

GCE

History A

Advanced GCE **A2 H506**

Advanced Subsidiary GCE **AS H106**

OCR Report to Centres June 2015

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 2015

CONTENTS

Advanced GCE History A (H506)

Advanced Subsidiary GCE History A (H106)

OCR REPORT TO CENTRES

| Content | Page |
|--|-------------|
| F961/01 British History Period Studies – Medieval and Early Modern | 4 |
| F961/02 British History Period Studies | 12 |
| F962/01 Medieval and Early Modern | 19 |
| F962/02 European and World History Period Studies – Modern | 27 |
| F963 and F964 AS History Enquiries | 40 |
| F965 Historical Interpretations and Investigations | 62 |
| F966/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1066–1715 | 65 |
| F966/02 Modern 1789–1997 | 72 |

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

General comments

Units F961 and F962 are identical in their aims and assessment objectives. The only difference is in the choice of Study Topics for the candidates and, as a result, these general comments apply to all four papers offered within the units.

The overall quality of the responses showed little change from previous sessions. A significant number of candidates showed sufficient understanding, knowledge and ability to analyse or discuss the issue or issues in the question to reach Level III for AO1b, and examiners were pleased to read some scripts that showed a consistently high level of analysis and judgement. There were some candidates who appeared to be ill-prepared for the examination and produced responses which lacked an understanding of the topic. It might therefore be worthwhile reminding Centres and Candidates of the basic requirement for these Units. Candidates need to use relevant and accurate factual material to support well-structured arguments. This will allow them to reach a well-informed historical judgement about the issue in the question. It might also be worth reminding candidates that all the Units require answers to be in continuous prose, avoiding the use of abbreviations, notes or bullet points.

Most answers did show at least some explanation, with the most successful supported by sound and wide-ranging knowledge. However, it is worth stressing that AO1a is awarded, not for the deployment of knowledge, but for its use in supporting an argument or judgement. Centres should also be aware that attempts at argument or judgement are only assertions unless they are supported by accurate and relevant factual material, which means that the two assessment objectives are closely linked. Although some weaker candidates did attempt to argue, their attempts at analysis had little supporting knowledge and often relied on generalization, which is likely to result in answers being placed in either Level IV or Level V for AO1b. The decline in the purely descriptive essay continues and where there was evidence of accurate and relevant knowledge most candidates were able to link it to the demands of the question.

It is important that Centres give equal attention to all Key Issues and associated content on which questions are based - there were certainly indications that some candidates appeared under-prepared for some of the topics. Not only should Centres ignore topics that have been set previously, but they should also give attention to areas that not have been set before, as with Question 11 on the Peace Treaties on F962/2. Centres should also be fully aware that Questions may test more than one Key Issue, as was the case with Question 1 on F962/2 on the rise of Napoleon.

The strongest answers will pick up on key words, phrases or dates in their answers, whereas weaker responses will be more general, often combining less relevant material with relevant comments. It is surprising that the term 'assess' still produces the 'list-like' response, with some candidates even signposting this approach with comments such as 'another reason for X was', whereas stronger answers will attempt to evaluate the importance of the reasons to enable a judgement to be reached. Therefore, whilst most candidates are usually able to suggest several reasons they need to try and prioritise their importance if they are to move beyond Level III for AO1b. However, it is not sufficient for a Candidate, having explained a reason, simply to assert why it was the most important: they need to have explained why it was the most important. There appeared to be a continuation in the trend for Candidates to learn a set of answers to previous questions and then try and apply them to the questions that are set in the examination. This is rarely successful and should be discouraged; candidates need to be flexible and be able to apply their knowledge to a question that offers a slightly different slant or emphasis if they

want to reach the top level. However, it might be helpful for Candidates to have a stronger understanding of key concepts and issues that relate to the Key Issues they are studying; for example, there was a significant number of candidates who seemed to have only the vaguest understanding of what is meant by stability and simply replaced it with success, thereby producing responses which had only limited focus.

The comments for some of the individual questions across the four papers in this Report may be repetitive, but this is deliberate as it emphasises that the demands for individual questions are similar and that Candidates make similar mistakes or show similar strengths, regardless of the Unit or Topic being studied. It also helps to reinforce the fact that all the Units are marked using the same generic mark scheme and it would be advisable for Centres to read the whole Report, rather than just the section that applies to the Study Topic or Topics that they teach, so that they are aware of the general trends.

Individual comments

From Anglo-Saxon England to Norman England 1035–1087

1. Assess the reasons for political instability in the period from 1035 to 1065.

The best answers to this question were very strong. They were characterised by an evaluative treatment over the whole period. Candidates familiar with the whole period therefore had little difficulty. Those who did, tended to be those who were able to move beyond describing the reasons to assessing them. One clear way to do this was to note the differing reasons for tension and the seriousness of that tension. Many candidates were uncomfortable with the very start of the period. Those who knew about Harold Harefoot and Harthacnut and the instability following Cnut's death tended to write descriptively, not with analysis. Many candidates struggled to recall and analyse evidence of Norman influence as a possible destabilising factor. Most knew of Edward's upbringing in Normandy and could also identify Robert of Jumièges as his preferred Archbishop, but few knew more than that. Most responses focused on the instability caused by Edward's management of the Godwins. Some responses also considered the role of Queen Emma and the looming succession issue towards the end of Edward's reign. The Viking threat was not covered in many responses. Most responses had a range of factors and focused on the specific question, sticking within the given dates. A few went beyond 1065 and even covered the Battle of Hastings, which was outside the time frame of the question.

2. 'The Scandinavian landings in the north of England were the most important reason for Harold's failure to defeat William of Normandy.' How far do you agree?

This question tended to be done well, with most candidates willing to offer an analytical view on the relative importance of the Scandinavian invasions. Better candidates used accurate knowledge to present a convincing case and reach a balanced conclusion. The vast majority of responses had at least a paragraph on the Scandinavian landings and many linked their consequences to other factors such as Harold's mistakes. Most responses had a good range of factors, including William's leadership skills and tactics, the role of luck and the support for William from the Pope. Most responses had judgements about relative importance, although with varying levels of substantiation. It was only better candidates who identified the significance of Harold's necessity of exerting his authority on the North. Weaker candidates tended to focus on the mistakes made by Harold whilst better candidates considered the strengths of William's campaign in strategic planning and the importance of Papal support. Hastings tended to be well-known and understood: where some candidates went astray was in their knowledge of what happened before, which they used to describe as factors leading to Saxon defeat. There were two common errors: Harold did not fight the Vikings at Fulford, Edwin and Morcar did; and there were three weeks between Stamford Bridge and Hastings.

3. How important was the new Norman elite in the suppression of opposition to William I's rule?

This was a less popular choice than the other two questions in this section. A minority of candidates struggled with the meaning of 'Norman Elite' but most did not. There were some strong answers which offered a working definition of the phrase, but some candidates thought it simply meant William and some attempted the question without knowing the names of any of William's close followers who might reasonably be counted as members of the elite. Most responses considered both the contribution made by the Norman elite to helping William (including regents/viceroy), as well as the problems that a minority of them created for him. Most successful responses defined Norman elite as being wider than the barons and considered the leading figures in the church. Most responses considered other factors, such as the disjointed nature of opposition to William, his personal ferocity, and his willingness to use a range of tactics including, harrying, swift and decisive interventions, the strategic placing of castles and the use of conciliation as a form of control, including paying off the Vikings with danegeld. Most responses considered the Northern rebellions and the less threatening ones from 1067-68. The revolt of the Norman Earls 1075 was covered in many responses. However the East Anglia rebellion was less frequently covered.

Lancastrians, Yorkists and Tudors 1450–1509

4. 'Overmighty subjects were the most important reason for the wars between the Lancastrians and Yorkists.' How far do you agree?

This was a popular question. A few covered the whole period, 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 only looked at the 1450s and considered only the role of the over-mighty subjects in starting the wars. There was plenty of thoughtful and balanced work which offered analysis of the key factors, but several candidates limited themselves by providing simple narratives based on the disruptive ambition of Richard of York, with little mention of the king's weaknesses or of the influence of Somerset, who could certainly be considered an overmighty subject. Several candidates thought that Margaret of Anjou was a subject, rather than royalty. The great majority of candidates agreed with the question. It was characteristic of the weaker responses that they tended only to set the overmighty subjects against undermighty kings as causes of the wars. Only the stronger candidates tended to set the overmighty subjects in a wider context. Most candidates, and nearly all the weaker candidates, looked only at a very few of the over-mightiest: few mentioned names such as Percy or Stanley.

5. Assess the reasons why Edward IV's second reign was more successful than his first.

This was a popular question and was generally answered well, with accurate and clear comparisons between the two reigns of Edward IV. Nearly all of the responses dealt with the question issue by issue rather than chronologically. As a result most candidates were able to do justice to their knowledge and ability. Responses dealt with a range of issues/factors including finance, foreign policy, dealing with Lancastrian threats, producing an heir, managing the nobility (mainly Warwick & Clarence) and the Woodville marriage. Few misunderstood the question and the principal discriminators were the quality of their analysis and evaluation, and the detail of their supporting knowledge. Most answers dealt with the issue of Edward's control over the nobles in his second reign, identifying this as a significant factor. Better candidates highlighted that his successes were only short term. Better answers explained why the deaths of Henry VI, his son Edward and of Warwick made life easier for Edward IV. Weaker answers assumed no need to explain. Edward's stronger finances were often mentioned, but few candidates understood this factor very well. Edward's decision to execute Clarence was mentioned by most, but listed rather than assessed in the weaker essays. Most tried to come to a conclusion. Many weaker answers did not move beyond the fact that Edward learned from the problems of his first

reign whereas better candidates considered a wider range of factors including his heir and finance. Better candidates analysed the wider perspective of his ability to rule.

6. 'Securing trade agreements was Henry VII's most important foreign policy achievement.' How far do you agree?

This was a popular question. A small minority failed to consider "trade agreements" at all but most were well focused and argued that these were useful rather than vital achievements. Security in general, and the protection of the Tudor dynasty in particular, were seen as Henry's most important achievements, with trade deals an added bonus. There was a lot of accurate and detailed knowledge on display. Most answers were aware that Henry's treaties with Spain, France and Scotland involved a number of benefits for Henry, among which were dynastic marriage alliances, depriving pretenders of foreign support, recognising the legitimacy of the Tudor regime and in some cases also trade! Some good answers wove in financial security from trade and the French pension. The vast majority of responses had a good section on trade agreements rather than peppering the factor here and there. Beyond securing the Tudor dynasty, other factors considered by most included marriage alliances, the Treaty of Medina Del Campo and dealing with specific Yorkist threats such as the pretenders and the hostility of Margaret of Burgundy.

Henry VIII to Mary I 1509–1558

7. 'Wolsey's greatest domestic achievement was the raising of revenue.' How far do you agree?

