern Europe; a desire to create a buffer zone of some depth to protect the USSR; a desire to ensure there could be no resurgence by Germany; determination to avoid the problems pre-1939; the effects of the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences; Stalin's reactions to Truman as US President and to the 'Iron Curtain' rhetoric from 1946 onwards.
26. This was usually done in a very chronological manner, often militating against real analysis. The range was, of course, vast and allowance was made for selectivity but there had to be sufficient range to offer contrasts across the period. Some candidates focused too much on the start of the Cold War or else on big episodes like Berlin and Cuba. Often more was known about events in the 1950s and 1960s than later. Some answers stopped at 1979 with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. The best answers appreciated the undulations in relations (extremes of bad relations, better phases, thaws, peaceful co-existence, Détente, the second Cold War, the eventual rapprochement). Events that featured often were: Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968, the Berlin Wall, Cuban Crisis, arms and space rivalries, Helsinki 1975, Afghanistan 1979, Reagan and Gorbachev's summits, and the contrasts between 1980-84 and 1985-89.
27. Some candidates wrote exclusively about the consequences for the USSR and Russia. This narrowed the range of available marks. Often too much was said about Gorbachev and some answers were focused on the reasons for the collapse of the USSR. Those responses that did engage with Eastern Europe were able to draw on a range of national examples and tried to assess economic, social and certainly political consequences, occasionally making comparative links between countries. Some common themes were: the dismantling of Soviet-era ruling elites and security apparatus, the advent of democratic

rule and government (with mixed outcomes), the realignment of economies away from Soviet-style command and control, the opening-up of trade and other links with the West, and new directions in foreign policies. East Germany (soon to be reunited with West), Poland and Hungary, and at times Rumania, featured quite a lot. But there were a few candidates who wrote too much about events in East Germany, sometimes providing a narrative of events throughout the Cold War.

28. There were some very competent answers to this question with an effective balance between home and abroad and some linking between the two. Most answers tended to be stronger on foreign policies and weaker in coverage of domestic matters. Weaker candidates seemed convinced that Nasser was a disaster and gave him little credit for anything or included too much about one or two big features (eg the Aswan Dam). Better answers looked at his standing inside Egypt and the Arab world (the UAR, Yemen); his promotion of Arab nationalism; military (including his standing with the army); political and economic developments within Egypt (not least the state of the economy, poverty); his relations with the USSR; his rhetoric; charismatic side; skills, not least survival no matter defeats and setbacks.
29. Again there were a few very strong answers which took a broad view of the consequences for Israel, the region and relations between the Superpowers both in the short term and into the future. Weaker responses described events, often with much on the War itself, although some candidates did consider territorial changes but little more. Some common themes were: territorial acquisition by Israel; enhanced security (but not when the 1973 War came), the Palestinian refugee problem, the Israeli control of more Arab areas, the reactions of Arab States, the growth of terrorism, possible future needs to attempt peace settlements, the Intifada movements. Few answers lapsed into an actual narrative of the war, but actual assessment of consequences (in terms of their relative importance/linkages between them) was fairly rare.
30. Fewer answers were seen. These assessed a range of factors: the Kuwait crisis, Saddam's actions, the legacy of the First Gulf War, the perceived links of 9/11 and terrorism, the Bush administration's attitude over 'unfinished business,' WMD, oil, the hopes of some that western style democracy could be promoted. Some candidates did not distinguish between the conflicts and their responses were generalised. A small number wrote about earlier conflicts involving Iraq and Iran. The best responses tried to build their answers around themes and assess those as to relative importance, so creating arguments.



## F963 and F964 AS History Enquiries

### General Comments:

Most candidates were entering for the first time this May with some retaking from last summer. It appeared that sources were being approached with much more confidence than previously, although with less expert use of historical terminology and the application of appropriate own knowledge. The integration of content and evaluation remained difficult for some candidates and many, after an initial grouping in Q(b) 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 candidates made a clear and commendable 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 what we have advised over recent years, even if that advice had only been partially understood. Centres are to be congratulated on the efforts made to get their candidates to respond to the historical skills required by the Enquiries papers. Most tried to compare the passages for a key issue, or at worst a general issue and, in the second question, to group the sources according to both the proposed view and possible alternatives. The main weakness in responses was to group well initially but then proceed to describe or reference source content and provenance either sequentially or discretely, with a judgement perhaps on the topic or issue rather than the sources as a body of evidence for the stated view. Many commented on provenance discretely making no attempt to link their points to the key issue or any argument for the question. Sources are often analysed in isolation, almost for their own sake. This did not help candidates to advance their arguments, which tended to come intermittently or in the conclusion. This limits candidates to a L3. Their failure to integrate content and evaluation remains noticeable, although many tried to do this at some point. 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 to evaluate the sources given. 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 must integrate provenance into their assessment of the sources' relative value. A small minority of candidates are still overly-dependent on a set formula. This restricts and impedes their engagement both with the content of the sources and with their interpretation. Centres should avoid this approach in their teaching at all costs.

Although still occurring, a judgement as to which interpretation is most valid based on the number of sources was less seen this session. If it remains a teaching approach it is to be discouraged. A judgement cannot be based on a 3 to 2 score.

Candidates' use of knowledge was more restrained this session, although it can still dominate, often, in whole descriptive chunks. If predominating factual knowledge 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 can twist the sources or the question to fit these preconceived approaches. They end up answering a different question, offloading large amounts of scholarly knowledge in the process. The Q(b) that we set invariably asks whether the 5 sources would support a particular view in the light of their content and provenance and whether knowledge can support or challenge this. The knowledge is there to serve, not dominate. Some candidates just string together part-quotes to form an argument that is largely knowledge-driven, the sources at best used for reference and illustration. 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 taken out of context and invariably lacks any explanation or linkage to the question and argument. Sources cannot be left to speak for themselves. They need to be contextualised, explained and used to

drive the argument. The danger then is that the candidate moves 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').

Most candidates had a good grasp of the Unit they had studied and this was an improvement on some recent sessions. However it was still not untypical for one or two sources to be misunderstood and misinterpreted, particularly in Q(b). For example, F964 02 Q2(b) on Italy saw a fair few candidates misread the introduction, which clearly informed them that the British ambassador was reporting Victor Emmanuel's views, not those he himself held. There are still candidates whose approach is so general and vague that they couch their responses with claims that, for example, A supports B and undermines E with no reference to content at all. Such responses are entirely generic and formulaic and the language of analysis and argument is used with no substance whatsoever.

A minority of candidates, as alluded to earlier, are overly formulaic in their answers. The danger with the formulaic approach is dependence on a few key evaluative organising words like consistency, utility, typicality, authenticity, completeness, tone or reliability. It can become a *cul de sac* of vacuity, its use a mantra to reassure the examiner that provenance and evaluation were occurring. Thus some candidates will assert that a source 'lacks completeness' if it does not have a range of views, which is historically absurd. This is true for both part questions, as is the continued but decreasing 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 the 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 a few candidates still do) is neither valid nor helpful. Some focus 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 pointless, another *cul de sac* for candidates - its practice is to be discouraged.

Nonetheless, taken overall some 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. Many candidates approached the sources with confidence, using historical terminology and knowledge with ease. It was a pleasure to mark such intelligent and sensitive responses. 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. Most candidates knew what they were supposed to do (comparing for the key issue and evaluating the sources for interpretations) and failed only because they were either too bound by a rigid formula, misinterpreted the sources, failed to see what was actually there or lacked a sound historical and contextual background.

Answers and standards were comparable across all 4 Units and candidates were at least trying to do the right thing. **It is however important that the provenance is tied into the evaluation of an interpretation and not just commented on in isolation.** It must be used to answer the question. We have often said that candidates need to do the work not the examiner. Vague references will not suffice. Sources 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 them to an argument for or against the key issue. In such a situation, provenance remains an isolated and undigested goblet of information that does nothing to move an argument forward.

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 or at worst paraphrasing. It is the content that is the tool for everything else – to compare, to assess and to probe in terms of provenance and utility what the sources actually say in relation 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.

Most candidates will, at some point, drift from the focus of the question as they grapple with individual sources, instead of comparing them in relation to it for a particular view **at every point**. The most effective answers read the sources and their introductions and attributions carefully. Thus on F963 01 Q1(b) several candidates missed the helpful steers on which reign was being referred to or on Q2 source C that it was the Privy Council in Edward's name who was responding to the Kett's rebels' petition; on F963 02 Q3, despite the points in the introductions of Sources C and D many failed to spot the different processes of a parliamentary bill being referred to and thus lost the chance to comment on the different circumstances of the two speeches; on Q4(b) few talked of the Curzon line, mentioned in both the introduction and in the body of the source itself; on F964 01 Q1(a) was about the character of the Emperor Alexis, not about hostility between Byzantine and Crusader, the subject of the (b) question; similarly some candidates failed to note that Source A was from Gregory VII, not Urban. In Q2)(a) the issue was Leo X's attitude to Luther, not the other way around; on F964 02 Q2(b), as already mentioned, some thought Source C to be the British ambassador rather than Victor Emmanuel; on Q3(a) many commented on the methods of opposing slavery or slavery in general rather than focusing on the 'reasons' for opposition; on Q4(b) a fair few assessed Adenauer's qualifications as chancellor rather than West Germany's success during his period in power. Without attention to this sort of detail, arguments became muddled. The extra information in the introductions aid candidates in accessing the question but some neither read the Sources carefully nor their introductions and attributions.

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, although much of the above is now the preserve of a minority rather than the majority. Centres are again reminded to refresh themselves as to what is expected and to endeavour to incorporate it in their teaching. It is particularly important to use, compare and group sources as part of the teaching process to accustom candidates to handling material in this way. There are now sources on most of the topics dating back to 2000 (only the questions have changed) – 27 topics have been set using 4-5 sources each. In effect there are over 100 sources available to practice in the classroom for each topic, a terrific resource and teaching tool. These can be set formally or can 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 in class? 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 few candidates compared the wrong sources (or all five!). It is now a weaker minority that offers a general sequential analysis, often without considering the question, although the latter is still, alas, frequent at some point in the response. In these cases there seemed to be a sudden realisation, halfway through the answer, that the question named a particular issue and candidates needed to identify points of agreement and disagreement. 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, described or massively over-quoted. Some had very little sense of the historical context to explain significance - for example, on F963 02 Q3 on England in a New Century, where the politics of 1909-12 was poorly grasped (as opposed to welfare issues, which were not the main focus of the question). 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 a focus on the key issue in the question. Candidates often ignore this and would be well advised to highlight it on the paper as an aide memoire. Many simply compare content and provenance regardless of the issue. 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, if either, provides the better evidence on the issue and explain why. In both questions the most common mistake is in the use of phrases such as 'this shows us that', which is neither a comparative nor an analytical approach. Some candidates seem to think that to use the sources illustratively to support a view is what is required on the grounds that they are explaining the utility of the source, saying 'Source A is useful, it shows us that...' In Q(a) this leads them away from the comparative issues towards sequencing. In Q(b) it leads to a general answer in which the sources are used to illustrate 'knowledge' points rather than as the central body of material for evaluation. It is important to consider the skills we reward and how to work with candidates on these.

**The following points in the 'comparison' answer need careful consideration. Each frequently lead to under-achievement:-**

- 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, Garibaldi or Leo and Luther, instead of the **specific issue**, Garibaldi's leadership qualities or Leo X's attitude towards 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, a level 4.
- Many candidates, at some point in their answer, resort to randomly juxtaposing dissimilar points. They do not **compare like with like** or point out that one source may make a point which is absent from the other.
- Some candidates are satisfied with **basic or undeveloped cross references**, often losing the question in the process.
- **Judgement** is often asserted at the end. It must arise from an evaluation of the quality of the content, either throughout or in a developed concluding paragraph. A failure to judge will confine a candidate to level III and below.
- **Judgement is all too frequently on the issue itself, rather than on the evidence for it** (see above).
- It is vital that candidates **identify the relevant issues** arising in the two sources and use these as their comparative focus. Failure to do so leads to description, paraphrase or at worst copying out what is there, word for word. Candidates need to spot the similarities and differences in the detail of the sources.
- The analysis and evaluation of two sources as evidence has the **higher mark weighting**.
- A **formulaic approach** often diverts the candidate from both the issue in the question (and the appropriate content) and the need to compare provenance, integrating it into an explanation of similarity and difference and arriving at developed judgement. **We cannot emphasis enough the damage done by a formulaic approach**. Candidates desperately seek qualities on their 'list' that are simply not there, or are of minor or tangential significance. For example, a paragraph might be added on 'completeness' which turns into a wish list of sources that were not used. Whole paragraphs are devoted to authenticity. Generic comments on reliability and utility are made without any reference to the content and nature of the specific sources supposedly under discussion. Although this is less frequent than in recent sessions it continues to crop up

in many guises and can tend to be a whole Centre feature, indicating that the advice given to candidates is inappropriate. If you are reading this report and recognise this as the sort of advice and technique you recommend to students please think again and revise your teaching and advice in the light of the above.

- The key to an effective comparison of provenance is to **ask questions about the authors, their likely purpose, the different audiences and perhaps their respective tone**. Some candidates will devote whole sections of their answer to reliability (see above). This leads to discrete comment. For historians, all evidence can be used. Issues such as reliability are factored in and only then are conclusions drawn from it. It is part of considering purpose, tone and audience. Simply to comment in isolation on reliability is not evaluation, only a relatively minor part of it. Many candidates ignore or simply fail to use the introductions and attributions. These contain vital information to support an understanding of source content.
- Candidates frequently **sequence their comments on provenance and deal with them separately**. Such a separation will often work, but more effective candidates will integrate their comments in a holistic approach. Most, however, having compared content, are then quite happy to comment discretely on authorship, tone or purpose. Without effective comparison on this they find an informed judgement much more difficult.
- Candidates will often take sources at **face value**. They need to probe.
- **Misinterpretation of the Sources** still occurs at every level. **Candidates need to read the material very carefully**. It should ring bells in terms of their own understanding of an issue. Our sources are fairly short but have been edited to contain real historical ‘meat’. The language and points made need both careful consideration and cross referencing, which can only be achieved by attention to detail. Again this is something to practice using past sources as and when the topics are encountered in the classroom. A good example of missing important detail came in Q2 on F964 02, the Unification of Italy, where in Source C the views reported were those of Victor Emmanuel, not those of the person reporting them – the British ambassador. There is much **assertion**. Candidates claim that something is useful or reliable, or biased, **without explanation, development or example**. We are still faced with much ‘stock’ comment as a result. A new variant on this is to argue that a source is limited because it only gives one point of view. One will use balance as a means of assessing the view in a modern historian and it might be relevant to comment on a particular slant but most contemporary sources will be partisan to a greater or lesser extent.

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

Most candidates now plan, and many try to sustain a clearly structured answer, reasonably focused on the question. Many had some argument of varying quality and endeavoured to reach a judgement, but often on the topic rather than the sources. Most know to attempt a grouping based on the assertion in the question but unfortunately, having done the difficult bit, they then still proceed sequentially, usually in two argumentative or more usually generally descriptive halves. It is vital not just to pay lip service to the grouping in the introduction followed by 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 raise in support or point to different ones. That way they **cross reference** and think about the key issues. Candidates need

to consider this more in terms of how they have approached the part (a) question – that is to compare and contrast sources they deem to support the issues, remembering that many sources are capable of supporting different views depending on certain phrases or provenance. It is also far better to integrate issues of provenance (authorship, purpose and audience) into this rather than separate them out into a later bolt-on section. It establishes the relative weight to be given to the evidence of a group of sources. It is, perhaps, instinctive for candidates to proceed source by source, even within an established grouping, but they need to bear in mind the need to **compare within and across their grouping** at key points. This needs to be done both in terms of the content and the provenance, which may affect the relative weighting given to their points. Unfortunately some candidates still prefer to write general essays about the topic, either for 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. They must not be allowed to speak for themselves – they don't. That is the candidate's task.

**The following points in the 'interpretation' answer need careful consideration. Each frequently lead to underachievement:-**

- Candidates are frequently puzzled by how to use 'knowledge' or context. A few 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 some cases candidates seemed to have little beyond a **general contextual underpinning**. They confined their comments to what was in front of them. This was either because their knowledge was unconsolidated or because they lacked it. In some cases it was simply inappropriate and led the candidate away from the focus of the question.
- It is important to realise what 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 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, although it should be noted that there were some excellent answers which did achieve this with both clarity and control.
- Candidates need to **explain, develop, use and cross reference** the points for or against a particular interpretation in the sources. In so doing they will analyse the material to answer the question and arrive at a well thought through, and argued, judgement. Many manage to do this only through a discrete discussion of the content of an individual source. Often effective points are only made in isolation of the question and argument.
- Many responses **drift out of focus on the key issue** in the question. The sharpness of focus was highly significant in marking out the best responses. Candidates would latch onto a preferred 'big' issue, perhaps tangential, and analyse the sources generally. They are drawn away from the question and 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 had 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**. Even candidates who had attempted a reasonable source focus suddenly forgot that they were **assessing them as evidence** in their judgements. Instead they resorted to **knowledge points on the issue in general**. The answer would become topic based rather than what the sources have to say about a particular issue. Conclusions which make no reference to the sources are not answering the question ‘*assess how far the sources support...*’ Often some better answers **lost sight of the Sources in the final page or so**, meaning that the conclusion and judgement were limited, undermining synthesis.
- Candidates need to **spot the main thrust of argument or view in a source**. All too often they pick on a minor phrase and mistakenly make it central to their case or they allow their knowledge to overwhelm. Having spotted the main 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. Many candidates are often surprisingly naive in this respect.
- Comments on provenance need to be meaningful and linked to the use of source content.
- **Formulaic answers and 'limitation' wish-lists are to be avoided.**
- Candidates should always consider the view in the question first, and balance it with other 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
- Avoid paragraphs of bolted on knowledge starting 'From my own knowledge I know. . .'
- **The lack of evaluation** was often a key reason for underperformance. Candidates used to confine their discussions on provenance to Q(a). They now know this is crucial on Q(b), but their approach is to do so **discretely**, failing to link their discussions to the grouping and the key issue in the question. Having fallen down on analytical skills in AO1b they compound this by **failing to evaluate the source's relative contribution to the debate**. This confines them to Level 3 and below. They cannot access Levels 1 and 2 unless the source is given relative ‘value’ in its contribution to the question. Evaluation is best achieved as part of the grouping, either within it, in terms of establishing relative importance, or as part of the grouping .It should always be related to establishing its value in relation to the question.
- By tackling the sources **sequentially and discretely** candidates inevitably move into Levels 4 and below. It prevents them making the necessary links within and between sources, and with the question. Most will have a reasonable focus with some analysis and some provenance and are thus Level 3 but if they can evaluate a source and relate it to the key issue and question they will move into Level 2 and above.
- Weaker responses will often simply **describe the introductions and attributions**, as if this constitutes evaluation. It does not.
- At **Level 5 and below** there were those answers which blatantly copied out Source content sequentially, with merely an uninformative, often repetitive, assertion in relation to the topic rather than the key issue.
- Many low level answers expressed **general comments about the topic** rather than focusing on the question itself or analysing the detail of the Sources. At the lower levels, several answers stated that the author 'had an agenda' without elaborating. However, at the highest levels there were 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 moving to imbalance).
- There are still some candidates who persist in **adding a bolt on** - 'and from my own knowledge, I know that . . .' This undermines synthesis. Evidence is not linked or active in assessing 'how far *the Sources* support . . .'
- 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. Sometimes there were unintelligible, 'made-up' words. 'Bias' seems to have reappeared. Informal language is always inappropriate in an examination.

*Thus Candidates would be well advised –*

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 the 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 views 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.

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

#### **AO1: Use of knowledge, clarity of expression; structure, analysis, evaluation, judgement.**

##### **Positive points:**

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

##### **Points to work on:**

- Understanding the requirements of the question and the key issue (see above)
- Avoid rushing into writing everything you know 'ad hoc' – a concise, reasoned, considered answer is more convincing – see 'Instructions to Candidates' on the front of the exam paper!
- Planning, structure and coherence are vital for comparison in Qa) and argument in Qb)



- 'Purpose' is a useful way into evaluating for the question and will focus a candidate on the right questions.
- Use relevant evidence within the date range of the question, not from the broader topic unless it is of relevance.
- Use a 'specific, applied' approach to historical knowledge rather than 'broad brush' and bolt-on. Knowledge needs to flow from and add to the source. It should not divert into something tangential.
- Judgement, on the value of the sources as evidence, needs *support* to be convincing.

**AO2: Skills of Source analysis and evaluation; synthesis of grouped Sources with relevant knowledge in evaluation of the interpretation.**

**Positive points:**

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

**Points to work on:**

- Many responses began with a long paragraph of introduction. These were essentially pointless although they did sometimes state the groups that they would be working with, although these groups were quickly abandoned for a sequential approach in the bulk of the response.
- Subtleties in the sources were often not explored. Detail is important in what are relatively short source extracts.
- Avoid writing essays about the topic with brief nods to the Sources by letter or in brackets. This prevents evaluation of the sources 'as evidence' for the question.
- Quote full phrases, not just *part* quotes (which can distort), and explain them rather than letting them 'speak for themselves'. In turn do not copy out whole chunks!
- Analyse and *use* integrated content and provenance for argument, don't just describe.
- *Use* Sources for the question, rather than copying out their content sequentially, or paraphrasing their general gist and noting author and date.
- Judge sources beyond *face value*, in the light of context, purpose, audience, tone, typicality and remember that not all of these will apply to all the sources. Sometimes the key is the date. At other times it will be tone or typicality. Avoid a formulaic trot through all these qualities, some of which will not be there.
- Try to make meaningful comments on provenance and **link provenance to content and to the argument.**
- Avoid formulaic answers and 'limitation' wish-lists, such as 'letters from peasants' or simply 'people' and especially the desire that we include the whole of the PRO.
- In Qb) always first consider the interpretation in the question, only then use grouped or cross-referenced sources to develop other alternative views to balance the argument.
- Make an interim judgement on how convincing a group of sources are, supported by analysis and evaluation, before moving on to the opposing group
- Avoid paragraphs of bolted on knowledge starting 'From my own knowledge I know. . .' - a purely knowledge-based judgement cannot answer the question.

## Comments on Individual Questions

### F963 01

#### 1. The Normans in England 1066-1100

a). This was reasonably handled by almost all candidates, although some merely described and cross-referenced source content without explanation. Most realised that both stressed how the regents worked together, the key difference being in how their behaviour was seen, positively by William of Poitiers, negatively by Orderic Vitalis. Fewer realised that Orderic comments on how they ignored the royal instructions, whilst William stresses their devotion to the Conqueror. Better responses used justice as a key comparative issue ('Christian peace' in William; lack of impartial judgement in Orderic). Surprisingly, context was rarely used, despite the hints in William about disaffection which pointed to the context of the late 1060s and early 1070s – the conquest and the problems thrown up by it in terms of peace, rebellion and change. William's comments might be seen in that light, whereas Orderic's come from a more stable, post-conquest, period. A minority of candidates used some effective contextual knowledge, particularly on Odo of Bayeux, using his later rebellion to validate Orderic's comments, or on William's role as knight, associate of Odo and later chaplain to the Conqueror and thus more part of the tight knit Norman group around him. Most candidates made sensible, if rather general comments on provenance with a particular tendency simply to trot out the introductions on William of Poitiers and Orderic Vitalis verbatim rather than using them to relate to content. Much was made of the dates, although for some this became 'stock' in approach. Judgement, invariably based on a preference for Orderic's mixed background, was rarely developed.

b). Responses here suffered from much simple identification of content which was seen as supporting the statement of success in controlling both kingdom and duchy. Evaluation was rare. Interestingly, very few candidates felt the need to have separate sections on the two Williams or to talk about Normandy and England separately. Those who did so tended to fare better as they compared and contrasted the different experiences at different times and in different places, arguing that the Conqueror had more success in controlling both England and Normandy, his son having difficulties with Normandy. Surprisingly few candidates made use of the obvious point that the Conqueror had bequeathed Normandy to Rufus' elder brother Robert and control there would be a matter of contesting this, as C, D and E made clear. Knowledge to assess the sources was sparse in many cases (on the deal over Maine for example in D, or of Odo's behaviour, later dealt with by the Conqueror, but released in time to plot against Rufus) and even less was integrated in helping to validate or challenge the sources as evidence. Some candidates wrote descriptively about what each monarch did in Normandy and England without fully getting to grips with the exact nature of the question of 'control' or the attempt to effect it. The case for successful control was usually seen as being demonstrated by Sources A, B and E, with C and D challenging it in the case of Rufus and Normandy, but better responses could see that A might hide some real problems (William's absence from England with contemporary post-conquest rebellions, hinted at in that each had to bring 'swift aid' to the other), that B could be seen as William's Anglo/Norman barons running amok or that C and D demonstrated persistence on the part of Rufus in prizing Normandy from Robert. Although E might suggest final control of Normandy it also suggests that this came quite late, in 1097, and perhaps owed more to Robert's desire to go on crusade than anything else. Thus more effective responses highlighted the nuances present in the sources and the potential of the post-Rufus sources, C, D and E, not to see his control as a given. Only a few responses pointed out that B, C, D and E were all written later, in the reign of the troublesome Henry, the youngest brother, indisputably ruler of both territories. They may look over-favourably on the two Williams given that Robert had been imprisoned by Henry but reading between the lines Rufus clearly had great difficulty in controlling Normandy for most of his reign. Not all responses used the information given in D as to the problem posed by the younger brother Henry.

## 2. Mid-Tudor Crises 1536-1569

**a).** The provenance of the sources was generally used well here, although not all candidates realised that Source C was the Privy Council (probably Somerset) who were responding on Edward's behalf rather than the boy king himself. If they didn't then it led to inappropriate comment on Edward's weakness in comparison to his father. However, a number of candidates used appropriate knowledge to contextualise the response to rebel grievance. Comments were made on the tone - ie that both felt aggrieved at the challenge to their authority. Most candidates pointed out how each claimed they had already done things to address grievance, Henry by rather perversely arguing he had eliminated corruption in monasteries (not the point at issue for the rebels) and was taxing to defend, whilst the Privy Council for Edward pointed to price proclamations and enclosure commissioners. Most also commented that such responses demonstrated the Council was more prone to concede than Henry, but fewer were able to explain this using context – that Henry was at the height of his powers with a rebellion yet to slip out of control and widen in scope to the whole north, whilst Edward and his Council were experiencing a royal minority with economic crisis, rebellion across England and war with both France and Scotland. Most pointed to Henry's aggression in comparison to the Privy Council's more conciliatory response. Not many picked up on how parliament fitted into the government response, Henry selectively using it to justify dissolution and the statute of uses, the Council arguing they had to wait until the next one before rents could be reduced by statute. Most judged Henry in A to be the better evidence on the grounds of his maturity as an adult king and the context of his comments.

**b).** Most candidates capably considered economic/social causes as against religious, and to a lesser extent, political grievances (the succession and royal marriage). There was much in the sources pointing to these grievances, although most realised that Source C was exclusively social and economic. The other sources were more mixed, particularly A and B. Most candidates linked A, B and C together for social and economic causes and then D and E linking to other political and religious factors. Better candidates realised that in focusing on certain aspects A and B might be hiding grievances that were more unpalatable to the authorities, especially Henry in A. Other candidates missed the chance to create different groupings by putting A and B with other sources. Candidates all either agreed or disagreed – thus giving them a chance to achieve level 3 but there was a significant minority of candidates who, rather than discussing the extent to which the sources backed the interpretation, considered the actual rebellions themselves. Sources were then used to provide illustration of their narrative and the response became more of a general essay on the causes of rebellion than an assessment of the sources provided. Knowledge was all too frequently not integrated and some made foolish factual mistakes – that Northumberland was to marry Mary Queen of Scots, that Wyatt was a catholic or that Source A was part way through the Pilgrimage of Grace rather than at the start. This question also provided a good illustration of how sources can sometimes be interpreted superficially. Source D for example, Renard's comments to Charles V on Wyatt's rebellion, suggested to the Emperor that the real reason for rebellion was religion and the succession rather than opposition to Mary's marriage to his son Phillip, a key imperial project. Whilst many rightly considered that the provenance would suggest he would be anxious to downplay the anti-Spanish marriage aspect and instead suggest religion, few considered his rather nonsensical remarks about the French, Scots and Danes joining in. Such rumours swirling around diplomatic circles in London were clearly unfounded and could have been used to question his evidence. Candidates tended to be weaker in assessing social grievances, although some impressive comment was seen on the great chain of being, linked particularly to sources A, B and C. Similarly it was rarer to see any distinction being made between the commoners who seem to figure in A, B and C and the gentry/nobles who appear in D and E, or to hint at probable authorship of the grievances in the first three sources (gentry, clergy, etc).