This was a very popular question. Most responses considered both the successes and failures of Wolsey's revenue raising attempts and came down on one side, in terms of which outweighed the other. Other factors considered by most were Wolsey's legal reforms, enclosures and his role in the church. A minority insisted on introducing foreign policy initiatives into the answer as examples of Wolsey's desire to serve the king to the best of his ability, and there were some detailed discussions of the divorce, which were not really relevant to this question. Many candidates wrote in general terms about Wolsey's humble background and his 'anti-nobility campaign' in the courts and over enclosure. Not all who wrote about raising revenue understood the change involved in the introduction of the subsidy as the basis for taxation. Many good answers made a comparison of the various spheres where Wolsey operated. Some candidates struggled. Of these, some resorted to a descriptive approach and gave the impression that they were putting down on paper all they knew about the Cardinal: at the lower levels there was a significant amount of tangential, even irrelevant material. It should be noted that credit is not given for knowledge per se but for the application of relevant knowledge to support the answer.

8. How effectively did Henry VIII govern from 1540 to 1547?

There were many effective answers here which showed lots of detailed knowledge of this complicated period. Most candidates interpreted the question as how successfully Henry governed, and looked at domestic and foreign issues in this light. Some answers spent too long on the fall of Cromwell and the closure of the monasteries and others wrote only about the very end of the reign, but many managed a thorough survey of the required period. Most candidates based their analysis around the question of factions and the success of foreign wars, although some included the succession as well. Some responses were rather one-sided, seeing Henry as either brilliantly successful in this period or completely inept. A minority of candidates wrote as if he was already ill and weakening in 1540. Also some answers dealt with foreign policy and nothing else. Most however also considered management of factions in the nobility, the dry stamp and the issue of Henry's will, the fall of Cromwell and religious issues. A few responses went into detail about Henry's last two wives, with a couple of responses considering Catherine Howard and Catherine Parr's manipulation of Henry as the most important factor, since "Kings

should not be manipulated by women".... A few descriptive responses were seen: there were some candidates who simply described the last years of Henry VIII.

9. Assess the reasons why foreign affairs caused problems during the reign of Edward VI.

This question was less popular than the other two in this section. Many candidates appeared to find it very challenging. Better answers considered the different policies of Somerset and Northumberland; many weaker ones stated that foreign policy caused the Kett's Rebellion. Most of the candidates were able to describe the fighting in Scotland and the problems associated with Boulogne. There was some understanding of the high cost of garrisons and the failure of the Rough Wooing. Many responses dealt with Somerset and Northumberland in two separate sections and were able to differentiate between their policies. Most did distinguish their different approaches and the consequences of them. Weaker answers simply dealt with foreign policy itself - this caused problems because it was not particularly successful! Better responses linked the conflict with Scotland and France to domestic issues by stressing the financial and economic consequences of Somerset's aggressive policies. Some wanted to compare the problems caused by foreign affairs with those stemming from religious reforms or the lack of an adult ruler. As a result they drifted into significant irrelevance.

Church and State 1529–1589

10. How much support was there for the Church in the early sixteenth century?

A minority of responses were rather one-sided and argued that the Church was fully supported. Most however took a balanced approach and dealt with anti-clericalism, Lollardy, corruption and issues such as the Hunne case. Most answers knew about the evidence to show that the Church was popular – wills, ordinands, Louth parish church – and also the criticisms from Colet, Fish and others. As always, the better answers were those which tried to offer assessment as well as description. At AS there is no requirement for a historiographical approach, and hardly any answers offered one. The phrase "early Sixteenth Century" did not cause problems for most. There were some sound and evaluative responses. However, there were several patterns of error in approach. Most responses did not go beyond 1529, although a minority went up to the Pilgrimage of Grace and a few candidates tried to extend 'the early sixteenth century' until Mary. While it was a legitimate approach to use the events surrounding the Breach with Rome as examples to show the degree of pre-existing popularity of the Church, the question is not about its popularity after the Breach, and a few candidates in effect addressed the question to the Church in the mid-century. One or two responses had sizeable sections on Martin Luther and events in Europe. A few responses described each critic of the clergy as a "lone wolf" with little further substantiation, and some saw them all as Protestant. However the vast majority were more balanced.

11. 'There was little popular support for the restoration of Catholicism under Mary I.' How far do you agree?

This was a popular question and often well done. Conclusions varied, but most responses were balanced and considered the evidence to the contrary of their argument. Issues covered in most responses include overcoming Lady Jane Grey, restoring Catholicism, marriage to Philip II and Wyatt's rebellion. Most candidates commented on the speed with which Catholicism was restored after Edward's death as a sign that Catholicism was popular. Most candidates who wrote about Wyatt's Rebellion presented it as anti-Catholic and easily defeated. The burning of Protestants was generally held to indicate support for Catholicism since there were so few ready and willing to go to the stake. A minority of responses were rather one-sided, Mary having either almost total support or (less commonly) virtually none. In contrast to the previous question, few candidates misinterpreted what was needed, and as a result there were few patterns of error, the discriminators being the quality of analysis and evaluation and the level of detail of the supporting evidence offered.

12. Assess the seriousness of the problems facing Catholics from 1558 to 1589.

Church and State was not a popular option this session, and this question was significantly the least popular of the three. Most examiners saw very few answers and therefore there is a limit to the amount of general comment to be made. That said, the quality was mixed. The stronger answers considered not only doctrinal/liturgical issues but also the political circumstances in which Catholics were trying to operate. There were attempted links to the wider European situation, but only a few seemed aware that Philip of Spain had no desire to see England ruled by a Francophile, even if she were Catholic. Weaker answers simply described the dilemma of whether to be loyal to Elizabeth or to Rome, with a paragraph on Mary Queen of Scots. A moderate grade was attainable as long as candidates were aware of the dates in the question and considered the whole period. Candidates who did were able to respond to the best of their ability and knowledge. Most did. A small minority considered either the beginning or the end of the period, and as a result were unable to develop a balanced answer to the question they had been set.

England under Elizabeth I 1558–1603

13. How serious were the religious problems Elizabeth I faced in 1558?

This question is of a type regularly asked, no more difficult than the others but all too often causing problems. As a general point, candidates need to know that if a question specifies a specific date the answer needs to address that date. Earlier and later material may be relevant, but only if used appropriately. Moreover when candidates are asked how serious a problem is, as in this case, they are not expected to rank it in order of importance against others as they would when answering questions 2 or 7 on this paper. The question caused problems for a fair few candidates. Many seemed to be answering the question: "How far was religion a more serious problem for Elizabeth I than foreign affairs and finance". Some linked the sections on finance and foreign affairs to religion but some did not. Credit could be given only insofar as other factors actively supported assessment of the seriousness of religious problems. The second pattern of error was in essays which went well beyond 1558, with the Spanish Armada and Elizabeth's quarrels with parliament over marriage (the lack of it) being well covered but in a way which could not support the needs of the question. A frequent line of thought was that 'the Catholics and Puritans simply accepted the Elizabethan Settlement so religious problems can't have been that serious'. Elizabeth's success in establishing a religious settlement did not in any way lessen the critical importance of being successful or the scale of the problem. There were therefore three principal ways in which candidates could mishandle the essay. That said, there was scope for those who did move beyond description to valuation of the problems to handle the question well, and there were some excellent answers.

14. 'Elizabeth I failed to manage her parliaments effectively.' How far do you agree?

This seemed a less popular choice than questions 13 and 15. The vast majority of responses had a balanced argument and considered a range of factors including the religious settlement, Mary Queen of Scots, the marriage issue and the role of Cecil. Better responses ranged across the whole reign and examined a variety of relevant issues before reaching an argued conclusion. Those candidates who were aware of the role of the Privy Council and the importance of the House of Lords wrote much better answers than those who saw the question as simply the relationship between Elizabeth and the Commons, and whose argument tended to be limited to stating that the Commons always gave in and voted her the money. Major problems with the question fell into two principal groups. Some answers did little more than run through the Neale/Revisionist interpretations, without expressing the candidate's own view. Historiography is not required for AS though it is credited if used well. Descriptively it is worth no more, and can be worth less in terms of addressing the question, than any other description. In addition, there

was a minority of candidates who assumed that Parliament equalled Government in the in the Sixteenth Century, and who could not differentiate between court, Council, Lords and Commons.

15. To what extent were monopolies the most serious economic and financial problem Elizabeth I faced?

This was a popular choice. Most responses contained a good range of factors and argued that inflation was a more serious problem than monopolies, although the two are linked and the issue of Monopolies was serious. Indeed there was much linking of factors in these responses. Most responses covered the broad span of the reign. Inflation, price rises, the cost of foreign policy and the inadequacy of royal income were identified as relevant factors. A small minority rejected the claim in the question and failed to discuss monopolies at all. Even if the named factor is rejected it must be considered in an answer and its lack of primary significance explained. There were some strong answers which recognised how monopolies operated and that they became a more controversial topic towards the end of the reign, as the economy came under greater strain. There were a few thoughtful answers looking at the weak structure of Elizabethan finance and how monopolies caused friction between Crown and Parliament, although few passed much comment on Elizabeth's giving ground on monopolies in order to retain the loyalty of MPs. In general this was a well-answered question.

The Early Stuarts and the Origins of the Civil War 1603–1642

16. 'Peace with Spain (1604) was the most serious cause of foreign policy disputes between James I and his parliaments.' How far do you agree?

The vast majority of responses had a good section on Peace with Spain and compared it to other causes of foreign policy disputes with Parliament such as the Thirty Years War. Most rejected the premise of the question and argued that the pursuit of a marriage alliance with Spain was more serious. The onset of the Thirty Years War in 1618 was also seen as an important factor. Some strong answers considered the benefits of making peace with Spain in 1604 and contrasted them to the anxieties raised by the outbreak of the Thirty Years' War and James' wish for the Spanish Match, so offensive to many of his subjects. Better answers commented on the clash between Parliament's claim to be entitled to discuss foreign policy and James' insistence that it fell within his prerogative. Weaker answers tended to go straight for the Spanish Match as the only factor worth considering. Most candidates appreciated the requirements of the question and addressed them, with the discriminators being the quality of their argument and of the factual support they were able to provide. A small minority misinterpreted the question and wrote about other causes of disputes between James and his parliaments.

17. 'The inadequacy of royal finances was the most important cause of James I's financial problems.' How far do you agree?

There were some excellent responses to this question, some agreeing with its premise and some not. Most showed an awareness of the named factor and also considered a range of other factors. The King's extravagance and parliament's reluctance to grant him adequate income featured strongly in many effective answers. There was much linking of factors and many responses had substantiated judgements about relative importance. At the high levels there was excellent factual support. This question, however, unsettled many candidates: for many, the examination of 'the inadequacy of royal finances' did not extend beyond knowing that James never had enough money. Few such candidates explored the causes of the shortfall or the reluctance of officials and MPs to update anything to take account of inflation. Many of the weaker answers stuck to one familiar factor, that James was an extravagant fool. For example, the money that went to his Scottish favourites was seen to many as simple waste, with no consideration of the King's need to ensure a degree of continuing popularity north of the Border.