### 3. The English Civil War and Interregnum 1637-60

a). This was generally reasonably well answered with the majority of candidates recognising the importance of the dates and provenance of the sources in assessing the King's willingness to negotiate. However, some candidates did not grasp that they implied unwillingness as well. Willingness then became the focus of the answer. Some thought Charles supported Presbyterianism in A and thus claimed a similarity with the content of C. A key weakness was not to compare what Charles and Parliament were negotiating over – a religious settlement, control of the army, the distribution of power and reconciliation post-civil war. In 'A' Charles appears unwilling to discuss these issues and is going to delay and dissemble; in 'C' he concedes with important provisos, rarely picked up on in responses (that a Presbyterian government is accepted for only 3 years; his own ministers to have an input; an exception to be made for his own household's religious practices, etc). These would suggest that he was delaying, as would the fact that this is his 3<sup>rd</sup> answer to the Newcastle Propositions, another introductory point missed by many. Most considered Charles in A to be the better evidence for the issue on the grounds of a private response opening his thinking to a beloved wife in exile, but the provenance of Source C was less well-handled by most candidates who failed to see it as a formal record, a statement without comment or opinion on what the king seemed to be saying. Instead the House of Commons was seen as an unreliable source given the war with the King, missing the word 'records' and thus the utility of the source as an official answer read out to the Commons and tailored to an audience of MPs to enable Charles to claw back as much power as possible. Nonetheless, most candidates could see that Charles was unwilling in A but prepared to consider terms in C and could see that the context and dates were important in explaining this apparent difference.

b). Most responses were reasonably focused and established the alternative of royal intransigence in A and C to that of divisions amongst his opponents in B, D and E as the reason for failed negotiations. Fewer candidates were able to see that sources C and E might serve both views, or to pick up on the Scottish aspects of the negotiations evident in A, D and E. Some candidates were confused by the "divisions amongst the king's opponents" and talked about why the King was opposed to his enemies but responses were generally balanced. Some found it hard to hold together an argument. Others struggled with the crucial difference between Independents in the Army and Parliamentary Presbyterianism. It was important to grasp this if effective use was to be made of B, D and E. Provenance was mixed. Few candidates challenged the evidence of division provided in Source B, where Edwards is clearly an outspoken and emotive critic (not many used the unusual title of his pamphlet) of the army and its views (some tied themselves in knots over his comment on whether the independents were opposed to Presbyterian government, missing his point that they objected to any form of traditional government). Many candidates also underused the emotive and Scottish tone of D which was similar to B, although it also provides evidence of the 'king's wilfulness'. Many commented on the provenance of Source E, but often simply stated the provenance rather than using it to support an argument. Much could be seen as hearsay in E, re army quarrels within themselves and with Parliament, but it is useful to see how the King might react to these – bitterly! Not many candidates looked objectively at the sources supporting divisions amongst opponents. They were all highly subjective and could be seen either as unreliable or as good evidence for precisely such divisions. The case for the King's role was usually confined to Sources A and C, although more effective responses also used E, which cast further doubt on Charles' sincerity. Some candidates usefully commented that it had been written under the Restoration, and used their knowledge of Charles' belief in divine right, to explain his continued obstinacy over negotiations. Others misused their knowledge to discuss matters outside the scope of the question - Prides Purge appeared a lot but as it was outside the dates it was not used well.

**F963 02**

**1. The Condition of England 1815-1853.**

**a).** Candidates drew out a number of similarities between the sources, such as the act's negative impact on the general population and its harmful effect on the radical cause. Many were less effective in pointing to the differences, Hetherington in A largely seeing the act from the vantage point of a government-devised stratagem to reinforce the existing system to the disadvantage of the people, whilst Hunt in B took a more strategic and logical view on the situation 3 years later. More effective responses suggested that the act was intended to preserve the status quo by maintaining the position of the upper and middle classes through suppressing the 'rising spirit of democracy' amongst those belonging to the lower classes. Many candidates recognized that Hunt, in B, was more concerned with the impact of the act – and some candidates were able to attribute this difference to the provenance of the two sources, in particular the date. Some candidates made good use of the steer provided for A and were able to evaluate its provenance fairly successfully: on the one hand, Hetherington, as one of those men responsible for drafting the charter, would naturally have a clearer perspective on the act; on the other, his involvement might have prejudiced his views on the act. Some were more effective on Hunt in B, aware of his leading role on the radicalism of the preceding generation and able to bring that perspective to bear on his approach to the Reform Act. Weaker responses misinterpreted A by not recognizing Hetherington's sarcasm. Thus, in these answers, A's view on the act ('great measure') was seen as positive rather than negatively ironic. This might have been because these candidates expected the sources to represent opposing views when in this case they are similar but simply adopting different perspectives, Hetherington a purely political analysis, Hunt both a political and economic one, aware of the linkage between politics and issues of 'labour, wages and profit'. Most candidates judged both to be of equal value, although fewer could outline precisely why they thought this.

**b).** Responses were generally fairly effective (with most grouping A and B against C, D and E) but some answers were fairly narrow, a result of candidates interpreting some of the sources rather simplistically. For example a fair few responses did not acknowledge that some sources (such as D) contained evidence for the interpretation (political origins) as well as evidence for economic motivations. The sources can bear a variety of interpretations. Thus Stephens in D could be seen as political (universal suffrage) or economic and social in his insistence that the main end of Chartism was to provide for 'home and hearth'. This is a famous speech – that Chartism was a 'knife and fork question' - yet many responses seemed unaware of the significance of the phrase and rarely used it in their answers. Indeed, this question provides a good example of where candidates might try to group the sources by theme rather than simply by whether they agree or disagree with the interpretation. Another case was the use of Kydd in C. Many saw this as political in that the new Poor law was a government-imposed measure on the disfranchised poor, whose rights were being removed. The Charter was to ensure these poor had a say. However, as an issue, poverty and the poor laws were social and the mobilization against it, so evident in this source, was a major way into the Chartism of the ensuing years. Much more could have been made by many candidates of C's provenance – Kydd was the secretary to Oastler, a key Tory paternalist and campaigner on factory and poor law issues (no mention was made of the Anti-Poor Law League), both social and economic matters. The provenance of E, Pilling's trial, tempted some into comments on the conduct of trials – that courtrooms witnessed truth and thus Pilling's evidence could be believed. It probably could, but not for this reason. More plausible were those who argued that Pilling's position as a power loom weaver and striker, and also Kydd in C, might provide a way into assessing ordinary chartists and their motivation, in contrast to the traditional radical leadership in A, B and D who may be more political in their approach. In combination with the date, 1843, linked to the context of the great depression, this might suggest that the origins for most lay with economic issues – wages, 10 hours and the New Poor Law. Oddly, very few mentioned the terms of the Charter – good contextual evidence of the political origins of Chartism, but perhaps they were rightly wanting to focus on the sources which made no mention of the terms. Some concepts are crucial to this

Unit and need to be understood – universal suffrage for example does not mean universal suffering.

## 2. The Age of Gladstone and Disraeli 1865-1886

a). Candidates found comparison fairly straightforward, largely because the sources clearly presented opposing views – even from the same debate, which was in Committee (the detail) rather than, as most said, on the floor of the Commons itself. Where many responses faltered was in evaluating the detail and using the sources as evidence in relation to the interpretation. Comments on provenance were generally stock and rather simplistic: Lowe, for example, as an opponent of Disraeli, would naturally disagree with him, and vice versa. The liberal critique of Lowe was rarely developed. Such undeveloped comments made it difficult to award marks above L3 for AO2. Most could comment on the similarities, particularly the popularity of the purchase, a matter acknowledged by Lowe, in A. Fewer candidates were able to spot the imperial vision or that both recognized Gladstone would not have gone through with it. Surprisingly, given the gloss, not many made much of Lowe's key point on share purchase and whether the government had, in practice, gained much control over the canal. Similarly only better responses saw how Disraeli had moved the goalposts by not addressing Lowe's concerns, instead arguing for purchase on grounds of imperial strategy. Again relatively few candidates compared the respective views on a possibly emerging Egyptian empire, something Disraeli is circumspect about but Lowe is certain may have been one of the objects behind purchase. Too many candidates referred to Disraeli actually purchasing the canal itself as opposed to shares in it – this wasn't penalized, but it clearly isn't correct, and did suggest – to a certain extent – that candidates hadn't fully understood the issue. Indeed weaker responses were uncertain as to whether the Suez Canal was good for British interests or not.

b). There were some effective answers to this question – candidates were able to identify which sources showed Disraeli's weakness in imperial policy (A and parts of C and D) and which highlighted potential strengths (B, E and elements of C and D). Better answers recognized that D could be interpreted either way: Disraeli's decisiveness highlighted strength, but the fact that his ministers were attempting to undermine or challenge him suggested weakness. The Cabinet was far from united on the Afghanistan issue, although few pointed out that this sort of debate could be quite normal and could indicate either a robust attitude to imperial policy or a weak and divided one. Many candidates were able to evaluate E effectively, in that although it suggested strength, when the context of events in South Africa (the Zulu war and British defeat at Isandlwana) are taken into account it actually pointed to the weakness of Disraeli's foreign policy, particularly confederation as applied to southern Africa. Less contextual knowledge was displayed on Afghanistan, despite the hints over the issues and stances adopted in C, D and even E. Most candidates also highlighted a weakness in provenance with sources B, C and D: all three were written by Disraeli and so should be treated with caution, especially the public one B and that reported to the Queen in D. Four were from highly placed Conservatives. In reference to D, some candidates were able to comment on Disraeli's good relationship with the queen, and suggested that his account of the meeting might have been shaped by a desire to impress her, his final decisive comments on military preparations being typical in this respect. C should have been very easy to handle in relation to this question, but some candidates struggled to interpret it correctly. More effective responses could either show that he was distancing himself from a too 'forward' Lytton over India and Afghanistan or comment that he had appointed him in the first place knowing that he might take such initiatives. Fewer candidates than we had expected seemed aware of Disraeli's aims in imperial affairs or of the liberal critique of this, evident in Source A. Indeed Lowe's comments were under-used. He pointed to unnecessary expense, a reactive policy that was ill thought-through and a pandering to the press and popular opinion. Weaker responses tended to drift from the key issue of weakness towards one on 'successes' or were hampered by weak contextual knowledge, important in assessing sources like D and E.

### 3. England and a New Century 1900-1924

**a).** Responses here were mixed. Whilst many candidates were able to recognize the principal difference between the two sources – that although both authors wanted the same thing (to preserve the House of Lords as an institution), the Duke of Northumberland favoured rejecting the bill outright, but Curzon urged caution on the grounds that with Peer creation they would be swamped anyway. Better to let it pass, avoid peer creation and live to fight liberal legislation another day. Better answers attributed these perspectives to the provenance of each source: Curzon's perspective belongs to a later stage in the negotiations when the issue of peer creation had raised its head. Northumberland was making his point at the beginning of the crisis. Weaker candidates were unaware of this important context or of the process of a Bill via readings, referred to in the introductions to C and D. They thus found it difficult to explain the differences of approach. Some candidates tried to make use of Curzon's apparently 'atypical' or contradictory view (contradictory in terms of his allegiance to the Conservatives), but to do so reflected a less careful reading of the source and a poorer grasp of context, as noted above. Curzon was – above all – trying to preserve the traditional make-up and role of the House of Lords as was Northumberland, who justifies it more thoroughly and emotively than Curzon in his more pragmatic speech. Judgment was a matter of deciding who might be more typical of Tory peer reaction and some used the context of the Bills passing without creation to opt for Curzon. Others decided Northumberland better-represented real feeling amongst Tory peers. Little was known of the latter's background, although this was not expected.

**b).** For a fair few candidates, the interpretation within this question (a 'matter of principle') presented difficulties and examiners were instructed to apply leniency. The abstract concept of a principle (democratic or otherwise) defeated them, although the other options in the sources were grasped more effectively – power and a programme of new liberal legislation. Often, weaker responses offered little more than an assessment of whether the reform of the Lords was a good or bad thing. Such responses were basic and less convincing. It was not uncommon to find some unusual grouping of sources, largely owing to the difficulties in interpreting what a 'principle' might mean in relation to the sources provided. Most candidates opted for a grouping of A and B for 'principle', although they sometimes struggled to make it fit with the politics discussed by the two sources and C, D and E for the alternative of ambition and power, although they struggled again to make them fit (did E suggest the Liberals pursued a principle in wanting to destroy hereditary privilege in the Lords?). Candidates could not always clearly link each source to the question (D in particular, since some candidates were preoccupied by its apparent 'atypicality'). Source C was often interpreted as reflective of the reform as a matter of principle. At first sight, such an interpretation appeared strange; but with closer consideration, it is logical to argue that since Northumberland was opposing the bill as a matter of principle, it had, in fact, been presented to the Lords in that way. Others dismissed Source C as not relevant to the question. More effective responses did precisely that and were able to use the sources in genuinely interesting ways. A real discriminator was Bonar Law in Source E, provided candidates possessed sufficient contextual knowledge. Bonar Law's argument could be seen in two ways. He could be arguing that the liberals were proceeding on the principle of destroying the power of the Lords, as implied at the beginning of his comments, but he went on to argue that this was a devious liberal tactic to preserve its dwindling majority by appeasing Redmond's Home Rule Irish who had always been thwarted by the Lord's veto, now no more. It was surprising how few candidates either picked up on the more extreme view in this source – that the Liberal government were a revolutionary committee who had seized despotic power by sleight of hand – or its famous context, the infamous Blenheim Palace speech where Bonar Law appeared to condone Ulster's armed resistance to the 3<sup>rd</sup> Home Rule Bill, now to become law in 1914. Few used his comment that the Liberals had not put forward Home Rule as an electoral issue in either of the 1910 elections and there might thus be substance to his view. Source A was rarely evaluated or explained in terms of possible principle and nor was its provenance despite the helpful steer. However, for some candidates simply the terms and concepts used in the sources were challenging as was the chronology of Budget, elections, Parliament Bill and

after. For example, there was confusion over the use of the term 'Tory' in Source B, considered a different party to the Conservatives, and over whether the Budget led to the Bill (it did not, having been passed before the 2<sup>nd</sup> 1910 election).

#### 4. Churchill 1920-1945.

a). The sources contained both similarities and differences. Candidates were able to identify the broad difference between them: that despite both claiming Churchill worked hard to cultivate friendship between Britain and Russia, in E, Churchill had clearly become anxious about Stalin's ambitions in Eastern and South Eastern Europe. They were often less effective on more detailed points of comparison. Better responses used context here to evaluate E: the unlikely union of Britain and Soviet Russia had been based on the objective of defeating the common enemy of Nazi Germany. Once the Nazi threat had subsided, as it had at the time of the writing of E, the shallowness of the relationship was exposed, particularly as E was post Yalta (February 1945) and A pre. Some answers offered a strained interpretation of A in which its tone ('don't let us get at cross purposes . . .') suggested Churchill's anxiety, as in E. These answers claimed therefore that the sources were very similar, when in fact they were not. Contextual knowledge was usually effective, although many responses included too much of what can only be described as tangential knowledge (Churchill's career in the 1920s), which was not always linked to the question. Churchill's attitude towards the general strike and his actions in relation to Tonyandy, for example, are certainly relevant up to a point; but candidates didn't do enough to link this information to the question and frequently wrote too extensively upon it. More effective responses made the point that Churchill in E seemed to be complaining about what he had agreed to in A via the Percentages Agreement and noted a hint of the 'naughty agreement' there in the reference to 'excepting Greece'. Some eschewed the opportunities for comparison on specific issues relating to the USSR (on Soviet armies, on different parts of Central and Eastern Europe, on precise areas of the Balkans, etc). Judgment usually favoured E as the better source for Churchill's attitude to the USSR on grounds of provenance (date and the special relationship) although some pointed to the need to get the new President, Truman, on side as a conditioning factor on what was said. Much was made of the memoir aspect of A re unreliability. For some its provenance confused as they were not sure whether to treat comments in Churchill's book as a contemporary source or not.

Few candidates pointed out that to admit to such a 'naughty' deal, with its coy references at the height of the Cold war ('might it not be thought cynical') gives Source A an authentic feel.

b). The question was focused on the realism or otherwise of Churchill's handling of wartime relations with the USSR 1944-5 and was generally answered well – knowledge of Churchill and his career was, overall, better known and understood than knowledge of the other topics. Some candidates offered fairly dubious interpretations of 'realism', as they had with 'principle' in Q3, which led to some rather unusual and unexpected groupings of sources. Weaker responses diverted to a question on whether Churchill's policy to the USSR was successful rather than realistic, preferring to substitute 'failure' for 'unrealistic'. In order to answer this question effectively, candidates needed fairly sound contextual knowledge. E, for example, as noted above, was usually evaluated well, because candidates recognised its timing towards the end of the war, although many were uncertain where to place it (most cited it as evidence of an unrealistic attitude on the grounds that Churchill's friendship to the USSR was misplaced but it could equally be used to demonstrate a clear understanding of the USSR and the need to co-opt the US into standing up to it). Similarly the need to appease Stalin at different points because of his vital role in the war effort against Nazi Germany, as reflected in A, B, C and D, was acknowledged, and better answers were able to locate each source in its context and evaluate its view accordingly. It was not uncommon to find reference to the strained nature of the relationship as a result of Churchill's reluctance to open up a second front before the D-Day landings although too many seemed to think this had yet to happen (the question related to the period from December 1944 to May 1945). Weaker responses tended to offer superficial views of the sources: A, for example, suggested a lack of realism because Churchill wanted to the burn



the paper on which the agreement had been drawn up (clearly less accurate). Such answers lacked depth, a feature that is illustrative of the need for contextual knowledge demanded by this question. Most candidates grouped A, D and less certainly E for the 'realism' argument and B, C and less certainly E for a lack of realism. This certainly worked for most but in handling some of the sources subtleties and caveats were missed. Thus, in placing Source C for an argument that Churchill lacked realism, only a minority of candidates picked up that McEwen admitted that most saw Yalta as 'realistic and necessary for our interests'. With B some missed the opportunity to assess Nigel Knight through the controversial title of his book given in the attribution. For most, as an historian writing from hindsight and with access to everything, he must be right, even though he omits any consideration of the context within which Churchill worked – the war, British concerns in the Mediterranean, etc. Similarly in E many thought that because Churchill was writing to an ally it must be the truth. Source D could be used either way – some noted its desperate tone (pleading and admitting that to support the Curzon line had 'startled' the world and appeared unrealistic); others stressed that this was realistic given Russian military occupation of the territory in question. Those who could assess the sources through their own knowledge were at an advantage here. Specific provenance was well discussed, albeit often discretely, with more effective responses commenting that potential pro realism views could be found in A, D and E, all from Churchill himself, with those that questioned this were his opponents, contemporary and modern - a useful point to make and develop.

## **F964/01**

### **1. The First Crusade and the Crusader States 1073-1130**

**a).** This question was generally answered well, apart from a minority who still describe or sequence the sources. More attention seemed to be given to provenance over content and was mostly based on authorship and date with effective responses pointing to the hindsight nature of both C and D (a joint awareness of hostility that may colour both their accounts of Alexius' character). Many answers had elements of formulaic evaluation even though credit was given to the general points made that were relevant. Many also drifted into 'attitude' rather than 'character', and there were some oddly savage dismissals of Alexius as a cruel tyrant without supporting knowledge. Other candidates missed the key issue entirely and referred only to relations with the crusaders, the thrust of Qb). They failed to link the evidence in both sources to Alexius' character – was he devious, diplomatic, angry, generous, wise or honourable? Both sources had much to say on these characteristics. Source D was usually seen as the more useful and reliable source, but there was the odd emphatic supporter of William of Malmesbury, who dismissed Anna as lying to protect her father. It was surprising how many responses took William of Malmesbury's evidence in Source C at face value. Rivers were not poisoned and William of Poitou did not even go on Crusade. The whole 1<sup>st</sup> Crusade didn't amount to much more than about 70,000 men so the loss of 60,000 in one ambush is hardly credible. One would have thought candidates would have picked up on such obvious exaggerations or use the interesting comment on 'snares for Behemond' to link William to those who were clearly suspicious of Alexius and the Byzantines. In contrast Anna's evidence is clearly more measured and balanced as to her father's approach – Crusaders 'supplied but watched carefully'.

**b).** Most responses here were effective to varying degrees. More successful answers used the chronology of the sources to good effect, arguing for an initial reasonable Byzantine and Crusader relationship that deteriorated from the arrival of Peter the Hermit's People's Crusade in 1096 (a good use of the Gesta in B). Most grouped B, C and D for hostility and A and E for caution or even some cordiality, especially if they noted the earlier context of A and E. More effective responses realised the nuances contained in Sources like the Gesta (B) which could be used as the key turning point in relations by those who spotted its evidence for Alexius' provision of a market and his sage advice to Peter followed by anger at the ensuing theft and looting. This was balanced evidence from a Frankish source for those able to comment on it. Some made distinctions as to who may be responsible for the hostility, Byzantine or Crusader, although such comment was dangerously tangential to the question. Many candidates took Source A as 'Pope

Urban' rather than Gregory and didn't question the date or circumstances of its creation. Above all, this and Source B (the Gesta as noted above) were the sources the handling of which marked out the more informed and able responses. Sources A and E were frequently linked but more perceptive responses pointed out that these two sources referred to the pre 1<sup>st</sup> crusade period from 1074 to 1095 and were offering views on the relationship between Byzantium ('the great Greek Empire' of Source A) and the West in the face of Turkish attack. Some perceptive provenance points were seen on Source A to the effect that Gregory's 'Call' hid much in terms of his political and religious objectives (the Investiture controversy, the need to distract and his concern to have influence over the Eastern Church following the Great Schism) which may detract from his evidence for a supportive relationship between East and West. Similarly on E there were important clues to be picked up on relationships – on the existence of 'tensions', on Church disputes, on the Byzantine habit of relying on western mercenaries and the context for Alexius' eventual appeal at Piacenza in 1095. Many weaker responses did not focus clearly on hostility, but merely analysed and compared the sources in an unfocused manner. Others did not specify the alternative view, merely mentioning 'unhostility' without specifying co-operation or support. Some twisted the focus of the question to 'reasons for hostility and attributed blame to the Crusaders or Alexius, comparing and judging which were more responsible. This sometimes led to a four-viewed argument. There were also instances of candidates writing an answer structured by compared content, followed by discrete compared provenance for each of the views they discussed. They lost sight of the question. When sources were used for more than one view, eg Source D, the comments on provenance were repeated, to no great effect. The best responses used a range of well-chosen knowledge to aid their evaluation of content as well as provenance. For example, as mentioned in the (a) comments, the claim in Source C that Alexius 'poisoned the rivers' could be refuted using knowledge, as could the reliability of William of Malmesbury's views in light of his links to Bohemond and relevant events concerning Bohemond's dealings with Alexius.

### **The German Reformation 1517-1555**

**a).** When candidates, perhaps most, focused on the key issue of Pope Leo X's attitude towards Luther and found links between the sources, an effective response ensued. However, some candidates produced a general analysis or focused more on Luther's actions than Leo X's attitudes. Many either linked the caring, 'fatherly' point between the two sources **or** the 'good-for-nothing', stubborn link, but far fewer used both effectively. Many did not compare like with like and cross-referenced 'good-for-nothing' with 'fatherly' as a similarity, ignoring the differences. The most common problem was that weaker responses took Source E at face value, forgetting that this was a document which would expel Luther from the Church in 60 days' time and sentence him to burning at the stake as a heretic – hardly a friendly, caring attitude! Many candidates judged E as the kinder and more reliable source, missing the importance of its propaganda role – the Pope was publically cataloguing care and concern up to that very point of condemnation and proscription as a heretic to be seen to appear bending over backwards to accommodate Luther in the eyes of Christendom. Some well-informed answers mentioned the role of Frederick the Wise and the imperial election in evaluating the concerns in Source B where Leo's real attitude is revealed as harsh, with a veneer of paternalism, arguably confirmed in more politic tones in E. The approach in B was seen as a response to Frederick's influence in the Empire and fears of the election of a Habsburg Holy Roman Emperor who might damage Papal power in Italy. Many answers noted the tone of E as using hindsight, referring back to the event in Source B and following the publication of Luther's 3 Great Works. Some went further and progressed to Luther's burning of the Bull in December 1520 and some even reached the Knights and Peasant s' Wars, the Colloquy of Marburg, the Schmalkaldic War and the 1555 Peace of Augsburg. Such candidates seemed to wish to off-load hard learned information, irrelevant though it was. There was also some development of the 'simple folk' as opposed to 'false rumours of evil men' one of whom was named by some, irrelevantly and inaccurately, as Erasmus. Most judged B to be the better evidence for Leo's attitude on the grounds of its privy nature.

**b).** There were some outstanding answers to this question, full of evaluation and excellent use of very pertinent knowledge. However, there were also some overly-complex answers which structured their argument according to - Luther did want peaceful settlement, the Pope did, they both did, followed by Luther didn't, Leo didn't, Leo did but Luther didn't, Luther did but Leo didn't wish to settle the dispute peacefully. Such an approach often unravelled. A simpler version of their views, perhaps conditioned by date and chronology, was more sensible. Often this meant using Source A with C to argue a case for Luther wishing to settle peacefully, evaluating the sources using knowledge and evaluating them at face value with clues such as 'I submit to the judgement of the Church and those better informed' in light of Luther's views reported in Source D. The counter argument that Pope Leo wished to settle peacefully was best represented in Sources B and E, evaluated at face value using knowledge of the pressures on Leo to allow a hearing in Germany and of the nature and impact of Source E as the Bull of excommunication. Source D then supported the counter argument, which revealed Leo's real opinions in sources B and E in light of Luther's stubborn actions and anti-papal publications between 1518 and 1520. Those who went further, to Luther's statement at the Diet of Worms, were technically outside the date range, but often made very valid points of evaluation about Luther's true opinions too. Better responses concluded that there was a change in attitude when Luther began to submit himself to disputations which confirmed that he had similar opinions to Jan Hus, so there was then no going back. Those disputations were often designed, as Eck's in D, to reveal Luther's heresy. However, many answers also saw a tendency to use Source D in isolation rather than as one of a group of sources. Although many candidates took Source A at face value and used evidence to make their case that Luther never claimed to provoke confrontation with Rome, there was some very convincing use of evidence to support the opposite view, including his letters to prominent figures such as Albert of Mainz at the time of writing the 95 Theses.

## **F964 02**

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

**a).** The most effective responses were those that understood that the reform of the Guilds and the parlement's resistance to it were symptomatic of a wider struggle over reform in general, the basis of the question – 'issues of reform', 1776 to 1789. However, most candidates focussed on the Guilds alone in their comparison and this worked up to a point. Most candidates understood that the sources expressed different views on Trade Guilds, although a small number did oddly conclude that both A and B were opposed to them. "Long apprenticeships" was commonly contrasted with "An apprenticeship scarcely trained..." More effective responses recognised that both sources referred to the authority of the master, and were able to explain this similarity, albeit by drawing different conclusions on its impact. Some responses picked up on Source A's reference to the exclusion of women, and most of these stated that Source B did not mention them. From a comparison point of view, most candidates did not seem to know what to do with the reference to the Lieutenant General of Police despite the steer in the introduction. In terms of provenance a surprisingly large number of candidates were very unsure of the nature and role of the Paris parlement. Some seemed to assume it was the same as the British Parliament, where ministers sat and was thus part of the government. This made some of their comparisons of provenance or evaluation uncertain, although most understood the vested interests involved. Candidates had more difficulty with seeing how parlement could then also pose as champions of progress and liberty, even though this was typical of the debate pre 1789. A proportion of candidates saw B as being representative of ordinary opinion. Apart from this, provenance was handled well. For Source A the majority of candidates were able to contextualise it in terms of France's financial and economic problems, the latter a particular concern of Turgot's, although they were not unanimous as to the extent of these difficulties. There was a tendency to conflate the problems of the whole reign with those at the beginning (where the focus of these two sources, pre the American war, lay).

**b).** Overall the chosen groupings were very consistent (ACD v BE), and the sources, with the exception of B (see above) and E, were generally well understood and interpreted. Some candidates diverted tangentially into royal responsibility for France's problems, putting forward a grouping based on the King's culpability. This was usually a mistaken approach. Weaker responses diverted into a 'factors causing the French revolution' approach, focusing on whether ministers or Louis were responsible for it. Very few candidates identified a counter-thesis that the ministers did not serve the king well by provoking opposition from the parlements and the second estate. However, within the groupings, the approach to Source C varied. Most used it to support the key issue, but more effective responses rightly questioned its reliability using their own knowledge of Necker having 'cooked the books', a good example of an appropriate use of knowledge to question what was said in the source. Such candidates were thus able to use it to develop the counter argument. Some decided to group C with B & E, and in these instances the benefit of hindsight regarding Necker's sacking played a larger part in the interpretation than a questioning of the source's face value. To a much lesser extent, contextual knowledge influenced the interpretation of Sources A & B. Surprisingly few made much of context in assessing Calonne in D to question whether the king was best served by seeking approval from the very groups most adversely affected by a general land tax or picked up on his reference to previous 'attempts in part' to tackle reform and avert crisis, an opportunity to cross reference with A and C. Candidates were either prepared to accept sound service on the evidence of the ministers in A, C and D or pointed to the mistakes of Turgot, Necker and Calonne and their self-justifications in the sources and their ultimate fate, if known. As in Q(a) a precise interpretation of the provenance of the parlement in B hindered argument with many responses taking what was said at face value, or thinking the views expressed came from the lower ends of the Third Estate rather than from a carefully orchestrated defence of tradition and privilege couched in terms of 'arbitrary decisions and popular ills from the higher ends. Source E created some difficulties because of the three dates associated with it (as a Journal it started in 1764, referred to 1789, but was published in 1803), as less effective responses struggled with evaluation and determining whether the source was "primary" or something else. Many candidates also struggled with placing its author – was a glassmaker a lowly artisan or a master craftsman – in relation to the debate and particularly his views. Was he linked to the Paris parlement given his opinion that the revolution was supposed to return rights to the parlement or was his reference to 'to those who called themselves the fathers of the people' ironic in the context of 1803? Did he represent the first phase of the revolution or its later more extreme one? Not all plumped for Source E's obvious reference to ministerial corruption, pleasure, ambition and general ineptitude (the latter a potential cue for cross referencing to Calonne in D).