Better answers recognised that there were faults in the king, in the system and in the attitude of Parliament. The Great Contract wasn't as one-sided as many supposed. Although this is a controversial topic, many candidates would have benefitted from a more objective and analytical approach.

18. How far were Charles I's opponents to blame for the outbreak of civil war in 1642?

This was a very popular question to which, to judge from their responses, most candidates had already given thought. Most answers agreed at least to some extent that the King's opponents were to blame, and focused on the actions of Pym, in particular, after the calling of the Long Parliament. Whilst Charles I certainly contributed to the outbreak of war, most felt that he had been pushed too far by his opponents. Weaker answers focused too much on the earlier part of Charles's reign and wrote extensively about 1625-1629 and the 1630s. Naturally some coverage of the Personal Rule to clarify the political stance of Charles is important, but knowing about the impeachment of Strafford and Laud, the Triennial Act, the Grand Remonstrance and the Five Members Coup is also essential. A few candidates lacked the necessary balance, but there were several strongly evaluative responses. As is so often the case, candidates who took care to identify the key words in the question impressed by intelligent use of their knowledge in an analytical and organised fashion. Most candidates were able to use their knowledge and abilities to the full. There were only two patterns of under-achievement. Some essays treated the early period as providing direct causes of the war as opposed to preconditions for its possibility. Some candidates were unable to see balance and placed all the blame on Charles or his opponents and in particular Pym.

F961/02 British History Period Studies

General comments

Units F961 and F962 are identical in their aims and assessment objectives. The only difference is in the choice of Study Topics for the candidates and, as a result, these general comments apply to all four papers offered within the units.

The overall quality of the responses showed little change from previous sessions. A significant number of candidates showed sufficient understanding, knowledge and ability to analyse or discuss the issue or issues in the question to reach Level III for AO1b, and examiners were pleased to read some scripts that showed a consistently high level of analysis and judgement. There were some candidates who appeared to be ill-prepared for the examination and produced responses which lacked an understanding of the topic. It might therefore be worthwhile reminding Centres and Candidates of the basic requirement for these Units. Candidates need to use relevant and accurate factual material to support well-structured arguments. This will allow them to reach a well-informed historical judgement about the issue in the question. It might also be worth reminding candidates that all the Units require answers to be in continuous prose, avoiding the use of abbreviations, notes or bullet points.

Most answers did show at least some explanation, with the most successful supported by sound and wide-ranging knowledge. However, it is worth stressing that AO1a is awarded, not for the deployment of knowledge, but for its use in supporting an argument or judgement. Centres should also be aware that attempts at argument or judgement are only assertions unless they are supported by accurate and relevant factual material, which means that the two assessment objectives are closely linked. Although some weaker candidates did attempt to argue, their attempts at analysis had little supporting knowledge and often relied on generalization, which is likely to result in answers being placed in either Level IV or Level V for AO1b. The decline in the purely descriptive essay continues and where there was evidence of accurate and relevant knowledge most candidates were able to link it to the demands of the question.

It is important that Centres give equal attention to all Key Issues and associated content on which questions are based - there were certainly indications that some candidates appeared under-prepared for some of the topics. Not only should Centres ignore topics that have been set previously, but they should also give attention to areas that not have been set before, as with Question 11 on the Peace Treaties on F962/2. Centres should also be fully aware that Questions may test more than one Key Issue, as was the case with Question 1 on F962/2 on the rise of Napoleon.

The strongest answers will pick up on key words, phrases or dates in their answers, whereas weaker responses will be more general, often combining less relevant material with relevant comments. It is surprising that the term 'assess' still produces the 'list-like' response, with some candidates even signposting this approach with comments such as 'another reason for X was', whereas stronger answers will attempt to evaluate the importance of the reasons to enable a judgement to be reached. Therefore, whilst most candidates are usually able to suggest several reasons they need to try and prioritise their importance if they are to move beyond Level III for AO1b. However, it is not sufficient for a Candidate, having explained a reason, simply to assert why it was the most important: they need to have explained why it was the most important. There appeared to be a continuation in the trend for Candidates to learn a set of answers to previous questions and then try and apply them to the questions that are set in the examination. This is rarely successful and should be discouraged; candidates need to be flexible and be able to apply their knowledge to a question that offers a slightly different slant or emphasis if they want to reach the top level. However, it might be helpful for Candidates to have a stronger understanding of key concepts and issues that relate to the Key Issues they are studying; for

example, there was a significant number of candidates who seemed to have only the vaguest understanding of what is meant by stability and simply replaced it with success, thereby producing responses which had only limited focus.

The comments for some of the individual questions across the four papers in this Report may be repetitive, but this is deliberate as it emphasises that the demands for individual questions are similar and that Candidates make similar mistakes or show similar strengths, regardless of the Unit or Topic being studied. It also helps to reinforce the fact that all the Units are marked using the same generic mark scheme and it would be advisable for Centres to read the whole Report, rather than just the section that applies to the Study Topic or Topics that they teach, so that they are aware of the general trends.

The Paper differentiated well and allowed for good candidates to show their strengths. The vast majority of candidates had been extremely well prepared but the failure to assess rather than simply describe with the occasional assertion on the part of many was noted. Bolt on comments are still common rather than ongoing analysis. Quite often, extended introductions and conclusions are seldom more than repetitions of the body of the answer and contribute little. That said, those who did craft relevant, focused and discerning conclusions did well. Overall the quality of response seemed higher than previously, but the skills of analysis and judgement seem to desert too many otherwise seemingly well qualified candidates. Listing did prevail in many cases and there needs to be thought given to how to link paragraphs and create a balanced, integrated overall answer.

Individual comments

Question 1. This was a popular question which attracted a wide range of responses. There were very few candidates who fell into the trap and went beyond 1793, which was encouraging. There were some weak considerations of royal influence along lines of, “George appointed him and was therefore important.” Many answers started with Pitt’s personal qualities, which usually led to weaker answers because they became overly descriptive or lacked the precise evidence needed to sustain an argument. The best ones started with royal support and assessed that clearly and well, making good links to both royal and Pitt’s needs, often using evidence from the first election to support their argument. Stronger answers used policies carefully, aware of the need to anchor these with the sense of political domination and not just the successor otherwise of the policies. Much was made of the failings of meaningful opposition and strong links were often made to the prevailing context, not least the growing worries over events in France. Weaker answers failed to analyse adequately the well-remembered domestic reforms and link them to supporting domination, or answered a different question on how well Pitt dealt with the radical threat. It has been mentioned on numerous occasions in reports that candidates need to answer the actual question set and not try to adapt pre-learned answers, and this was further evidence of the traps that could follow such an approach; candidates need to be flexible and apply their knowledge to the actual question set.

Question 2. Stronger answers often started with a definition of liberal and then compared the reforms of the post 1822 with that definition. Weaker answers did not establish a set of criteria against which to judge the measures and often focused on a narrow range of issues; many ignored the trade and financial reforms which could be seen as some of the more liberal measures, or at least allow a case to be made that they were economically liberal if nothing else. Most took the view that, even though the reforms looked liberal, they were not introduced for liberal motives, and therefore could not be, often pointing to Catholic Emancipation and the desire to preserve order to support their argument. Many, but not all, did see the change in personnel and so outlooks as important, but often noted that many had been in government before 1822. Some examined a few of the pre-1822 acts as a way of reinforcing the contrast in periods and this was often done in an effective manner and allowed some to argue that even if the measures were not liberal they were more liberal than the earlier Liverpool period. Most felt

the economic policies were the most liberal, with the caveat of the retention of the Corn Laws. Other areas covered were gaols, justice, policing, combination laws and Catholic Emancipation, but stronger answers did note the failure or absence of political reform. Description was often seen but there were genuine attempts at analysis and evaluation in a good number of responses, with stronger answers offering an overall judgement and the very best offering interim judgements on the various aspects of reform.

Question 3. A number of candidates struggled with this question, perhaps having prepared for a question on his 1841-6 ministry, and were unable to adapt their material to fit the question. As a consequence, a number failed to use their material to focus consistently on the actual question and produced only elements of an answer. Stronger arguments considered the long-term disquiet in the party about Peel's commitment to Tory values, especially from Catholic Emancipation, but these were usually used as brief context before focusing on 1841-46; some did mention the nature of the 1841 election victory and the basis of Conservative support, which Peel appeared to be either challenging or ignoring. Weaker answers relied on Peel's poor leadership style, without assessing properly the merits of the key reforms. The best answers used the Irish legislation and events in Ireland to reinforce the long held suspicions amongst peers and backbenchers and were confident in assigning relative importance to Peel's actions, viewing the Repeal of the Corn Laws in 1846 as very much the final damage to an ever growing leadership failure, rather than the key factor. Weaker answers were very descriptive, sometimes simply write about the ministry and its policies with little attempt to link the material to the question. If Question 2 encouraged candidates to reach judgements on the issues discussed, this was often absent in this question and evaluative comments were rare and often, if they were present, were not developed.

Question 4. Although this was quite a popular question, there were a significant number of candidates whose knowledge of the radicals was inadequate and who chose either to write generally, or virtually ignore the named factor. Where the latter approach is taken, answers cannot go beyond Level IV for AO1b, as answers must contain a good paragraph on the named factor; even if the response goes on to argue that it was not important, it cannot simply be dismissed. The majority of candidates lacked a confident appreciation of either what or who the Radicals were, although they are specifically mentioned in the Specification. Weaker answers often used them as very much a bolt-on to answers about the creation of the Liberals via the impact of Russell, Gladstone, Palmerston et al. Better answers appreciated the policy differences within the Radicals and their weakness in numbers which precluded them from creating their own party. Only the better ones were able to discuss in any depth the basis of radical ideas as a launchpad for detailed analysis. Those that were able to do this were, as a result, able to produce strong answers. However, many wanted to write at length on either Palmerston, Gladstone or the Peelites, which had appeared in previous questions on this issue.

Question 5. This was the least popular question in this section and, of those who attempted it, relatively few analysed the nature of Gladstonian liberalism before embarking on a review of the reforms. This inevitably, in most but not all cases, resulted in a bolt-on approach with assertions about why each was introduced, rather than considering the aims of Gladstonian liberalism and how the various reforms linked to them. The strongest answers adopted a more thematic approach, but most resorted to largely descriptive accounts of individual reforms and superficial analysis or assertion, which was bolted-on at the end of a paragraph. External events such as the growing electorate or economic factors formed part of only the most outstanding answers. There was often an impressive knowledge of the legislation and the content, but this was not adapted that well to the thrust of the question. The better responses did consider the motives and appeal and the gradual loss of direction and energy, but many candidates were unable to adapt their considerable knowledge to the actual question and wanted to answer a slightly different question – often about how liberal the reforms were.