## **2. The Unification of Italy 1815-70**

**a).** Most candidates focused on Garibaldi's leadership qualities well. The less well focused drifted to a general comparison, missing the focus on Garibaldi's leadership, both military and political. The word "admirable" in both sources was invariably latched onto, as were references to Garibaldi's courage. There was less consensus as to whether the description of Garibaldi as "more like a chief" had positive or negative connotations. The majority of scripts highlighted the key difference ("lacks none of the qualities" versus "deficient in those...supposed to be essential in a good general") although very few considered the ambiguity of Dandolo's comment. Did he mean it in an admiring sense, intending it as a comment on the stilted approach of conventional, often aristocratic, generals? Some took this as praise for the tactics which had won him fame in South America. Others, more rarely, spotted that the diary entry was before the heroic fighting retreat from Rome in 1849. More candidates successfully pointed out that Dandolo would not have said this after 1860 when B was written, particularly after the battle of Volturno when he commanded large forces very competently for the first time. Some candidates misread A's description of Garibaldi's use of peasant clothing, seeing this as Garibaldi dressing up like a peasant in order to show he was a man of the people. At the lower levels, provenance was often rather 'stock' (the first hand nature of Source A, the Swiss writer in B being an outsider) but more effective responses were able to contextualise the sources in terms of Garibaldi's exploits in order to support their interpretation, particularly the failed defence of the Roman republic against

the French in A in contrast to a much later account of Garibaldi, at the height of his success in ‘liberating’ Naples, in B. Most candidates preferred Dandelo’s evidence in A on grounds of balance and eyewitness status. Monnier in B was rarely seen as being rather over the top in his praise of Garibaldi’s qualities. Some saw this to be the consequence of his Swiss origins – as a nation they were neutral and this extended to citizens like Monnier – others took it to be simply because Garibaldi’s deserved such unreserved praise. Candidates were divided as to whether Monnier was an eyewitness, as Dandelo clearly was, or whether he was simply part of the liberal academic world that confirmed Garibaldi’s heroic mid-19<sup>th</sup> century status.

**b).** Groupings were very consistent on this question, (A, B and E versus C and D), although A, B & D were often used in both groupings by the more discerning. Most candidates managed to grasp the key hook in the question – ‘by all’. They were able to spot the comment in B that landlords and officials did not admire Garibaldi and indeed feared him, the comment in A that his military abilities in some circumstances were not universally admired, and the counter comment in D that the people clearly admired him as they appeared to be worshipping him as a saint. Effective responses were able to point to a division in terms of how Garibaldi was seen – popular amongst the people, much less so amongst those in authority, political, civic, social and religious. Although most candidates understood that the sentiments expressed in Source C were those of Victor Emmanuel and not the British ambassador, others tied themselves into knots trying to explain why a pro-unification British ambassador would be so negative about its greatest hero. They disappeared into a cul de sac of obscure analysis – a very good example of the need to read introductions with care. There was some sound contextual knowledge. Source D in particular produced some very effective contextualization across all levels and many saw its use for both sides of the argument. Nonetheless, for a minority of candidates, a cartoon is nothing more than crude propaganda and it was dismissed as such, a shame given its richness for this particular question. However, apart from Hudson in C and the cartoon in D, for some candidates discussion of provenance tended towards a rather ‘stock’ approach. For example the reliability of Source E was generally questioned along the lines of “well he would say that, wouldn’t he?” and the opportunity to contextualize using the battle of Custozza, the number of volunteers (and they were ‘volunteers, helpful for the question’) and their possible typicality and ‘our dangerous and uncertain situation’ was missed as was the post-unification autobiographical aspect. It also provided candidates with an opportunity to compare the military aspects of ‘admiration’ with Dandelo in A.

### **3. The Origins of the American Civil War 1820-1861**

**a).** Most candidates had few issues understanding the sources, or knowing the context for them, but the similarity of views expressed meant that some found it hard to make a fully developed comparison. Crucial was the ability to compare provenance in relation to the issue rather than generally. The most common comparisons were the references to religion, a shared conviction in freedom and the conviction of both authors that their cause was just. Some compared the references to God in source E with the quote “...all men are created equal...” in Source A. Some candidates mistakenly saw ‘created equal’ as being an exact comparison to ‘bound with them’. Most used the guidance in respect of the quotation from the Declaration of Independence, although a minority missed this, despite the gloss, and thought the quotation came from the Bible or the Constitution. In terms of difference, the respective provenance, tone and language of each source was mostly evaluated, as were the methods used by each author. The latter proved a trap for some as it led them away from the question of reasons for opposition towards methods or slavery in general, a level 4 or below. A few compared Garrison’s language (“severity”, “harsh”) as being similar to that in D, but on the whole Garrison was seen as someone who would act constitutionally. The common references to “justice” were less well recognised. Provenance for Source D was commonly well supported by the context of Harper’s Ferry but a significant number of candidates attributed the unreliability of John Brown’s speech to him being “mad”, with some long digressions on his mental condition. Some candidates had knowledge of Garrison and his work to contextualise A. In terms of judgement, most preferred Garrison in A on the grounds of a wider rationale, others preferred Brown on the grounds of date (setbacks to the cause), the wider appeal (to South as well as North) or the nature of his trial.

**b).** Few answers really got to grips with the interpretation here (abolitionist activity undermined rather than promoted their cause) because most, at some point, diverted into related issues on whether abolitionists were successful or whether they caused secession and whether or not this aided or detracted from the cause. Few candidates made as full use of the sources as they could have done, when compared with other questions on the paper. Most however were able to identify a basic grouping, usually A, C, D and E for undermining and A, B, D and E for progress. In so doing they advertently or inadvertently came to realize that, apart from C, all the sources could support both views, particularly when the provenance was taken into account. Source C was common to nearly all groupings in support of the key issue, although the extent to which it was made central to the argument varied across all levels. However, it was uncommon to see scripts that used an individual source to support both key issue and counter argument. For most the sources generally fell into one group or the other. Some of the more effective answers developed a 'North-South' perspective in their analysis. In terms of provenance, tone and language was frequently commented on, if not used to support evaluation. Contextual knowledge of Brown and Calhoun was good, less so of Webster. Some candidates almost totally disregarded A, as it was so early in the period, but others did effectively link this to other sources and/or wider knowledge about the development of Garrison's movement. Not all spotted Garrison's own caveat – that he hindered the abolitionist cause. Most candidates did identify the context for Sources B and C (the Compromise of 1850) and use this to evaluate their provenance at least to some extent. Indeed the strongest responses were able to place Sources B and C in their correct context in order to explain the apparent anomalies of a Southerner assessing the strength of the abolitionist movement and a Northerner decrying the movement. A surprising number of candidates did not know who Daniel Webster was and, given his negative comments on the abolitionist cause, mistakenly identified him as a Southerner and/or pro-slaver. The analysis of Webster proved a good discriminator – was he mistaken in his views of the southern reaction? Did his purpose undermine what he said – an attempt to persuade the South to support an agreement by criticizing abolitionists? Almost all candidates were familiar with John Brown, but this led in many cases to long narrative sections about him and his raid, rather than evaluating the source as evidence for the interpretation. More effective responses could see the ambiguity of Brown's comments – would they detract from the cause or promote it and amongst which groups? Source E was a challenging source to use because of its date, and a few candidates did fall into the trap of taking a very teleological approach – abolitionism causes secession, secession caused war, war caused abolition, hence they helped their cause. Others saw the onset of secession as a failure for abolitionism. However, most did make a good attempt to evaluate what was a challenging source to apply appropriately given its date and context. The sources did give candidates a good opportunity to cross-reference and most answers displayed at least some of this.

#### **4. Dictatorship and Democracy in Germany 1933-63**

**a).** This question presented issues for many candidates due to fundamental misunderstandings of the sources. D presented a particular issue; E referred to the economy as a whole. Once this was grasped candidates were on firm ground and could develop both the reactions of government and of people. A fair number got themselves completely tied up in trying to understand the economics of it all whilst others couldn't quite get the chronology and thought the sources were from the early period of the 'miracle'. Most candidates did manage to identify at least some basic similarities of content and more especially some differences in provenance. There was a tendency, particularly at the lower levels, to quote chunks from the sources, and make general loose comparisons of doubtful validity and there was much misunderstanding of the housing problem as outlined in D. Many scripts were able to recognise in both sources that it was thought the actions of West Germans were responsible for economic problems, although fewer recognised that Erhard in E held them more responsible collectively than did Lucke in D. Some of these labelled their actions as 'selfish'. Fewer candidates developed comparisons around the role of government in causing/solving problems, a focus of D rather than E, although Erhard did want to proceed through wage and price controls, arguing for more state control in this area rather than less. The majority of candidates recognised that Source E had wider scope

than D. Some chose to compare the positive aspects of the sources, but most saw them as containing negative messages. The respective dates of the sources figured strongly in many responses, and candidates generally used this as an opportunity to contextualise their argument, although a few still saw West Germany experiencing the economic miracle of the late '40s and '50s as late as 1962. The immigration from East to West prior to the building of the Berlin Wall was often used as context for source D, in that it was seen as contributing to the housing problem, a point of only tangential relevance. In terms of provenance, there was much 'stock' discussion at the lower levels ("They were ministers, so they would know what was going on", a fair point but rarely developed). Better answers developed the relatively frank tone of each source to debate reliability.

**b).** The greatest issue with this question was the large number of candidates who were not expecting a question on the Federal Republic 1949-1962, (it was clear that most wanted to talk about the Blockade or Wall and were not happy with an economic angle) and did not understand the wording of the interpretation because of the use of the word "unqualified". All examiners were advised to mark generously on this question as it was clear that most candidates struggled with the term in the question. Most in practice, reasonably successfully, simply ignored that word, and analysed success/failure. A minority entirely lost focus as a result and these tended to write about how qualified Adenauer was for the role of chancellor. The latter mistake was, however, more to do with missing that it was 'West Germany' which was the focus of success, rather than Adenauer as chancellor (it was his period in office that provided the chronological span required). Some candidates in practice wrote an answer analysing reasons for success rather than extent of success. A small number insisted on writing a comparison of East and West Germany, with a very small number getting confused as to whether the sources related to the GDR or FRG. Nonetheless almost all responses managed a workable grouping (A, B, and C versus D and E), the danger being a very sequential approach which prevented candidates from cross referencing (and there were some good opportunities to do so on housing in A and D, on the economy in A, B and E and on social issues in C and D). More effective responses recognized that there was also evidence for unqualified success in parts of D and E as well, Erhard in E for example, recognizing that wage levels were high and that wealth had been and was growing. Many answers described/explained source content rather than analysing or evaluating it. Similarly many candidates struggled to use more than stock comment on provenance, although some had some very good contextual knowledge which was used to good effect on the electoral politics of the governing party (the CDU), Marshall Aid, currency reform, Korean war demand, guest workers, the ECSC and the EEC. *Der Spiegel* came up in many answers too but was irrelevant in this context. Some candidates had issues with the provenance of Source B, not being sure whether this was likely to be reliable or not and many discussed provenance rather generally and speculatively as a whole across the sources. Comments like were typical - 'the figures from Bosch might be less important than the performance of smaller companies'; 'growth might have slowed down by 1962'; 'if a state can afford to provide pensions it must have money to burn'; 'if the Rhein-Neckar-Zeitung is sympathetic to the CDU it must be lying propaganda'. All these were potentially effective points to make but without development were not credited as much as they could have been. Another issue was Source A, which some candidates tried to pick up as being in praise of Erhard but not Adenauer, as though Erhard was somehow detached from Adenauer's government, rather than an integral part of it. Even though C was routinely grouped with A and B, few candidates were able to develop a linkage, and it appeared to be 'out on a limb' within their group. Occasionally, a candidate grouped source A within the counter argument, as again they saw Erhard and not Adenauer being responsible for the 'economic miracle.' Particularly at the lower levels, A, B & C lent themselves to direct quotation without explanation and provenance comments were fairly standard (for example: Source A, propaganda; B, accurate figures, so reliable; C, D & E government ministers so reliable/unreliable). The key to effective judgment was to use the sources combined with evaluation and supporting or qualifying knowledge to explore change over time.

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

a). This question was largely well done with most candidates understanding the provenance and content of the sources (the same date for example). Some were a little vague about who MacArthur and Marshall actually were, thus limiting their ability to compare provenance, but most were secure, more so on MacArthur than Marshall. However, a surprisingly large number of candidates (compared to Qs1-4) included large sections of effectively bolt-on knowledge about the Korean campaign, not relevant to the comparison. Some lost sight of the focus – US views on Chinese intervention in October 1950, but comparisons generally centred on a similarly held view of Chinese aggression. Most candidates picked up on B's reference to the USSR, although a significant minority did not and thus missed the key difference. Most recognized the caution expressed on Chinese intervention in Source B and were able to compare with the more 'gung ho' implications of MacArthur's words to do this. MacArthur's attempt to run his own foreign policy was well known, though geographical confusion between the 38<sup>th</sup> Parallel and the Yalu River border was common. In terms of provenance, opinions were split. Notwithstanding its tone, many saw Source A as being the more reliable due to MacArthur being at 'the sharp end'. Others felt that Marshall had more authority and a wider frame of reference, thus providing better evidence. Much was made of the more private nature of Source A, versus the anti-Soviet propaganda judged to be contained in Source B. The National Security Council was often mistakenly seen as meeting in public, explaining why some thought Marshall was engaged in 'propaganda' and thus far less reliable than MacArthur in A. Marshall himself was less well known than MacArthur and only rarely identified with his plan and the competing demands of Soviet challenges to Western Europe's independence. His status as a general was not well understood and thus his military expertise was not factored in, candidates preferring MacArthur.

b). There were three potential views in the sources and the majority of candidates identified these although a few lumped the USA and the USSR together as a counter argument to the role of China. Common groupings were A with occasionally B (China), versus B & E (Russia) and C & D (USA). Some candidates missed B's reference to the USSR. Overall analysis was sound and was generally backed up with some solid knowledge, although it could become bolt-on rather than used to evaluate the sources. For example, the Sino-Soviet Treaty of friendship of 1950 and the Stalin-Kim talks were quite well known, as was the Acheson 'defensive perimeter strategy'. Sources C and D presented a surprisingly large number of candidates with issues, misunderstanding source content and struggling to apply it to the question. Source C dealt with the war prisoner issue, not especially well known if most responses are to go by, and this could be seen itself as a factor prolonging the war, but most candidates couldn't decide whether it was evidence for US, Chinese or Russian delaying which lay behind this and for what military motive. They lacked contextual knowledge that it was the USSR and perhaps China who used this to prolong the war. They were reluctant to accept Truman's humanitarian stance at face value. Similarly Source D proved challenging for most candidates. Many took quotes out of context (eg the Chinese "wished to build up their strength", "most Americans want peace") rather than understanding the source as a whole. They missed the date and the helpful introduction that told them Van Fleet was commenting on current peace talks but in a private capacity having recently ceded command in Korea. They couldn't see that he was seeking to influence the debate on peace via Life Magazine and that his views on the need to continue the war were the opposite of those the administration were currently pursuing. His is further evidence for Chinese blame rather than as used, for US blame – this time with a wider Chinese agenda to include other parts of South East Asia having been halted in Korea. They couldn't distinguish between Van Fleet's personal wish to prolong the war and his government's perceived desire to end it. Because it (and Source E) were published in *Life Magazine* they were also subjected to formulaic evaluation of the most basic kind ("selling copies", "entertaining"). The content of Source E was generally well used, although many candidates seemed unsure of the provenance and were overly keen to dismiss it completely as unreliable evidence. They seemed misled by his immigrant status and he was seen as lying to please his new hosts who, as ever, were over eager to read of the machinations of the USSR. His useful evidence on Soviet military and diplomatic involvement, and his telling point on the importance of Stalin's death to the peace



process, was thus either missed or downplayed and not many picked up its later date which perhaps gives it greater credibility. They also failed to pick up his significant position mentioned in the introduction – Soviet military attaché to Red China and North Korea. Only a minority commented on the US nature of all 5 sources, 4 of them highly placed militarily and politically and used this to discuss US culpability.