Question 6. Although this was quite a popular question, there were very few who were able to deal with the named factor in an adequate manner in relation to the actual question set. Domestic reforms were often used to either top or tail this answer, with very few responses able to link their limited nature to the Conservative defeat of 1880. Instead, descriptions of the reforms were often the order of the day, and the fact of their permissive nature or Disraeli's delegation of responsibility for them was underplayed. The role of Gladstone was appreciated by most, but not often as a specific contradiction of policies and errors perpetrated by Disraeli. Weaker answers often focused on Disraeli's poor health and inability to campaign. Most answers became dominated by foreign and imperial policy, but at times this was not closely linked to Gladstone and the Midlothian campaign. Better ones did assess the limitations of domestic policies and were able to assess the importance of a range of issues including a lack of direction, poor organization, economic downturn in 1879-80, a resurgent Gladstone and Liberal Party organisation and appeal.

Question 7. This was a popular question, which was usually well balanced between the specific Balkan issues and the wider more general ones. Weaker answers relied on the general balance of power and other big issues almost forgetting the desired focus. There was often an impressive range of detail even in weaker answers, though focus tended to be pre-1890s so there was some imbalance, and this often resulted in answers not reaching the highest levels as there was only some command. When candidates are required to cover a lengthy period it is important that large sections are not ignored; this will prevent answers from being placed in the highest Levels as the conclusions and judgements drawn from a limited coverage may not be reflective of the whole period. Many answers dwelt too much on the period 1856 to 1878, with a great deal of description of the Congress of Berlin and the terms obtained, although very few pleasingly included extensive Crimean War detail. Weaker answers contained much detail on the issue of the Suez Canal and the passage to India, which was then repeated virtually verbatim for Question 8.

Question 8. This was a popular question and most responses were analytical in their approach, even if their handling of the named factor was either weak or unconvincing. A significant number did not use the named factor as an argument and simply made a brief reference to India, Suez and Sudan at the start before analysing the Scramble for Africa in varying levels of depth. Weak answers cited the question at the end of each paragraph, as if this might constitute analysis rather than simple assertion. For a good number, it was clear that the geography of Africa was not clear to them; East Africa especially was very much under-covered compared with South and West. Better responses had a suitable grasp, offered a good range and were aware of shifts in policies, usually embracing a range of factors, not least the civilising and humanitarian as well as great power rivalries and commercial-strategic imperatives. Many were able to place events in a wider context when discussing rivalries or strategic considerations, bringing in the challenges from Germany and France, but also linking this, where appropriate to the preservation of the route to India. In many of the stronger responses the depth of knowledge used to support the argument was impressive and often resulted in high levels being awarded, with knowledge used to drive an argument forward or to explain an idea, rather than simply imparted.

Question 9. This was the least popular of the questions in this section and it is perhaps surprising that it was not done better. Far too often the consideration of the naval rivalry was lacking detail, especially in how precise parts of it impacted upon specific facets of British-German relations. Many answers adopted a chronological approach and preferred to turn it into a more general essay on international relations in the early twentieth century, often with excessive consideration of the Moroccan crises and their impact. Relations with France were generally covered well, although as mentioned above there was a tendency to spend too long on Morocco, and their impact on Germany and Britain was confidently handled. The place of Russia in the relations between Britain and Germany was rarely considered. Only the best commented on the decline of naval tension after 1912 and the weaker spent much time on the invasion of Belgium. A number wrote about why Britain went to war with Germany. A few of the stronger

answers were aware of a context of perceptions, misunderstandings, Foreign Office attitudes, and the role of important personalities.

Question 10. This was a very popular question, but only the best responses focused on the impact of Lloyd George's actions on the Conservatives. Too often it was simply an overview of what Lloyd George did wrong and a simple assumption that this brought about his downfall, with any reference to the Conservatives often being reserved for Ireland, the Chanak issue, his personal immorality becoming a liability and often only one or two of those factors. 'Assess the reasons' was taken by too many as simply an invitation to describe his period in office after the War, with an assertion tacked on at the end of each paragraph that it brought about his downfall. Knowledge of Lloyd George's errors whilst in office was often extensive, but candidates do need to link that knowledge to the actual question and not simply imply that it contributed to his downfall. At times, too much space was given to consideration of the problems of the Liberal Party, badly divided in 1918. Usually, answers attributed the fall to his character defects or the Carlton Club meeting. The best answers blended policies and actions with the political scene and the dependence on the Conservatives, culminating in the October 1922 meeting. In stronger answers good links were made to foreign policy (Chanak), the rise and threat of the Labour Party, the dangers of the 'dynamic force' that was Lloyd George and the growing belief that freedom from the Coalition was best for the Conservative party. However, there were a number of responses where candidates explained how Lloyd George's policies had alienated the working class, for example over the Geddes Axe, but did not link this to the actual question.

Question 11. This was a very popular question, but it also attracted a significant number of weak responses. There were a number that spent time on the background to the strike and its causes rather than analysing the reasons for the failure. Some were able to describe the various factors for the Strike's failure, but analysis of the relative importance of the factors was either absent or was less confident. Most knew far more about the government's preparations, such as stockpiling or the production of its paper, than about union weaknesses, whilst others argued that the government's ability to portray the strike as a threat to the constitution was an important element. The weakest answers failed to distinguish between the TUC and the unions or did not include the miners as part of their union analysis. Some referred to the later Trades Disputes Act. In dealing with the Unions a number of answers relied on very general comments or simply stated that the Unions were not as well prepared as the government, without being able to explain in what ways this was the case. Some gave much attention to the role of the public in helping to keep services running.

Question 12. This question produced a wide range of responses, with some stronger answers covering a good range of issues, whilst others were very narrow, often not going beyond nationalization and the NHS. Many candidates treated this as an overview of policies with a comment on whether they succeeded or failed, rather than as an overall judgement. The Welfare State and nationalisation were usually the key areas covered; relatively few mentioned areas such as austerity, foreign policy, a tired team or the failings of the second term. Why Labour lost in 1951 was not analysed by many, although some contrasted Labour party stagnation with the renaissance of the Conservatives' organisation. There were those who did focus too much on the success of 1945 or the eventual defeat in 1951 rather than on the actual demands of the question. Centres should do all they can to encourage candidates to read the question carefully, ask themselves what is the focus of the question and to ensure they link their material to that rather than writing generally about the topic with any reference to the actual question very limited.

Question 13. Although a popular topic, the responses to this question were uneven; this almost certainly reflects the inclusion of "far" into the question. There were a significant number of responses that focused on the reasons for the change, rather than how far the policy changed, and where this was the sole focus answers did not progress beyond Level III for AO1b; once again, candidates must answer the actual question set if they want to reach the higher levels, Examination of how the policy changed was done well in some cases, though few linked it to

Suez or decolonization, but extent - particularly the British response to Europe in the immediate aftermath of the Second World War - was largely ignored except in the strongest answers. Britain's economic problems and the failure of EFTA were commonly cited, but again EFTA could have been used to show that Britain did not want to distance itself completely from Europe, which some answers implied. References to the attitude of the USA and to the Cold War did appear as an explanation for the changing relations. Few answers made any reference to the views of the respective parties and how far they were transformed. Too many took a highly generalized approach, built on a few key dates and events, or wrote about why Britain did not join the EEC until 1973 or why it did join.

Question 14. This was the least popular question in this section and many answers were weak or did not focus on the demands of the question. Many were characterized by lists of opponents or brief surveys of CND/Greenham Common, which were seen by many as all that was needed, although most agreed that they had little influence. Weaker ones took the view that because Britain's nuclear programme was secret this proved how powerful opinion was, or because governments persisted it was insignificant. Few mentioned Labour and unilateralism, although some of the better answers did consider the debate in the party in both the 1950s and under Michael Foot. Some examined the costs and the role of the USA/USSR, but all in all this came across as a question done very much as a second choice.

Question 15. This was a popular question though even the best did little or nothing to debate what they understood as a world power. It would have been beneficial to establish some criteria against which Thatcher and her policies could be judged. There was usually extensive and accurate coverage of major events, with stronger answers distinguishing between Britain's status and that of Thatcher's prestige; this was the usual pattern, and the split focus of the Special Relationship was appreciated by most. The Cold War, the Falklands War, Grenada, the bombing of Libya and Britain's relationship with the EU featured in most answers. The weaker answers simply asserted that, *de facto*, Thatcher's success improved GB status, but these types of response were rare. More worryingly there were some who seemed to think that Thatcher was in office whilst Stalin and Kennedy were in power, making their attempts at analysis unconvincing. There were also a number of answers that attempted to turn this into a question about Thatcher's domestic policies and how far her achievements made Britain stronger.

Question 16. This was another very popular question, but a failure to focus on the detail of economic performance was often evident, particularly among the less strong responses. Often living standards were ignored or covered perfunctorily and late in answers, suggesting that a number of candidates did not really grasp the concept. The signs and the feeling of affluence and the issue of employment versus unemployment were not covered that well, although some were aware of rising unemployment at the end of the period. The manipulation of the economy for electoral purposes was rarely considered, but could have proved very valuable in tackling the question. Many focused on Labour divisions and the strength of Conservative leaders, although knowledge of them was often quite general, at the expense of any economic factors at all. Some of the weakest answers wrote about scandals and the Conservative defeat in 1964 and failed to focus on the demands of the question.

Question 17. This was another popular question and it is pleasing to see how both the depth of knowledge of this period and an understanding of the issues has developed since the topic first appeared. There were some strong, balanced answers which covered a good range, but many suffered from imbalance with nearly all focusing on the negatives. The Miners and EEC entry dominated some responses, with Selsdon and U-turns rarely covered by any but the best, although there were some precise examples such as Rolls Royce. OPEC-induced economic issues, immigration and the Northern Ireland crisis were often present in the stronger answers, but were absent from weaker responses. More could have been made of industrial relations, and this could have been linked to the state of the economy. Stronger answers covered Local Government reform well as a balancing factor. Most concluded that Heath was a failure as Prime

Minister and Party leader, citing the 1974 General Elections, but only the best considered a sufficient range to allow such a response to be really justified.

Question 18. As with responses on Heath, the quality and number of answers on this topic has risen. However, there were still a number of heavily descriptive answers or responses which covered only part of the period and therefore showed only some command of the topic. As mentioned for other questions that cover a large period of time candidates should try and make some references to the whole period so that their analysis and judgements are based on the full period, otherwise conclusions drawn may be less valid or based on only a partial understanding of the topic. Most suggested that the policies followed, at least until the end of the period, only created more opposition and violence and so must be failures. Many focused on Bloody Sunday and internment, but Sunningdale and other more positive moves were largely ignored. Many did not progress beyond the 1970s and 1980s and none began in the 1950s. A surprisingly small number commented on the impact of the mainland bombing campaign even though they wrote about terrorism and responses to such. Knowledge was usually sound, but all too often presented only via description. There needed to be a surer sense of analysis and the best answers did indeed create this.

F962/01 Medieval and Early Modern

General comments

Units F961 and F962 are identical in their aims and assessment objectives. The only difference is in the choice of Study Topics for the candidates and, as a result, these general comments apply to all four papers offered within the units.

The overall quality of the responses showed little change from previous sessions. A significant number of candidates showed sufficient understanding, knowledge and ability to analyse or discuss the issue or issues in the question to reach Level III for AO1b, and examiners were pleased to read some scripts that showed a consistently high level of analysis and judgement. There were some candidates who appeared to be ill-prepared for the examination and produced responses which lacked an understanding of the topic. It might therefore be worthwhile reminding Centres and Candidates of the basic requirement for these Units. Candidates need to use relevant and accurate factual material to support well-structured arguments. This will allow them to reach a well-informed historical judgement about the issue in the question. It might also be worth reminding candidates that all the Units require answers to be in continuous prose, avoiding the use of abbreviations, notes or bullet points.

Most answers did show at least some explanation, with the most successful supported by sound and wide-ranging knowledge. However, it is worth stressing that AO1a is awarded, not for the deployment of knowledge, but for its use in supporting an argument or judgement. Centres should also be aware that attempts at argument or judgement are only assertions unless they are supported by accurate and relevant factual material, which means that the two assessment objectives are closely linked. Although some weaker candidates did attempt to argue, their attempts at analysis had little supporting knowledge and often relied on generalization, which is likely to result in answers being placed in either Level IV or Level V for AO1b. The decline in the purely descriptive essay continues and where there was evidence of accurate and relevant knowledge most candidates were able to link it to the demands of the question.

It is important that Centres give equal attention to all Key Issues and associated content on which questions are based - there were certainly indications that some candidates appeared under-prepared for some of the topics. Not only should Centres ignore topics that have been set previously, but they should also give attention to areas that not have been set before, as with Question 11 on the Peace Treaties on F962/2. Centres should also be fully aware that Questions may test more than one Key Issue, as was the case with Question 1 on F962/2 on the rise of Napoleon.

The strongest answers will pick up on key words, phrases or dates in their answers, whereas weaker responses will be more general, often combining less relevant material with relevant comments. It is surprising that the term 'assess' still produces the 'list-like' response, with some candidates even signposting this approach with comments such as 'another reason for X was', whereas stronger answers will attempt to evaluate the importance of the reasons to enable a judgement to be reached. Therefore, whilst most candidates are usually able to suggest several reasons they need to try and prioritise their importance if they are to move beyond Level III for AO1b. However, it is not sufficient for a Candidate, having explained a reason, simply to assert why it was the most important: they need to have explained why it was the most important. There appeared to be a continuation in the trend for Candidates to learn a set of answers to previous questions and then try and apply them to the questions that are set in the examination. This is rarely successful and should be discouraged; candidates need to be flexible and be able to apply their knowledge to a question that offers a slightly different slant or emphasis if they want to reach the top level. However, it might be helpful for Candidates to have a stronger understanding of key concepts and issues that relate to the Key Issues they are studying; for

example, there was a significant number of candidates who seemed to have only the vaguest understanding of what is meant by stability and simply replaced it with success, thereby producing responses which had only limited focus.

The comments for some of the individual questions across the four papers in this Report may be repetitive, but this is deliberate as it emphasises that the demands for individual questions are similar and that Candidates make similar mistakes or show similar strengths, regardless of the Unit or Topic being studied. It also helps to reinforce the fact that all the Units are marked using the same generic mark scheme and it would be advisable for Centres to read the whole Report, rather than just the section that applies to the Study Topic or Topics that they teach, so that they are aware of the general trends.

The Crusades and Crusader States 1095–1192

1. To what extent were political motives the main reason for the First Crusade?

Stronger candidates were wise to define political motives early in their answer and found plenty to say about the Pope's ambitions. They then went on to compare this to the more spiritual motives of both the papacy and those who went on the crusade and many concluded that religious motives, and the central role of Jerusalem, were the dominant driver. The strongest candidates produced detailed and convincing analyses of Urban's aims and the position of the papacy at the time. Weaker candidates seemed unsure what political motives might be in this context and some chose to ignore the factor altogether, forgetting that it is essential to consider the named factor. Some candidates were reluctant to see beyond a negative interpretation of "political", ascribing to Urban nothing beyond a self-centred desire to increase his power, and in doing so betrayed a limited empathy with the period. Similarly, some had little idea of what constituted religious motives at the time, assuming Christians thought then as they do today. There was considerable confusion about the relationship between Rome and the Byzantines, with minorities seeing them as inveterate enemies and some seeing Alexios' letter as the prime cause of the crusade. A significant proportion of the moderate candidates produced good lists of factors with little analysis or linkage between them. It must be stressed that to assert the importance of a factor is not to evaluate it.

2. How strong were the Crusader States in the period to 1192?

No specific view was looked for and there was a wide variety of successful approaches to the answer. There were some very successful essays that argued that the Crusader States always lacked manpower and that they came under increasing pressure as the Muslims united and grew stronger. Most could see several strengths, and there was some good evaluation of factors such as leadership, the military strengths of the religious orders and castles, and so on. The best showed impressive knowledge of these. There were thoughtful comments too about geographical factors and the relationship between the Franks and their Muslim neighbours. Some candidates misread the question to read 'in 1192' and wrote only about the situation in that year. The more moderate candidates produced lists of the strengths and weaknesses and had some idea of the changing situation. The ability to pull these together to a supported judgement about the strength of the Crusader States was one of the principal discriminators between the middle and high grades. There were some who lacked sufficient knowledge and tried to rely for their factual support on the events of the crusades, and a few who chose just to narrate the main events of the Second and Third Crusades. Some factors, such as military tactics, overlap, but it was important to give examples that were not all drawn from the crusades. Unfortunately, even relatively detailed knowledge of the crusades, used exclusively, could receive only limited credit.

3. How far did the Muslim world's reaction to the Crusader states change during the twelfth century?

This was the least popular question of the three and it seemed to cause confusion over how to approach it. This often led to a description of the rise of jihad, although a few candidates did write effectively about the changing reaction of the Muslim world. The best essays showed real knowledge of the Muslims as well as of the Franks. They were able to evaluate factors such as the original under-estimation of the Christians, the effects of the deep political and religious divisions among the Muslims and the resulting mixed feeling towards the newcomers who could sometimes be allies. Some also wrote well about the relationship between the Franks and the Muslims in the territory they had conquered, and appreciated the degree of cooperation achieved between them. Most candidates had a fair amount to say about the effects of jihad and the new unifying Muslim leaders. The differentiator for higher grades was the move beyond explanation of individual factors to a supported judgement on "how far". There was a small but significant minority whose knowledge did not go beyond the crusades themselves, and who compared only the reactions to the three crusades, with some doing no more than write about Saladin and Richard I.

The Renaissance from c.1400–c.1550

4. 'Cultural factors were the most important reason for the development of the Renaissance in Italy.' How far do you agree?

The major discriminator between moderate and strong answers was the ability to support the conclusion. There was no correlation in terms of success between candidates who agreed with the question and those who did not, as long as sufficient supported attention was given to the named factor. The best justified their choice well, whereas the more moderate candidates found it hard to move beyond a general list, starting each paragraph with "Another factor..." and neglecting to assess their relative importance. There were those who asserted relative importance, thinking that this constituted evaluation. Some essays were improved by conclusions that finally showed some analysis, but the best candidates analysed and linked the factors as they went along, and often favoured economic factors over cultural. There were some patterns of difficulty or weaker candidates. Some were unsure about the meaning of cultural factors. There were general points about differences between cities, for example, or descriptions of individual artists' work. The role of the Church as patron tended to prove difficult for the weaker candidates.

5. How far did painting change in the Renaissance?

A few excellent essays had a clear view about how much was innovative and argued their case effectively. These were supported with detailed knowledge of individual painters and paintings, and were able to use this knowledge to move to a supported judgement on change and continuity. The discriminator at the top was the ability to address "how far"? Most considered the importance of classical influences, and set this alongside and against the continuing preponderance of Christian imagery and motivation. Some candidates were confused by this and assumed that the Church was against artistic innovation. Many considered changes in techniques and materials, with discussions of oil painting and perspective predominating. Some, however, could not move beyond using the vocabulary – chiaroscuro was mentioned, for example, without explanation. There were two principal patterns of mishandling of this question. A significant proportion failed to stick to painting and wrote a considerable amount on the development of sculpture, and more frequently architecture. Some ignored the word 'change' and just gave a descriptive overview of art in the Renaissance.

6. Assess the main developments in social and political thought in the period from c.1400 to c.1550.

This was by far the least popular question in this section. It was notable that there were few moderate answers. The strong showed a detailed understanding, particularly of political as opposed to social thought, and supported their line with well-chosen and detailed examples. There tended to be a focus on the continuing influence of Latin sources and the growth of Greek, with many mentioning the fall of Constantinople. There was well-chosen and well-understood reference to the major thinkers. These candidates had no problem with the word "assess" and as such, though the few that were seen varied in their approach, they had in common that they addressed the question well. At the other extreme were candidates who were out of their depth in terms of the ideas and wrote descriptively and thinly. They tended to know a few thinkers but not much about what they actually thought.

Exploration and Discovery c.1445–c.1545

7. 'The most important motive in exploration was personal.' How far do you agree?

This question was the most popular in this section, and proved very accessible to most candidates. Nearly all succeeded in passing the first hurdle, and focused on the motives in exploration. There were hardly any answers unsure of the demands of the question. Candidates dealt with the various motives. Success depended upon the amount of supporting detail in which each was considered and the ability to evaluate them. No particular answer was expected, and there was no correlation between the success of the candidates and whether or not they agreed with the question. Virtually all candidates assessed personal motives against others, and most took examples from both Spain and Portugal and were able, to a greater or lesser degree, to differentiate between the two. They typically discussed gold and spices, national rivalries, the support of backers and governments and religious motives. The term "personal" is open to variable interpretation and most candidates saw this, and defined it accordingly. The stronger of those who wanted to agree with the question were able to draw some other factors under the umbrella of personal, so instead of contrasting personal with royal motives, they noted Henry the Navigator's personal desire for fame, and Isabella's personal religious devotion, for example. There was commendably little reference to technology, which was an enabler rather than a motive, and is thus easier to treat irrelevantly than relevantly for this question.