# F965 Historical Interpretations and Investigations

## General Comments:

### 1.1 Overall performance

The assessment of pupil performance was more appropriate generally and there was some very strong work which used contextual knowledge well to assess the interpretations in the passages and the chosen sources in the Investigations. Such work showed evidence of wider reading and the ability to use knowledge flexibly. The issues were well-understood and the level of overall argument was high. Even where evaluation was less developed, many responses showed an ability to interpret passages well and to select a range of relevant information which was used to construct a coherent argument. There were few answers which offered no attempt to make use of the passages, though less effective responses were restricted to paraphrase or very simple comment on the passages and a descriptive answer which referenced some researched information.

### 1.2 Choice of topics

There was no indication that the choice of topics had either advantaged or disadvantaged candidates. Where centres had allowed candidates a choice of Investigations topics and where it was clear that candidates had been restricted to the same topic, the results depended on the skills shown. Where there was an established historiographical debate and historians had been labelled as part of a general school of history, there was a tendency for candidates to devote too much time and effort into classification of 'revisionist', 'orthodox', 'structuralist' and so on, to no real point. Centres are advised to stress to their candidates that classification alone is not evaluation. Awareness of recent historiography is more limited than consideration of historical debates of the past which have rather limited relevance to modern historians. Sometimes key debates of the past were rather shoehorned into answers and the impression was that candidates were using secondary works about debates rather than considering the evidenced itself. This was apparent with the Neale debate, Richard III and the Holocaust. With some questions chosen by candidates, there seemed to be rather an absence of any debate, so evidence tended to be used to illustrate different reasons or factors rather than being evaluated.

### 1.3 Assessment Criteria

Despite many examples of work being assessed correctly and realistically, there still remained a substantial number of centres which did not apply the OCR marking criteria with sufficient understanding. As a result of uncertainty about the criteria, candidates had not really addressed themselves to key aspects of the course. The understanding of the requirements is therefore of crucial importance to improving candidate performance. Unless teachers are fully aware of the requirements of the coursework, then their pupils are unlikely to be able to achieve higher levels in the mark bands. What follows is an attempt to clarify the demands, not to denigrate the work of centres or pupils which was often creditable in itself, but not sufficiently focused on the key elements required.

## Interpretations

- The intention is not for pupils to produce an essay which references the passages or parts of them and uses knowledge to offer an answer to the question in the title. Instead, the intention is that the four passages should form the focus of the response
- The four interpretations should be established clearly by the candidate and evaluated using contextual knowledge and evidence from the other passages
- A thematic approach in which the question is broken down into different components and then information taken from the passages in support of the aspects is not helpful.

- If knowledge is merely juxtaposed with material taken from a passage or passage to argue a point the candidate wishes to make, then this is not direct evaluation of the interpretations offered.
- ‘Interpretations’ must be taken as the interpretations in the four passages, not possible explanations identified by the candidate.
- All four passages must be analysed fully and their interpretations of the issue in the question must be firmly established. Only if this is done can the candidate evaluate the passages as a whole
- The evaluation of the passages is not best done by finding out about the historian and offering views about likely ‘bias’ or attempting to fit the historian into a ‘school of thought’
- The evaluation should be tested by contextual knowledge gained by independent research
- The mark given for evaluation should be based on the quality of that knowledge. Unless the focus on the question and the support of any view taken about the interpretations in the passages are supported by knowledge, then higher level marks should not be awarded
- Annotation should show where the passages are being correctly analysed and linked to the issue in the question. It should also show where there is assessment of the passages and how well that assessment is being supported by contextual knowledge (synthesis) or by the use of evidence in the other passages (synopsis)
- Only when there is the perceptive use of strong and apposite knowledge should Level 1 be awarded for AO2b
- If limited use is made of contextual knowledge then AO1a marks should not be too high
- Referring to other historians’ work without further explanation as a means of evaluation is unconvincing (Passage A is also confirmed by J R Jones, for example. Passage A is also confirmed by JR Jones who points that the production figures for US steel production were in fact higher ... is different, of course)
- If the candidate has not offered a strong and supported argument based on evaluation of the passages, then AO1b should not be top level.
- If there is some supported evaluation, but not very developed, then Level 3 may be awarded for AO2b, but it is unlikely that higher levels will be appropriate for AO1a and b. If so, then the centre should explain the basis for that.

Successful judgement by the centre will be helped by clear annotation in the margin which shows where the passages are being interpreted clearly (‘analysis’), where there is a judgement being made about them (‘eval’), where that judgement is being supported by reference to evidence in the other passages (‘synopsis’), and where contextual knowledge is being used. (‘O.K’). There should also be an indication of the level and depth of the knowledge (‘some OK’, ‘good OK’, ‘very good OK’, ‘excellent OK’). Responses where the centre has not been able to write ‘eval’ at all will not go beyond Level 4 for AO2 and consequently will not score highly in AO1. Similarly, if the centre writes ‘eval’ and then offers a mark of Band 4 or below for A02b then there may be severity which needs to be corrected.

The evaluation is central to the exercise and if done properly will involve thought and additional research together with understanding of the issues involved. The candidate is not supposed simply to offer an essay in which different factors are outlined, supported by reference to the passages and some additional knowledge. This would not be much more than an AS period studies essay with some references taken from the passages and is not consistent with the demands of the mark scheme.

## Investigations

- The aim of the Investigations essay is not to write an essay on the topic in which various historical views are referenced or in which different arguments are illustrated by reference to primary material. That could not result in a candidate showing ability to assess and evaluate evidence, which is the main focus of this part of the unit
- Simply piling up references to historians is not the same as evaluating them.
- Taking various arguments and then saying that different historians agree is unconvincing. At this level and because this is a personally-researched piece of work, candidates are expected to consider the basis of the historians' views and do more than produce some short quotes from what they have read, or read about.
- Simply to comment on the origin of the historical view is no more convincing by itself than in the Interpretations unit. 'Taylor argues that Bismarck was not a master planner, but he is a well-known revisionist and known for his unorthodox opinions so may be unreliable' is of little real value unless there is some explanation as to why Taylor is unconvincing, which may mean actually reading Taylor's work.
- It is nor convincing when secondary works are used to confirm primary evidence. Nor is it at all useful to have generic comments about primary material being more or less useful than secondary material or vice-versa.

It is not unusual for Investigations essays to refer to a considerable number of pieces of evidence with no explicit evaluation of that evidence at all and yet to receive Level 1 marks. The marks are often awarded for a variety of good features – understanding, style, knowledge, wide reference to historical sources. This is often not contested by moderators, but the bulk of the marks should be given for evaluation of evidence and so cannot be awarded for other qualities.

It may be helpful to quote from a moderation report which is typical for responses which do not focus on the main business of the coursework.

"For a mark in Level 1 we would expect to see annotations of evaluation with excellent contextual knowledge. The absence of this annotation showing this on the papers suggested that there was very little evaluation. This means a mark in level 1 cannot be supported. There were notes of 'critical evaluation' but this was next to the evaluation of factors or issues in the question, rather than evaluation of the sources. The requirement of AO2a to 'analyse and evaluate a range of source material with discrimination' means that a candidate needs to show that they are aware that some sources, whether primary or secondary, are more valuable than others. This judgement will have been reached though comparing the historical evidence with contextual knowledge, not simply a summary that '*Therefore all 4 historians are in agreement*'. The annotation of 'discrimination' seemed to apply to the candidates' selection of views rather than a judgment on their validity."

It is vital for candidates to see the distinction between assessing factors and issues, which they have been required to do in AS Period Studies, and assessing the historical sources they have chosen. It is the view or argument of a particular historian or a particular primary source that should be assessed not a general explanation.

### 1.4 Rank Order

Generally, there were more disagreements between moderated marks and centre marks at the higher end of the mark range and this was generally more pronounced in Investigations than Interpretations. The rank order of merit was generally established correctly by centres. Where this was not the case, it was usually the result of a failure within the centre to put into operation an effective process of standardisation to ensure that all work was marked to the same standard within a department or faculty. In some cases there was considerable disparity in marking style between different markers. It is strongly advised that centres decide on a common style which is firmly based on OCR criteria and intended to

demonstrate to the moderator where specific requirements of the OCR mark scheme have been met. Comments clearly intended for the pupil are not appropriate or helpful. However, few centres had to have their work returned for re-marking because of rank order problems and those that did tended to respond very helpfully and professionally.

- 1.5 Word limit. There were instances of centres appearing to ignore violations of the 2000 word limit and not ruling off the work after 2000 words had been reached and showing no signs in the marking of disregarding the excess writing. There is absolutely no tolerance and work over 2000 words should not be marked.

To focus on areas where there were problems with the nature of work done by candidates or incorrect assessment by centres would be unfair to the considerable amount of well-considered and thoughtful analysis seen. However, there was a considerable gap between the majority of centres who distinguished well between the ability of their candidates to support judgements and offer convincing critiques of evidenced, showing real discrimination and the minority, though a substantial minority, who were unable to make those distinctions and whose candidates did not, even at the top end of the centre mark range, show the higher level skills demanded by the assessment criteria. It may be helpful here to refer to the support offered by past reports on the unit in previous years; by the examples of marked work at different levels available; by on-line training materials offered by OCR. The individual reports to centres are essential documents and should be read carefully.

## **F966/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1066–1715**

### **General**

The Historical Themes paper is a well-established examination and one which is highly regarded by schools and universities. The main reason for this is that it stretches and challenges candidates by demanding that they:

- a) assimilate and deploy a range of factual material in answering questions that focus on historical periods of at least one hundred years;
- b) effectively handle a range of historical concepts especially that of change and continuity;
- c) show skill in synthesising material to form balanced arguments.

With respect to the above it has been very gratifying to witness the progress that candidates have made. Generally, the majority of scripts seen by examiners in this examination session at least showed the maintenance of a good standard already set, but with many also showing further advancement in terms of academic quality. There were a good number of truly excellent responses and very few answers that merited scores in the lowest of the mark scheme Levels. However, as will always be the case, there is still room for improvements to be made.

With respect to the use of historical knowledge, many candidates seem to realise that the examination is partly about the effective selection and deployment of material. The very best responses use historical evidence to support well-framed, balanced and fluently written arguments. However, there has been something of a trend for candidates to simply regurgitate material that has been learned in great depth without giving much thought to how it applies to the exact demands of questions. Examiners are now witnessing essays that are over-long and where copious amounts of detail are used to describe trends and/or patterns of change and continuity. In such cases the material is invariably accurate but this does not compensate for the fact that if it is not used to good effect then it is unlikely that marks will be awarded above Level 4. Candidates would be advised to spend more time unpacking questions, planning and thinking critically about the implications of what they are being asked to do before jumping in to start their answers.

The handling of concepts has certainly improved as well, but again candidates need to think more carefully about how they can best explain change and continuity over relatively long periods of time. It is not adequate to simply state that there was change and/or continuity; responses need to consider how and why change and continuity occurred and use a range of evidence to support their judgements. Centres have obviously taken on board the idea that one useful approach to dealing with such a concept is to utilise a mini-theme or factor based approach. Hence, many responses are now seen that revolve around the application of analytical frameworks based on economic, social and political factors. This is to be commended but only if that a kind of approach is properly understood and used appropriately. Some answers revealed a lack of clarity over what might constitute a factor. For example, economic factors (or for some candidates, economical factors!) are simply equated with industrial developments or anything to do with finance. Social for many seems to mean anything that impacted on society, for example, repression, and political is often seen as being synonymous with government. Such terms need to be reflected on, and not used without thinking through what they actually mean when applied to particular places at particular points in time. Also, it is not always appropriate to use such a framework. In the case of the questions on Russia and its rulers, for example, the mini-thematic approach worked quite well for answers to question 10 but was less effective when applied to question 12 and mostly redundant when used in tackling question 11.

Yet many candidates persisted in using the factor-based approach when a different tack would have reaped greater dividends. Thus, with question 11, the focus needed to be purely on Russian government (not economic and social developments) and with question 12 a better approach would have been to consider the living and working conditions of different groups of Russian peoples throughout the period. Examiners have gained the impression that candidates have been drilled into using mini-thematic approaches at the expense of being flexible and adaptable when faced with a particular historical problem.

Linked with the above is the issue of tackling turning point questions. Most candidates now seem to appreciate that for an event to be a turning point there needs to be measurable change as a result of that event. It is therefore rather strange to witness answers that either make a claim for an event being a turning point without providing adequate support material and/or that equate an event with an over long period of time (for example, the rule of Stalin). Some candidates have started to confuse turning points with factors and others make a case for almost every event of any note being a turning point. A significant number of scripts were seen where candidates were initially stating that an event was a turning point only to proceed to conclude that not much happened as a result of that particular event! Candidates would be better off thinking more carefully about how they can measure whether an event led to significant change (ie what turned?) and also about making comparisons between events so that judgements about relative importance can be made. There are still many answers that describe a range of potential turning points in list form without any attempt to make links, which will limit the level that can be reached. Once more, using a mini-themes approach to make such links can be very fruitful but only if used appropriately. Question 18 on F966/1 and 11 on F966/2 are good examples of where the very best answers centred on judicious selection of events which were analysed.