8. Assess the reasons why Spain and Portugal were able to develop overseas empires in the period from c.1445 to c.1545.

There were some very strong answers. The best essays differentiated between Spain and Portugal, displayed knowledge of a range of reasons and supported a judgment on their relative importance. This question, however, posed more problems for candidates than question 7. In addition to the need to support a hierarchy of factors to achieve a judgement, there was an issue of content. A significant minority of candidates did not differentiate between exploration and discovery. This led either to a very generalised and semi-focussed approach or to an assumption that the same material could be used for questions 7 and 8. Candidates need to be aware that while occasionally the same factual material may be used to support two different answers, AO1A rewards not just knowledge but its application to the answer. Most candidates for this unit are now aware of the need to argue, not simply to describe, but there was a minority of responses which simply described the empire builders. One example may serve: technological and navigational developments were cited by many as a factor. The candidates who were less clear on the question did not differentiate between the elements of ship design which aided exploration and those, notably carrying capacity, which supported the growth of empire.

9. Assess the impact of the Spanish Empire on its subjects in Spain and the Americas.

This was significantly less popular than the other two questions in this section. It was essential to consider both Spain and the Americas, and nearly every essay did that. Candidates were aware that if they thought in terms of good and bad effects and compared them an evaluative approach was the natural one. As such there were few essays which did not address the question to the best of candidates' abilities. Moreover, most were able to see positives and negatives both in Spain and the Americas, and to weigh them against each other. As such there was only one clear pattern of difficulty. Some candidates when faced with a balance of factors found it impossible to compare them or evaluate them. They simply used them to contradict each other. A factor was good for Spain because.... And then in the next paragraph, the factor was bad for Spain because.... Sometimes the paragraphs expressed open disagreement. The attempted judgement was no more than a discounting of one set of paragraphs. On this paper, questions regularly come in this style, and it is worth candidates' while to develop the skill of addressing them.

Spain 1469–1556

10. 'The Reconquista was Ferdinand and Isabella's most successful religious policy.' How far do you agree?

There were some strong answers to this question. They all featured consideration of the Reconquista and a supported judgement on whether it was more successful than other religious policies. The best essays evaluated the success of the Reconquista against several other aspects of religious policy, including where appropriate the differences between royal policy in Aragon and Castile. Some successful candidates agreed completely with the question, some (not at all, but most) saw the Reconquista as having a valid claim for consideration. The few who disagreed too completely found it hard to develop relevant analysis, as they were only comparing factors other than the named factor in the question. That led some candidates towards a tangential treatment, and meant they did not use their knowledge to the best advantage. Some were also led into a loss of focus by the consideration that the Reconquista was not exclusively a religious policy. A close focus on religious policies paid off on this question, but a few weaker candidates opted for a more general run down of all domestic policies in the hope that some would be relevant. Even many of those who did focus on religion seemed unsure of how to judge success and failed to include much analysis.

11. How powerful were Ferdinand and Isabella as monarchs?

This question provoked some excellent responses which successfully analysed the power of the monarchs and distinguished between the two kingdoms. The best essays also argued that their power fluctuated over their long reigns. There were some very knowledgeable and well-argued responses, which took a variety of approaches, for as usual no set answer was expected. Many took the civil wars as a starting point. They tended to be more successful if they went on to take a topical rather than chronological approach, but noted that power varied in different areas over time. Most strong essays dealt with the different conditions in Castile and Aragon, control of the towns, relations with the nobility and Cortes, and financial strength. Weaker essays tended to drift towards an answer to a different question, often looking at the success of their domestic policies with little reference to power. Indeed some candidates did not differentiate between power and success. A few weaker candidates tried to re-use their limited knowledge of the Reconquista in a way which did not very successfully address the needs of the question. Some saw Spain as one homogeneous unit and failed to appreciate the very real variations in the monarchs' strength in place as well as time.

12. 'Charles I failed to improve the economy and finances of Spain.' How far do you agree?

While ideally a balance between treatment of finance and of the economy was looked for, a considerable degree of latitude was allowed. Candidates were able to attain the higher grades with a focus on either economy or finance, as long as there was sufficient detail and understanding of a range of the factors to enable supported analysis. The best answers were able to come to a judgement: the difficulty in this question lies in that it was a hard thesis to disagree with and some candidates ended up just listing all the reasons why Charles proved so incompetent with finance. The economy was also often ignored or barely touched on by weaker candidates. There was therefore a proportion of candidates who did not really appreciate the requirements of the question. Prolonged discussion of the costs of war and the effects of Charles' absences could gain only very limited credit.

Charles V: International Relations and the Holy Roman Empire 1519–1559

13. 'The most important reason for the limits to Charles V's power as Holy Roman Emperor was the impact of Lutheranism.' How far do you agree?

To succeed, candidates needed to consider not only the impact of Lutheranism but also other factors which limited Charles' power. There was a variety of approach and judgement: there were strong answers which both agreed and disagreed with the primacy of Lutheranism. A few excellent answers argued that Charles had limits put on his power from the very start of his reign by Princes who jealously guarded their independence, and showed how this finally linked to the exhausted Charles giving in to the forces of particularism at the Peace of Augsburg. For weaker candidates this proved a hard question and some misread it. Some treated it as a question focusing solely on the reasons for Luther's success and failed to set Lutheranism against the Emperor's other difficulties; some tended to describe the support given by the princes, usually with a disproportionate amount of attention being given to Frederick the Wise. Others described at length how Charles's weaknesses as Emperor aided the spread of heresy. A word from the question which tended not to be addressed was "impact", and some drifted towards reasons for the support gained by Lutheranism.

14. How much support was there for Lutheranism within the Holy Roman Empire in the period to 1555?

The essentials for a fully successful response were to assess (as opposed to describing) the levels of support and to deal with the whole period. This involved an awareness of change over time, not only overall, but of the different groups. There were some excellent essays which were able to do this with effective supporting detail. Most candidates dealt with different groups in society. Treatment of the princes was virtually universal. Some candidates used this very strongly. There was plenty of scope, from the original motives of Frederick the Wise to the formation of the Schmalkaldic League and the mixture of reasons which led princes to join it, some with a higher degree of religious devotion, others making economic and political calculations. Considerations of the significance of the gaining of "cuius regio, eius religio" in 1555 tended not to be developed. Weaker candidates tended to know the name only of Frederick, and perhaps Philip of Hesse. Few know much about the towns, and these tended to be underestimated in importance. Many essays did not mention the name of a single town, which disappointed. The knights tended to get a glance, with Hutten, if mentioned, often being mistaken as a prince. Treatment of the peasants varied very much, but the effects of Luther's response to the Peasants' Revolt were known to most.

15. Assess the reasons why the impact of Charles V's actions against the Ottomans was so limited.

This question was generally very well tackled, with an impressive knowledge of both Charles's weaknesses and Ottoman strengths on display. As a result an evaluative approach was logical, and most candidates were able to do justice to their knowledge and ability. Answers which were limited to lists of factors with no supported judgement were limited to level 3, and this was a question where some candidates thought it was enough to assert links or relative importance of factors. There was considerable variety of approach to Charles. Some were sympathetic to the difficulties posed by the need to deal with the French, with his duties as King of Spain, Lutheranism, the difficulties of raising an army in Germany that would function beyond its borders and so on; others were more critical of his mistakes and judgement. There was, on the whole, less developed treatment of the Turks, with their strengths in most cases stated rather than assessed. The moderate essays tended to lose focus on "impact", discussing more generally Charles' actions against the Turks. A minority of weaker essays became sidetracked into discussing Charles's wars with the French and/or Lutherans in great detail.

Philip II, Spain and the Netherlands, 1556–1609

16. 'The Moriscos were the most serious internal problem facing Philip II in his rule of Spain.' How far do you agree?

This question did not prove troublesome for stronger candidates who recognised the need, whether they agreed with the question or not, to give thorough treatment to the named factor. There were some strong essays with only modest development of the Moriscos but enough to balance the judgement that other factors were more important. The wording of the question may have helped, in that candidates recognised the need to deal only with Spain and not to be distracted by the problems of ruling the rest of the monarchia. In evaluating the significance of the threat posed by the Moriscos, most started with the revolt and developed the aftermath and the ongoing tensions. Few looked at the events leading up to the revolt in as much detail. Remarkably few developed fully the difficulty of addressing the revolt, the lack of seasoned troops in Spain and the subsequent time taken to crush it. As a result the possibility of developing the link between Philip's over-commitments, his financial problems and the revolt were not exploited, though this did avoid the risk of a tangential treatment of policies and problems beyond Spain. A set answer was not expected, and the top grades were awarded both to candidates who agreed and to those who disagreed with the question. Most candidates disagreed and felt Philip's financial problems were more serious. However they still needed to give a good paragraph to the Moriscos and this proved too much for some who knew very little about them.

17. Assess the reasons why Philip II was at war for so much of his reign.

This question elicited some excellent analytical responses that showed great understanding of Philip's foreign policy aims and why these led so frequently to war. As long as candidates made the link between Philip's aims and the warfare which resulted, the way to a strong answer was clear. Philip as the Sword Arm of the Counter-Reformation, the defender of his monarchia, his determination to maintain his reputation, the threat of the Turks, the Dutch and his determination to defend the Western Mediterranean: all made war inevitable. Although not required for AS level, a historiographical approach, relevantly taken, was appropriate here. Some factors were dealt with better than others, with religion often being treated less effectively than the others. Candidates' evaluation tended to over-simplify Philip's religious aims and motivation. He was credited with too much religious zeal in his policies, and the mistrust of the Papacy was rarely understood. At a lower level the question provoked some very descriptive essays about Phillip's wars with the French, English and Turks. There were hardly any average answers, perhaps

because those who saw the question as requiring description of the reasons why Philip was at war had no clear way to move to evaluation or judgement.

18. How important were strategic factors in explaining why Spain was unable to defeat the northern provinces by 1609?

The question gave candidates considerable freedom of approach: as long as strategic factors received a significant treatment, any of several other factors could be evaluated against them to answer the question “how important?” Strong candidates made good use of this, and came to a variety of judgements, all agreeing that strategic factors were of significant importance but coming to a variety of conclusions about the most important factor. The best answers developed strategic factors fully and linked them effectively to the others, enabling a fully evaluative approach. The question did however pose a difficulty to many candidates. Even some of the stronger thought it best not to try and define what they meant by ‘strategic factors’, perhaps fearing that they might be adopting the wrong approach. This led to some vague focus and less effective argument. Some fell back on rehashed essays focusing on Philip II’s weaknesses or the role of the House of Orange; few considered that during a long war the role of different factors might fluctuate. A minority made the bigger mistake of ignoring the date in the title and at worst treating this as an essay on the causes or, not quite so seriously, spending far too long on Alva and William of Orange.

F962/02 European and World History Period Studies – Modern

General comments

Units F961 and F962 are identical in their aims and assessment objectives. The only difference is in the choice of Study Topics for the candidates and, as a result, these general comments apply to all four papers offered within the units.

The overall quality of the responses showed little change from previous sessions. A significant number of candidates showed sufficient understanding, knowledge and ability to analyse or discuss the issue or issues in the question to reach Level III for AO1b, and examiners were pleased to read some scripts that showed a consistently high level of analysis and judgement. There were some candidates who appeared to be ill-prepared for the examination and produced responses which lacked an understanding of the topic. It might therefore be worthwhile reminding Centres and Candidates of the basic requirement for these Units. Candidates need to use relevant and accurate factual material to support well-structured arguments. This will allow them to reach a well-informed historical judgement about the issue in the question. It might also be worth reminding candidates that all the Units require answers to be in continuous prose, avoiding the use of abbreviations, notes or bullet points.

Most answers did show at least some explanation, with the most successful supported by sound and wide-ranging knowledge. However, it is worth stressing that AO1a is awarded, not for the deployment of knowledge, but for its use in supporting an argument or judgement. Centres should also be aware that attempts at argument or judgement are only assertions unless they are supported by accurate and relevant factual material, which means that the two assessment objectives are closely linked. Although some weaker candidates did attempt to argue, their attempts at analysis had little supporting knowledge and often relied on generalization, which is likely to result in answers being placed in either Level IV or Level V for AO1b. The decline in the purely descriptive essay continues and where there was evidence of accurate and relevant knowledge most candidates were able to link it to the demands of the question.

It is important that Centres give equal attention to all Key Issues and associated content on which questions are based - there were certainly indications that some candidates appeared under-prepared for some of the topics. Not only should Centres ignore topics that have been set previously, but they should also give attention to areas that not have been set before, as with Question 11 on the Peace Treaties on F962/2. Centres should also be fully aware that Questions may test more than one Key Issue, as was the case with Question 1 on F962/2 on the rise of Napoleon.

The strongest answers will pick up on key words, phrases or dates in their answers, whereas weaker responses will be more general, often combining less relevant material with relevant comments. It is surprising that the term 'assess' still produces the 'list-like' response, with some candidates even signposting this approach with comments such as 'another reason for X was', whereas stronger answers will attempt to evaluate the importance of the reasons to enable a judgement to be reached. Therefore, whilst most candidates are usually able to suggest several reasons they need to try and prioritise their importance if they are to move beyond Level III for AO1b. However, it is not sufficient for a Candidate, having explained a reason, simply to assert why it was the most important: they need to have explained why it was the most important. There appeared to be a continuation in the trend for Candidates to learn a set of answers to previous questions and then try and apply them to the questions that are set in the examination. This is rarely successful and should be discouraged; candidates need to be flexible and be able to apply their knowledge to a question that offers a slightly different slant or emphasis if they

want to reach the top level. However, it might be helpful for Candidates to have a stronger understanding of key concepts and issues that relate to the Key Issues they are studying; for example, there was a significant number of candidates who seemed to have only the vaguest understanding of what is meant by stability and simply replaced it with success, thereby producing responses which had only limited focus.

The comments for some of the individual questions across the four papers in this Report may be repetitive, but this is deliberate as it emphasises that the demands for individual questions are similar and that Candidates make similar mistakes or show similar strengths, regardless of the Unit or Topic being studied. It also helps to reinforce the fact that all the Units are marked using the same generic mark scheme and it would be advisable for Centres to read the whole Report, rather than just the section that applies to the Study Topic or Topics that they teach, so that they are aware of the general trends.

Individual comments

Question 1.

This was a relatively popular question. Subject knowledge was on the whole, good, but very rarely went beyond 1799, with the result that candidates covered only part of the period and demonstrated only some command of the topic, which resulted in a partial answer or judgement and limited the response to Level III. Candidates were able to discuss a good range of factors including the impact of French Revolution, luck and good connections. Answers that were good or very good, in many cases, blended the military (successes, image, hold over his army) with domestic politics and seeing the role of Napoleon himself, the start of policing system and controls over the press and the fashioning of a powerful image all growing over time. Stronger candidates also identified that ability extended beyond military prowess and cited examples of diplomatic successes that aided Napoleon. They were also able to make the link between patronage and ability, ie Napoleon got many of his chances because of his contacts or relatives but made the most of the opportunities he was presented with. Most of the really strong responses focused on the domestic and the issues of his powers as a build-up to becoming 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. The uses of the Constitution, his route to the Emperorship, the wooing of the aristocracy and church to build up support and isolate opponents all featured, as did some examination of the nature and strength of opposition, in Paris and in the provinces. All answers, not least those that stopped in 1799, covered themes such as his military talents (Toulon, Italy, Egypt), his appeal within the ranks of the army, the weaknesses and unpopularity of the Directory, powerful friends in important roles, the coup of 1799. Weaker answers often assumed that explaining Napoleon's military successes would be enough to explain why he came to power.

Question 2.

The strengths of French army were dealt with satisfactorily and majority of candidates were able to support their arguments with a range of examples highlighting the French strengths. Other factors addressed included the weaknesses of opponents, Napoleon's leadership and good luck. On the whole, however this answer resulted in more Level III listing qualities. Divisions were handled well with apposite examples and comments on the over-dependence of his enemies 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. Generally pure description was avoided but some answers had understanding yet lacked sufficient supporting

content. However, weaker candidates did not deal with the named factor of the French army well apart from simple comments about its size, whereas better answers explained that Napoleon inherited a powerful force and improved it with his reforms but was this also linked to other factors and it was argued that he was successful because of his own skill and the weakness of his opponents. Many were also able to identify that once his enemies joined together Napoleon found it difficult to defeat them. Stronger answers offered exemplification but there were too many who produced a generalized list of factors without a battle in sight, which has become a more common feature in answers on this topic over recent years.

Question 3.

This was the least popular of the questions in this section and those that did answer it were less successful, often providing only vague comments. The best answers approached the question by looking at themes, (political, economic and social) rather than using a paragraph for each conquered territory. The best responses also provided a range of geographical examples and assessed such features as social changes, the encouragement of forms of nationalism, legal codifications, economic measures (the Continental System), trade, military controls, garrisons and indeed conscription. A few did assess and argue over benefits and the reverse. It was also refreshing to see that most candidates did discuss the conquered territories rather than France, which has been an issue in the past. Most were able to identify the pros and cons of Napoleonic rule, but a significant number drifted into a list and lacked overall judgement. In the weaker responses the range was often quite narrow, with some limiting their assessment to the impact of the blockade.

Question 4.

This was a popular question for those taking this Study Topic, however many candidates would have done better to assess the problems that Louis faced before listing those things that Louis did well or did not do well. Unfortunately, a significant number of answers often tended to list features, being over-reliant on description, or where there was analysis it was confined to the last couple of sentences of paragraph. Even where the focus was more analytical the question still tended to elicit a list-type response, with successes and failures set out chronologically beginning with failure – 100 days - and then a gradual recovery until the murder of the Duc de Berry in 1820. As ever, better ones were more analytical, even thematic in approach. Quite a number looked at the reign in phases, following a chronological route, and this was acceptable provided that the question was addressed, although some who took this approach gave scant attention to Louis' latter years. The problems that often appeared were: 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. Survival and the return of stability were seen as important success areas. Louis's own abilities as a ruler were assessed on occasion. A few stronger answers were able to evaluate the entire reign but most restricted themselves to some brief analysis in the conclusion – 'overall problems were solved and Louis performed well'. However, this question discriminated well and those who identified problems and responded to the question were set apart from those who wrote an all-purpose account of the reign.

Question 5.

This was a popular question and on the whole answered relatively successfully. Many students dealt with this well, with good, secure subject knowledge. Quite often much was said about foreign policy (above all, the failure to achieve anything by way of glory) and not enough about domestic, with a few answers even ignoring domestic. Only the best answers really assessed the nature of the growth of opposition in 1846-48, a growth that became unstoppable. There were certain factors that usually appeared: Louis Philippe's character; his conservatism linked to 'immobilism'; political and constitutional issues factions and critics; ministerial appointments that went wrong; social and economic dislocation from c.1846; the broad-based nature of opposition

spanning different groups and interests the Reform Banquets. Rather than evaluative responses, many answers tended to be a list of reasons for the growth of opposition with limited overall analysis or judgement. Many candidates struggled with the term 'assess' and failed to attach importance or find some linkage between the factors or issues discussed. However, even the weakest answers usually managed to remember that he looked like a pear and failed to deliver 'la gloire' in foreign policy. The stronger answers were characterised by well-explained factors which included both foreign and domestic policies and distinguished between long- and short-term factors.

Question 6.

This proved a less popular question and students tended to end up producing a narrative, with vague comments and limited specific detail. Many did not say enough about the issue of benefit (or otherwise). Most felt Napoleon III was a failure. Some dwelt overlong on the issue of the 1860s as a 'liberal' era. The most cited domestic themes were railways, banks and credit, urban regeneration, agrarian and industrial initiatives, attempts to help the poor, free trade policies, political idealism and practices. The improvements to Paris were better known by most candidates than the economic policies. Better responses highlighted successes and benefits into the 1860s then the end of such, leading to growing criticisms and unrest. Although most managed to stick to Domestic polices without drifting into irrelevance with discussion of foreign policy, there were some, where foreign policy was discussed, and in places, dominated. The problem for many was to define 'benefit' and generally this was the weakest of the answers on France.

Question 7.

This question was popular with students and generally answered well. A number of students achieved good Levels due to their interlinking of factors or ability to reach a supported judgement. Good subject knowledge was demonstrated by many, though some allowed this to become excessively descriptive. However, there were also some answers that did not go beyond a list of factors; even if the lists were well-developed and explained they could not go beyond the top of Level III for AO1b. Stronger answers were more developed and sophisticated answers which did argue and assess, often with a wide range of knowledge to support were seen quite frequently. Part of the success here did lie 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 - all featured to varying degrees. Weaker answers were few and far between and most were at least able to hit Level III with a list of reasons for the opening up of the West. Stronger responses linked themes and attached relative importance to the factors that were discussed. For example, Federal policies were often seen as the most important because they acted as a stimulus and this was then linked to other factors. On the negative side, this question saw a lot of candidates abbreviating – WE for Westward Expansion, and this should be discouraged.

Question 8. This was a popular question but candidates did not always assess slavery as an economic difference and failed to link the two. Some arguments tended to stray off the specific question and ended up focusing on slavery as the main cause of tension. 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, the growing disparity between the two economies, 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 considered in the strongest answers. Most candidates took the view that tensions increased, though a few tried to argue that such tensions might have been contained but for the wilfulness and stubbornness of

powerful minority opinions in the North and South. The weaker answers tended to drift into a description of the differences between North and South. There were a significant number who ignored the named factor and wrote an answer to a rehearsed question on slavery being the main cause of tension in the period. Centres should be reminded that where the named factor is ignored or briefly dismissed responses are confined to a maximum of Level IV for AO1b, regardless of how strong the rest of the answer is. The developments of the 1850s were not generally very well known, whilst others were unable to discuss the political and cultural implications of slavery, confining their answers to the economic element.