There are still issues surrounding the understanding and use of synthesis. Many candidates are now using the language of synthesis (via connective phrases) without demonstrating it. Synthesis is about showing and explaining connections between events before arriving at well informed judgements. Too many responses involve simply stating links and/or describing them rather than explaining and evaluating them. Also, synthesis is concerned with condensing historical evidence to support arguments. This adds even more weight to the requirement that candidates write in a more measured, economical manner as opposed to one where they bombard their examination booklets with copious amounts of fact. Simply listing events from across the period in the same paragraph is NOT synthesis; links and comparisons must be made.

Finally, it is worth making some comment about stylistic approaches to questions. The majority of candidates plan answers carefully and make a good attempt to structure their essays by installing an introduction, middle and conclusion. Most also write in well-constructed paragraphs by making a point, explaining and developing the point and then linking it to the next paragraph. However, a significant number of candidates write in a rather inappropriate way. It is not uncommon to come across either scripts that consist of one block of writing (a kind of 'stream of consciousness' approach) or that simply list comments (one sentence constituting a paragraph). Of even more frequent occurrence are essays that have over-long introductions (six sentences is usually more than enough), randomly arranged middle sections and conclusions that simply replicate the main part of the answer (rather than make a substantiated judgement). Of greater concern is the irritating use of abbreviations to shorten and/or speed up the writing process. The biggest culprits in this respect are candidates answering questions on Tudor Rebellions, the foreign policy of France, the Russian and Civil Rights Themes; rulers frequently have their names shortened (often to one letter) and African-American leaders, presidents and pressure groups are also often abbreviated to an extent that detracts from the quality of writing. Candidates need to be clear that although marks are not deducted for stylistic sloppiness the Assessment Objective 1a does demand that examiners pay attention to the quality of communication of historical knowledge and understanding. Candidates will penalise themselves if they also do not heed this part of the generic mark scheme.

Themes report F966/1

1.

This was the most popular of the questions in this section and attracted a wide range of responses. Candidates were often keen to explain why developments in central government were necessary, rather than addressing the actual question. Some candidates showed little awareness of what 'central government' was, with the only the strongest answers offering a definition. Many answers considered the role of individual monarchs rather than the crown itself. Sometimes 'other factors' were difficult to spot, as many appeared to ascribe all developments to the crown, or at least to monarchs, though lands in 'Normandy' were cited as the reason for the development of the justiciarship and the exchequer and useful points were made about the Anglo-Saxon inheritance. However, at the higher levels good answers interwove the crown and other key factors such as leading officials and continental possessions. There were few purely sequential answers but many lacked comparative evaluation and simply provided a list of reasons.

2.

Questions on the common law are not popular and this was no exception. Many candidates do not have a clear idea of the actual concept and this made focus on the demands of the question more difficult; as a result this was the least well answered question in this section. Stronger answers attempted a definition of common law, but often the connection between this and feudalism was invisible. Candidates did however know more about common law than about feudalism, where they struggled to explain its contribution and knowledge was equally thin. They often dropped in the names of Glanvill and Richard FitzNigel but were unsure as to their significance. Some found it difficult to keep to the question and thought it was on the development of feudalism. There were also a number of answers that were heavily narrative, especially of the work of Henry I and Henry II.

3.

This was a popular question and many candidates were able to produce a thematic approach which allowed comparison between a range of Archbishops. There were a number of very good answers, which showed a good knowledge base and were consistently comparative and evaluative in approach. Many candidates were quick to argue that Lanfranc and Hubert Walter were much better than Anselm at handling relations with the crown. Anselm was usually seen as poor in handling of relations, along with Becket and Langton. However, once Langton actually came to England, his relations with John were at least serviceable, but many candidates thought that his relations with John were poor from the start when the real problem was with Lothar the papal dictator. A shortcoming was often that students could not fully assess all the appropriate archbishops to a similar standard and there was some fairly basic rationale being used. Becket was killed – therefore his relations were bad.

Despite some candidates being desperate to shoehorn in general accounts of church/state relations, this question was the best answered in this section. It was pleasing that some students were able to write knowledgeably about archbishops not mentioned in the specification and, although this was not required, it was good to see the breadth of relevant knowledge.

4.

This was by far the most popular question on the paper and attracted a very wide range of responses. At the lower end there were two particular pitfalls for candidates; the first was to avoid writing a general essay about causes of rebellion and focus on the key phrase in the question, 'main cause', the second was an understanding of what is a social cause. It would certainly have benefited many candidates to decide what made a cause a 'main' cause, and what was meant by social causes before they began. 'Social causes' were often confused with economic ones and there were some interesting variations on what constituted a social issue, with most defining it as socio-economic and some including religious factors, whilst others ambitiously and usually unconvincingly tried to argue that all rebellions had social issues within



them. Political and religious factors were obviously safer ground and were usually managed well. These preliminary steps would have avoided essays which were mostly undifferentiated accounts of the causes of rebellion. There were some very strong answers which were able to explain change over time in relation to the question. Many answers attempted to evaluate importance the importance of factors but convincing comparative evaluation, in anything but the conclusion, was rarer. It was also noticeable that a number simply asserted that X was a cause of a rebellion or simply listed, for example dynastic rebellions without any explanation or supporting detail. A number drifted into Irish rebellions which was not relevant.

5.

A common mistake was to explain why rebellions failed without assessing the reasons, ie saying which were persistent or more influential. However, most candidates were able to produce a good list of why rebellions failed, although some spent too long on pre-emptive measures, such as government social policy. There was also a significant number of answers that did not have a clear line of argument, often suggesting that, for example poor leadership was a major cause of failure and then explaining how rebellions with good leadership also failed. There was also a significant number of candidates who explained why some rebellions were successful; although valid points could be drawn from this, often answers spent too long on the issue. There were also some who wrote about how the government brought about political stability and therefore the argument was often implied at best. Here, reference to Ireland was appropriate and was often handled quite well, with some candidates drawing distinction or comparison with England. However, what was often lacking was an assessment of relative importance which was often confined to the conclusion.

6.

This was the least popular of the questions in this section. The strongest answers started by defining 'threat' and used the criteria against which to judge a range of rebellions. The quality of the answer was affected by the understanding shown of 'threat' and there were some where the only element of threat that was analysed were the aims of the rebels, rather than the force raised by the rebels or the context of the rising. However, a significant number did not define threat or asserted that a particular rebellion was or was not a threat to the monarch or minister. The range of rebellions considered was often narrow and for some knowledge of the threat to either the monarch or minister was limited, with many, for example, able to state that the Amicable Grant was a threat to Wolsey, but not really able to explain why. However, answers at the higher end did compare and were evaluative, showing range and a good understanding of the issues in the rebellions discussed.

7.

This was a popular question with some very strong answers which considered both a range of methods and were able to show change and continuity in the methods across the full period, with most arguing for continuity rather than change. Many answers were able to consider issues such as war, marriage and treaties, but trade presented a greater problem, requiring discussion of issues such as trade embargoes. However, there was also a significant number of candidates who focused on aims rather than methods. Some thought they needed to explain the reasons for inconsistency or approached the question by looking at change or continuity in terms of methods used towards each country which often resulted in repetition and prevented a full overview of the period.

8.

This was the least popular question in this section. The question encouraged a chronological approach. Candidates mostly narrated the ups and downs of the relationship rather than evaluated 'pursue a consistent policy'. Sometimes within this structure the policy would emerge, but this was more through chance than planning. A significant number of candidates seemed to know little about Burgundy and the Netherlands apart from vague knowledge that the first helped Yorkist pretenders and the second was involved in the cloth trade. Knowledge of Elizabeth's policies was often cursory at best, with limited understanding of England's involvement in the

Dutch revolt. However, those who adopted a thematic approach were more successful and considered issues such as trade, national security and support.

9.

The focus was more often on whether relations were good or bad, rather than the direct comparison required by the question. Those who did focus on which monarchs handled them better evinced knowledge of Henry VII and Elizabeth and their relationships with Spain, but Henry VIII's relationship was less securely known. Most answers concluded that Elizabeth handled the relationship better despite war and the threat of the Armada, with many concluding that the circumstances and context made it particularly difficult for her and that she did well to avoid war for as long as she did. However others argued that it was Henry VII who handled relations better and discriminated between him and Henry VIII. Despite distinguishing in the body of the essay between the quality of performance of Henry VII and Henry VIII, some candidates failed to reflect this in the conclusion. The better candidates were also often able to establish that there was a variety of levels of performance from Tudor monarchs in both the earlier and the later periods. Lower level responses were tempted to assess each monarch in turn and then make a brief judgement in a conclusion which limited the level of synthesis or change and continuity that could be displayed.

10.

This was a popular question, but a number of candidates struggled to deal with 'the influence of Protestantism' and often arguments were asserted or implied. There were some strong answers, but very few candidates were able to discuss the issues in a balanced or nuanced fashion and some considered only one side of the argument. A number argued that the process of reform was underway before Luther nailed his 95 theses to the church; some answers began with the revival in Spain and the efforts of pre-1517 popes. Discussions of Trent were the most disappointing as few had sufficient depth of knowledge to show whether it was a response to Protestantism or part of the catholic revival, whilst knowledge of developments post Trent was also lacking.

Many responses generally decided early on that it owed a great deal to Protestantism, or that it owed very little – and arguments were constructed, usually quite well, accordingly. The balanced assessment was less frequent. A number followed a sequential approach which usually failed to convince.

11.

This was the least popular question in this section and was done the least well. Many could give reasons why the Jesuits were successful, but few could actually explain why they were more successful than other religious orders, with some even ignoring other orders. Some assessed well the reasons for Jesuit success but failed to explain why they were more successful than others. Even better answers were limited to Barnabites and Ursulines and few considered what made a religious order successful. A key area of difficulty here was the ability to deal with other orders as thoroughly as the Jesuits – this, on occasion, led to some impressive detail on Ignatius et al.

12.

This question produced some strong and impressive answers where candidates adopted a thematic and comparative approach. However, some candidates knew little about Sixtus who came off badly from comparison with the Tridentine popes but fared better than those from 1492 up to Leo X. For those students who did not know much about the kind of things that Sixtus did, it was difficult to answer this question well, although many were at least able to comment on his curia reforms. The main problem was lack of sustained comparison, with weaker candidates often adopting a chronological rather than thematic approach which limited evidence of synthesis or comparison.

13.

A number of answers showed a good grasp of the definition of a nation state and adopted a generally thematic approach. However, chronological approaches were not uncommon in weaker responses. Better answers often began with definitions of 'nation state', though many efforts ascribed the poor showing from 1560 to Henri IV exclusively to the Wars of Religion. Nonetheless, in general the question was reasonably well answered, although the middle period received less attention than usual. Most responses dealt quite fully with the issues of the early period, but the years after Henry II were less well covered and even the discussion about Henry IV was limited in many of the responses. Candidates seemed to know much more about the earlier kings and the Medici hardly got mentioned except by a small number of students. There were some descriptive approaches, particularly on Henry IV's achievements and then assertion that France developed more in his reign, rather than comparing it with the earlier period

14.

Many answers failed to spot that 'mainly' necessitated comparison of financial issues with other factors. Knowledge about finances was not extensive: there was some knowledge of the changes made by the early kings, but little about the background to these and evidence for Henry IV, in particular, often lacked detail. However, in stronger answers the thematic approach was the norm, with some effective comparison within the themes. There were some very good answers which intertwined the various hindrances and pulled them back to the root cause...the crown. However, in some very weak responses there was confusion as to what was meant by finances and some wrote about the economy in general.

15.

Fewer people chose to do this question than the others in the set and those who did mostly made a decent fist of it, although again the knowledge about who actually controlled France during the wars of religion was poor, so discussion of that period was weaker than might have been expected. However, some of the analysis about who handled it better was still pretty simplistic; minimalists went for a straightforward comparison of Francis I with Henry IV. The answer also attracted a number of chronological approaches with good coverage of Francis, Henry IV usually given most credit, and usually well justified arguments. The key to many stronger answers was identifying what the religious problems actually were and then linking them to 'managed' and comparing Francis I with other rulers.

16.

Although this was a popular question, there were very few who had the depth of knowledge required on ministers other than Richelieu, who was often written about in considerable detail. There was also a number of chronological responses where the amount of time devoted to Richelieu was excessive, but possibly this was an attempt to mask the lack of knowledge about other ministers. The chronological approach made it difficult for candidates to compare and show synthesis and thus limited the level the response could achieve. Even where a thematic approach was not adopted a number of candidates did not compare the ministers and therefore also failed to reach the higher levels as synthesis does entail comparison and not simply listing examples from across the period. Some assessed Louis XIV in some depth, arguing that he was, in effect, his own minister, which was acceptable.

17.

For many a good start would have been a definition of economic and financial problems and then a consideration of how Richelieu, Mazarin, Colbert and Le Tellier dealt with them. Few, though, managed to distinguish between finance and economics, and while some candidates had detailed knowledge of the economy and were able to apply it to the question, knowledge of finances was much more limited. Most managed to make some judgement about effectiveness. However, there were some tremendously knowledgeable, thematic responses, although a chronological approach was also common. There was some tendency to reach a final judgment on the relative effectiveness of individual governments in managing economic and financial problems, rather than to go on to attempt an overall judgment on the effectiveness of governments of the period.

18.

This question was the worst answered of this set with some candidates reluctant to make cross-period comparisons. Few responses approached this thematically and many failed to grasp how to manage a turning point question, often describing the content of various treaties. Some had little grasp of the concept of a turning point, comparing Westphalia with, for example, the activities of Louis XIV. Some others thought this was a question about France's ascent to European power rather than the treaty of Westphalia as a turning point. While some candidates dismissed Westphalia and went for the Pyrenees, others surveyed the whole of French foreign policy over the period but left the readers to make up their minds about the turning points. Knowledge of the various treaties discussed was variable, but sometimes better than of Westphalia, although the later period was often dismissed in a brief sentence, while earlier developments were given excessive treatment.

## **F966/02 Modern 1789–1997**

### **Question Specific Comments**

#### **The Challenge of German Nationalism 1789-1919**

1. Many appeared to struggle with the concept of “no more united” in this question. Candidates often divided the essay into 1871-1919 and 1789-1870 without making comparative links between the two sub-time periods. At best this meant any synthesis was partial and uneven. Many candidates were able to deploy good, at times very good, knowledge of both periods, but with some overall tendency to favour the earlier one. They were able to assess a range of political, economic, social (classes, North-South differences), cultural, linguistic, and regional issues (particularism was often handled well). However, even well-informed candidates who appeared to be aware of the need to write synoptically still found it a challenge to be consistent in linking developments.
2. Again, structuring answers appropriately was an issue. Some candidates wrote in a genuinely thematic way but too many answers involved the simple listing of potential turning points, occasionally with some comparative analysis bolted-on at the end of each paragraph. A problematic issue for a number of candidates was that they simply did not know enough about what happened in 1815 to appreciate its significance. Some simply went for a narrative of events and description of features such as the causes of the revolutions, the Frankfurt Parliament, liberal democracy and the Kleindeutschland and Grossdeutschland debate, for example. A good few then fell into the trap of mentioning many significant events as if they were all important turning points; others went for one or two; very few went for a more sophisticated, thematic approach that allowed for comparison between events. As a consequence the use of synthesis was limited. There were those here - and indeed also in answers to question 3 - who wanted to write about Metternich, Bismarck and Wilhelm II and their management of German nationalism (a past question). Better answers focused on a discussion of a range of turning points most notably 1806, 1815, 1862 (a strong contender), 1871 and 1888-90, more occasionally 1914. Needless to say, the very best responses (and there were quite a few) used thematic connectives to show which year/event provided the strongest contender for ‘most important’.
3. This question was dealt with in a slightly more effective manner although a significant number of candidates did not really get to grips with what was the best approach to use. There was some attempt to distinguish between different types of nationalism (romantic, political etc) but this kind of strategy was not always attempted in a convincing way. Clearly there was dramatic change after Unification when what had been liberal became rather right wing, but many did not appreciate this. Key aims and so issues in German nationalism were seen to be anti-French, unification and European military domination often linked to colonial expansion. A few wrote about the aim of making Germany even more unified after 1870-1 or spent time on discussing events during the First World War. That said, a noticeable feature here and in the other questions on The Challenge of German Nationalism 1789-1919 was the tendency to cover much before 1871 (often Bismarck was prominent) but far less afterwards. This created imbalance and hindered effective synthesis over the whole period.

### **The Changing Nature of Warfare 1792-1945**

4. This question created problems for some candidates who were unsure of 'public opinion' and tried to make the term fit most aspects of warfare. 'Consistently ignored' proved challenging, too, but it had to be engaged if a response was to score well. Some answers simply set out a list of standard factors or features (for example, leadership, strategy and tactics, transport and communications, resources) in the hope that this might suffice. Those answers that did try to address the question directly considered how far governments and military leaders did or did not ignore public opinion and drew, in the main, from the examples of the Revolutionary and Napoleonic Wars, the Crimean War, American Civil War and, of course the two World Wars. Such responses then tended to consider controls over opinions, means to shape opinions, the outright ignoring of public opinion and ways adopted to win and retain public support for causes that might be popular or were unpopular but required public support (this included the North's position in the American Civil War and the attitudes of governments in the two World Wars).
5. The very best answers to this question measured the impact of weapons technology on warfare by organising their material around a framework that considered strategy, tactics, leadership and logistics. Such responses then sustained a comparative analysis and evaluation of a range of wars both before 1866 (especially the Napoleonic Wars) and after (including of course the World Wars). A significant number of candidates appeared to know little about the events of 1866 and focused more on events that happened after this time. Many, sadly and inevitably, listed wars and described developments without making any attempt to provide a synthesised argument. Chronological, descriptive accounts were often well informed but were of limited merit as they veered away from the exact demands of the question. Some candidates detailed developments in weapons technology and threw in material on communications and transport for good measure which resulted in irrelevancy. This was a question that required careful unpacking and those that failed to do so rarely received marks above Level 4.
6. Most candidates made an attempt to define 'total wars', but then went on to list different sorts of wars and how they fitted the model, rather than taking the strands of the model to make comparisons. Often, even though there was synthesis within paragraphs, there was a listing of wars that were total and others that were not. Better answers considered aspects of the concept of 'total wars' and focused on discussing key issues such as the involvement of civilians either through conscription or as the target of enemy actions or both, the mobilisation of people for war efforts (fighting, supporting), the mobilisation of all economic assets and resources, aspects of new military technology, casualty levels, tighter controls exercised by the state (propaganda, censorship etc). Some answers made much of public opinion, so repeating content from question 4 but without strongly linking their arguments to the question as set. On the whole, though, candidates did seem to find this question more manageable than the other two.

### **Britain and Ireland 1798-1921**

7. Some very good answers were seen to this question which focused on how the level of support could be measured (for example, through attendance at meetings, election results, backing from British politicians) and how such support continued or changed over time. However, many answers were uneven in nature and tended to give more weight to one or the other forms of nationalism. There was also a tendency to veer towards discussing the reasons for changing levels of support by assessing standard themes such as leadership, strategy and tactics. Such approaches were rarely done well as the thrust of the question was about how patterns of support changed and not why they changed. Sometimes answers did compare the two movements within a thematic structure. Quite often answers looked at each form of nationalism in turn but separately and without effective comparisons. Most answers ranged across the period but some focused on Constitutional

nationalism only up to Parnell and Revolutionary nationalism only after c.1905. As with similar questions on past papers, there was some confusion over who were or were not Revolutionary nationalists.

8. Few answers to this question were seen. Some candidates struggled with the requirements of the question. A very few did provide some range of material and factors, from the Act of Union through to the agreements of 1920-21, but most focused on the end of the period from the 1880s or even c.1900 onwards. 'Methods' posed problems of interpretation though most candidates were able to say something about the creation of armed camps and the preparedness to use force in defence of Ulster if not the Union. A few were able to make links to attitudes towards successive British governments and methods of cooperation or opposition and defiance. Some covered the changes to the Protestant Ascendancy, land and politics, the shrinkage of old influence, the impact of Home Rule ideas on Ulster and most dealt with the responses, culminating in Carson and the UVF, 1912-14 and the events of 1919-21. Where candidates did understand the implications of the question, as evidenced in how they proceeded to clearly define the parameters of their answers, then some truly excellent work was produced.
9. On the whole, this question was tackled effectively. Candidates tended to analyse and evaluate a range of factors but sometimes forgot to make links and comparisons. Only a few said relatively little about agrarian issues; most covered them well although sometimes, surprisingly, not extending as far as 1903. There was, of course, much discussion of the Famine, tenancy rights versus landlord control, the three Fs and Land Acts. Other factors set up for counter-argument embraced religion, politics, attitudes of British governments and the place of constitutional and revolutionary nationalism. This question was another example of where taking time to think about how material could be ordered most effectively would have paid even greater dividends. The question demanded that judgements needed to be made for candidates to achieve marks in the higher mark Levels. Many failed to do so as they did not show how factors might have been connected; this would have allowed assessment of relative importance to be made.

### **Russia and its Rulers 1855-1864**

10. On the whole this was done reasonably well: most candidates focused on discussing patterns of change and continuity which was reassuring given the concept was signposted in the wording of the question. Some very strong answers were witnessed that used the economic, social and political framework for analysis before arriving at well informed judgements. Better answers set out arguments that the Tsars were more conservative by nature whereas the Communists, in theory, were all for change. In addition, they often addressed how far there were rulers who were genuine reformers set against those who made great changes but not necessarily 'reforms.' Interestingly, here and in question 12, Alexander II and Khrushchev were presented as liberal. The reality is that they were just comparatively more reformist than other rulers. However, quite a number of candidates simply listed reasons why the rulers were opposed or not opposed to change. A few spent too much time on consideration of motives for change or got confused and wrote about the opposition to rulers (a different question entirely). Discussion of economic developments featured frequently; social at times (including education and ideas about youth and women); political at times, sometimes with a lively contrast between commitment to economic reforms set against a desire to stay in control and further set against fears of changes initiated from below. Some responses became unbalanced because too much time was devoted to consideration of the outcomes of reforms. Some candidates moved into a rather standard essay on repression or reform. There were those who wrote about reluctant reformers (a past question). Many candidates got themselves into some difficulties with Alexander II who clearly was open to reform, but also forced to reform by the defeat in the Crimea. Therefore, for some, he was both a reluctant reformer and not a reluctant reformer. This had some merit but usually needed to be expressed more

convincingly. The same applied with the treatment of several other rulers. There were those who wrote about war or wars as the 'locomotive of change' and some who spent much time arguing for the Provisional Government as favouring reforms but then lacked the space to write about much else.

11. Many answers to this question took the form of lists of events (especially wars), sometimes with synthesis appearing in the conclusion. The best answers centred on discussion of ideology, structures and systems of government, support bases, and repressive methods (occasionally with consideration of the handling of national minorities). There remains, with questions that specifically ask for a focus on government, a tendency to look at economic and social developments which is clearly irrelevant. Some references to economic and policies can be accepted if these are linked to something like centralised government planning (especially under the communists). But it is imperative that, with a question on government, the focus should be on areas of government and nothing else. Some candidates adduced very few turning points so failing to cover enough of the period in range and scope. Arguments for turning points other than the named one focused mainly on 1905, October 1917, occasionally the Civil War, occasionally 1938-39 or 1945 (Stalin with absolute power), and 1956. Most candidates picked alternatives with varying success. There was a tendency to write off the importance of Nicholas II and especially of the two Revolutions in 1917 without appreciating the significance of the massive changes generated by events in that year. There was also a common formulaic dismissal of the February Revolution as insignificant simply because the Provisional Government was short-lived, ignoring the significance of the end of Tsarist rule and the way that this made October possible. Nevertheless, the best answers tended to suggest that October 1917 had more to offer than Stalin in terms of importance, by offering analysis of ideology, repression, 'liberalism' and forms of benevolence. A good number of candidates presented Stalin's government as a continuation of Lenin's so they rated Lenin's takeover of power and what he did with that power as more important, which was a reasonable line to take.
12. This question was probably tackled the most effectively of all the questions on this Theme. Two approaches predominated, both of which tended to result in a good level of success. One was to look at how the living and working conditions of different groups in Russian society changed over time. The other was to consider how the economic, social and political status of different peoples was affected across the period. The former was probably the best plan of attack as, with the latter, some candidates tended to describe reforms without linking them to how they impacted on Russians. Some responses centred on discussion of motivations for improvement (for example, to catch up with the west, modernisation, preservation of regimes, ideological imperatives) to the detriment of maintaining relevance and focus. Where a living and working conditions focus was maintained this invariably broken down into consideration of health, housing, welfare, food, diet, nutrition, hours of work, pay (or the lack of it), educational opportunities (often done well), political rights and freedoms (or otherwise), repressive controls, subsistence farming, and generally, levels and extent of any betterment over the period. It was heartening to witness answers that gave such wide ranging consideration to the plight of Russian peoples although, again, material was not always used wisely. Some simply described rather than assessed how the lives of Russians were affected. Pleasingly, a good number of candidates did consider a spectrum of social groups including not just peasants and workers but also the aristocracy and the middle classes. Some were able to make significant points about nationalities and their treatments. The young, women and religious adherents also featured.



### Civil rights in the USA 1865-1992

13. The standard approach to this question was to start with Martin Luther King, either describe and/or evaluate his contribution and then to move on to discuss the role of other leaders. There were some satisfactory answers that made some, albeit limited, comparisons between leaders as each was dealt with. The best responses were those that considered how leaders impacted on the political, social and economic status of African Americans and used this framework to make sustained comparative analysis and judgments. However, this was done most convincingly where candidates clearly had a firm handle on the meaning of the term 'civil rights'; this was not always the case. The weakest answers listed and described the activities of leaders and sometimes alluded to comparison. Here was a case of candidates often being well informed but not using evidence to full effect. Such lists sometimes included comments such as 'Du Bois was similar to King as they both influenced the passing of legislation'. Candidates need to realise that this kind of statement does not constitute synopsis; it lacks explanation, support and development and therefore constitutes assertion. Often candidates could write much about King (the context, his impact and the responses of the government and others) but were less secure in discussing a range of other leaders. A small number said little about King but much about others yet, again, without synthesis, often simply listing features, actions and methods. Some drew in the role of Federal Government (Presidents, Supreme Court) and a few wanted to write about whether other influences attempted 'help or hinder' African Americans. This, once more, was an instance of where candidates seemed to be adapting previous questions, which they may have practised, to suit their needs.
14. The majority listed and described potential turning points. The Dawes Act was usually covered well although at times too descriptively. Other turning points put forward included the Nixon era, 1928, 1934 (and the New Deal era in general) and the 1950s. Quite often a policy area (for example, termination) was used to compare the impact of events; this usually proved effective and placed such responses in the higher mark Levels. It was fairly common, though, to witness scant attention given to the period before 1924 (except for 1887). In a number of cases, far more was known about the last thirty or so years of the period. Often knowledge on the post-Second World War period was impressive but led to uneven coverage and imbalance. Native Americans' leadership, recourse to pressure group activities, self-belief, organisation in movements, greater opportunities (legal, economic, social and educational) featured often. As with question 13, some candidates showed a desire to develop an answer around the overarching of ideas of 'help versus hinder'; this did not always serve them well. In all, this was a popular choice, but often answered very mechanically.
15. The majority of answers started with discussion of World War One and then proceeded to consider other factors in particular World War Two, activist groups, Prohibition, the 1960s and 1970s and the role of federal government. There was some lack of clarity over what constituted a factor as opposed to a theme or even a turning point. A significant number changed the question in to one about the impact of events. Some candidates were able to structure answers by linking types of rights (for example, political, social, economic, employment, pay, divorce, abortion) with factors such as those listed above but this was not the norm. Most wrote well enough about the campaign to get the vote, pressure group activities either side of the First World War or in the 1960s, the rise of Feminism and New Feminism, though interestingly less was made of the importance of the 1960s. The two World Wars were seen as very significant and better responses did offer strong evaluation of the economic (and social) gains made then. In some instances focus was only on the Great Depression and the two World Wars. Quite a number of candidates wrote about changing attitudes to female employment and the increasing levels of women in the workplace but with some vagueness and generalisation. Again, there was some tendency to write about factors (usually Federal government) that helped or hindered progression.

For many, the word 'advance.' was brushed over which detracted from the quality of analysis. Overall, this question elicited a variable quality of response. Better candidates had a grasp of the underlying themes and an ability to make something of the earlier decades, so that the First World War and then 1945-92 were not their only concern.

### **The Development of Democracy in Britain 1868-1997**

Very few responses were seen to questions on this Theme. However, as with other Themes there was still a mixture in terms of quality.

16. The best answers compared 1945 with other general elections that offered a sensible opportunity to focus on what constituted something that was 'key'. Hence, there was consideration mainly of 1868, 1906, 1918, 1923, 1964 and 1979 as general elections of particular note. Many candidates translated 'key' as meaning turning point which was perfectly acceptable. They then tended either to make comparison with respect to the impact on democracy or offer a list with description and some limited analysis.
17. This question was not very popular. Of those that did attempt it the focus was primarily on the latter part of the period rather than the earlier and therefore resulting in a lack of balance. The material used to support answers was of variable quality. On the whole, responses tended to contain much generalised, vague comment.
18. The best answers measured economic change against other types of change (especially social where there was some detailed discussion of education policies in a particular) before arriving at a judgement. Weaker answers either described economic, political and social trends and/or consisted of generalised, vague comment.

**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](mailto:general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk)

**[www.ocr.org.uk](http://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 2014