Question 9.

Although this question was probably attempted by fewer candidates than the other two questions in this section, those who did tackle it often did so more successfully, with good subject knowledge of actions and events. They were often able to draw upon specific military campaigns, battles and leadership to support their arguments. However, some answers veered into Lincoln-Davis or Grant-Lee comparisons, and some had imbalance in coverage between sides. Quite a number wanted to write about why the North won with only occasional links to the actual question set, and as with other questions where the focus is not on the actual question set this limited the level achieved. Various factors were adduced to explain the length of the War: leadership, generalship, political and military skills; strategies and tactics; diplomacy (especially in respect of Southern hopes that help would come from Britain); the effectiveness of the mobilisation and uses of economic and manpower resources; railroads and transport; States' rights in the South; Lincoln's determination to preserve the Union, meaning a prolonged campaign; his choice of generals and their strategic decisions; the impact of the Emancipation Proclamation on the South; the nature of warfare in later 1863 and 1864, Southern morale and determination to fight on often featured, which provided a good range of issues for candidates to discuss. Where comparisons between the north and south were made, these usually added quality to the answers. Stronger answers sometimes compared the Union's approach in the early years to the 1864-5 period and made good points about generalship. The role of Lee was analysed and the South's unity in comparison to the North's lack of identity at the beginning of the war. Most were able to assess and explain the importance of factors and were therefore able to avoid the 'list' approach and go beyond Level III for AO1b. However, purely military developments continue to be the weakest element.

Question 10.

This was - surprisingly - a less popular question and answers were quite vague at times or focused too much on the War as whole. Weaker answers gave a narrative of events, tending to stray away from the focus of the question. Some answers stopped short of 1918. Responses too often suffered from a lack of an argument and specific subject detail, relying on generalisations with little reference to specific battles or events to support the argument. Improvements in strategy and tactics, the better uses of the power of machine guns and artillery, the changed attitudes of generals, the impact of vast resources (men, munitions, domestic economies), the better uses of tanks and planes, the entry of the USA, the failure of the Spring Offensive, weakening morale on the German Home Front, the effects of the blockade of German ports all usually featured in responses. Some emphasis was given to the return of mobility in 1918 and its consequences. However, there were very few answers which addressed 'To what extent' and again this limited the level that could be achieved. Weaker responses often limited themselves to tank warfare and failed to identify other changes in strategy – planes, creeping barrage etc, whilst others drifted into a list of reasons why Germany lost, either focusing on the British blockade or on the entry of the USA into the war, and failed to address the question or the named factor. A few candidates successfully argued that it was a change in German tactics in 1918, with the gamble of the Ludendorff offensive, which led to defeat. It was disappointing that so few candidates knew much about the changes in strategy or tactics, though the creeping barrage seems to have captured many candidates' imagination - but although this was indeed a development, it was one which dates from relatively early on. The major developments of 1918,

with coordinated tactics, were not so well known and the contribution of the US was often overstated in purely military terms.

Question 11.

Many students struggled with this question and did not deal with the named factor well. Many focused primarily on the Treaty of Versailles. It was rare to see much good knowledge and understanding of the impact of the treaties on the Austro-Hungarian Empire, but it is in the specification and Centres should expect that all elements of it will be tested. Where there was consideration of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, common themes were territorial disintegration, the end of dual monarchy and the formation of new (often weak) nation states. Some made reference to the severing of ties between Germany and Austria-Hungary. Unfortunately, most responses dismissed the premise in the first paragraphs and then spent the rest of the answer discussing the impact on Germany, although some did mention Turkey. It can only be stressed again that Centres should note that there is a requirement to study the whole settlement.

Question 12.

Listing was common with this question, which was not done as successfully as it could have been, with many candidates trying to include everything rather than forming their own argument. It is a very big topic and, to produce a convincing argument, candidates needed to plan carefully and decide upon their thesis before starting to write. Many focused on the legacy of WWI, the impact of the Versailles Treaty, the weaknesses of League, not least in Japan and Abyssinia, and the effects of the Wall Street Crash. There was some uneven coverage of Hitler's foreign policy actions, though in many instances this produced a narrative. Anglo-French Appeasement was also a popular theme. The best answers embraced these areas but made links, analysed importance and conveyed the complexity of the 1930s, often linking effectively the Spanish Civil War, the Axis, Hitler's growing assertiveness in 1938 and 1939 and the context and conduct of appeasement. Stronger answers often started with German aggression and this was then linked with appeasement and the weakness of the League. However, most simply gave a list of reasons, with a brief attempt at assessment in the conclusion. A minority drifted into irrelevance with discussion of Japanese aggression in the Pacific. Given the scope of the question it might not be surprising that a number of answers ended in 1936 and therefore failed to cover the crucial latter period and therefore, at best, showed only some command of the topic. There were also a number who showed considerable factual confusion over the chronology of events or Chamberlain's period in office, which resulted in unconvincing attempts at analysis.

Question 13.

This was a very popular question. Many students focused on 1905, the causes of the Revolution, and events in the preceding two years, therefore not covering the whole period, showing an imbalance or only some command of the topic and so limiting the level which could be achieved. Very few answers interrogated the concept of 'very serious threat'. There was much general description of peasants' lives and of autocratic practices, which it was often assumed would create opposition, which was then assumed to be serious, often simply because there were so many peasants. Candidates often embraced areas such as economic changes in agriculture and industry, the effects of Witte's policies, repressive agencies, military disquiet, the growth of a range of opposition movements and the prevalence of critics and their demands for constitutional reforms. There were a number of answers which went well beyond 1905 and could not gain credit for those sections. Knowledge of opposition groups was variable and there were numbers of answers that relied on generalisations about these groups. The stronger responses successfully argued that, although Nicholas did face opposition, the policies of Stolypin and the support of the Church and the army meant his position was never seriously threatened. However, a considerable number of responses focused on the events of 1905 as the high point of opposition while stronger answers displayed a depth of knowledge across the period. The biggest weakness was that too many answers offered a general survey of the problems of

Russia with a focus on cold winters, starving peasants, an uncaring autocracy, regional diversity and limited industry, rather than looking at the unrest that these elements might have brought about in this specific period.

Question 14.

This was also a very popular question, although there were numbers of candidates who focused on 1905 and some who strayed from the title, focusing on loss of World War I and Rasputin; previous reports have stressed the need to read the question carefully, and this was a further example of the pitfall that can result when this does not happen. Listing of issues that either caused or limited instability was common but these answers did not address the focus of the question and again limited the level that could be reached. Better responses did try to assess the stable and unstable, at times referring to historical debate here, although this was not essential for any level. A number of answers got bogged down in a description of the Dumas and of Duma politics and the reforms they carried out. Stolypin's role was appreciated by a good number, not least the mix of reform and repression he followed. The economic context was understood by some and the nature of peasant unrest as well as worker strikes, above all in 1912-14, appeared in stronger answers. Many had something to say about land reform issues, working conditions and the activities of the Okhrana. Here, as in Question 13, there was a tendency amongst some to exaggerate the influence of the Bolsheviks. Quite often Nicholas II's personality and adherence to autocracy were cited as fundamental to instability. Yet some recognised the popular celebrations in 1913 marking 300 years of Romanov rule. Weaker responses concentrated on issues such as the role of the Duma, with stability not really addressed. The strongest answers often suggested that stability after 1906 masked underlying problems and that instability was building before 1914. However, the issues of stability in both this question and Question 16 were beyond many candidates, who turned the question into a success/failure account and missed the focus.

Question 15.

This was another popular question, but many candidates did not always address the 'growth of the police state' effectively, often showing a limited understanding of the term, even though it appears in the Specification. Many glided over this factor and focused more on propaganda and the cult of personality or, in the case of weaker responses, narrated economic developments with limited link to the actual question. Many students also looked at Stalin's rise to power and produced a narrative of 1924-29, rather than focusing on his consolidation. Often impressive details and figures were adduced, though equally often that meant a lot of description rather than argument or link to the actual question. Stronger answers assessed these as to scale and impact and therefore made it relevant, rather than simply deploying the material. There were references to the fate of the kulaks, propaganda and the workplace (Stakhanov), but a significant number of answers did not assess enough the police state dimensions: those that did were able to assess the roles of the GPU and then NKVD, spies, informers, trials (including the Show Trials), law to back up police actions, and, of course, the Purges as part of the 'Great Terror.' To go high in the Levels, such assessment was needed. Weaker answers resorted to assertion and there was a lot of 'everyone was terrified of Stalin' and also a discussion of Stalin's rise to power in the 1920s rather than consolidation. Better answers were able to go beyond a list and often agreed with the premise by weighing it against other factors.

Question 16.

This was a very popular question but, although many candidates knew a great deal about Italy pre-World War One, they were less able to link the material to the idea of stability, instead answering on previous questions on the seriousness of problems or the weakness of Italy. Others assumed Italy was unstable and produced a list of reasons as to why. Many students had good subject knowledge and were able to provide a range of interlinking factors. Much was made of economic factors (the North-South divide, unemployment, wages, poverty). Literacy

rates were engaged by many, although this was not always clearly linked to the issue of stability. Unrest, violence and disorders were assessed and most found these issues easier to link to the actual question. The nature of coalition governments, the place and appeal of liberalism and the place of both socialism and nationalism featured, too, and again provided a means by which candidates could access the demands of the question. References were made to foreign policy, not least in North Africa, although this was not always well used. Some insightful answers also assessed the position of the monarchy and the attitudes of the elites and church hierarchy, above all the Papacy and its stance on the relatively new Italian state and its impact on stability. Many linked the problems to the nature of the unity created in 1870. Many responses did address the issue of stability and were able to prioritise – often citing the role of the government and the growth of socialism. Some responses drifted into a list of stability/instability factors, but most were able to give some overall assessment. As with Question 13 there were far too many general surveys of post-unification Italy, with its characteristics and problems being described rather than the focus being on stability in this particular period. Centres need to look very seriously at the way that this part of the specification is addressed.

Question 17.

This question produced a wide range of responses. Some answers were very successful, providing a good argument that focused on Mussolini's power from 1922 to 1939, while weaker responses focused on events at the beginning and the March to Rome or simply described his economic and social policies, which were then weakly linked to the idea of 'how powerful'. Most responses were sound and some strong in their analyses. Surprisingly, many said relatively 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). At times, foreign policy detracted from the coverage of domestic issues. 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. Many candidates tried to balance apparent or real successes against the extent of Mussolini's power, pointing out the weakening of his position in the later 1930s or considered the extent of limiting factors such as the King, Papacy or the lack of genuine popular support and how effective Fascist control of Italy actually was. Then there were answers that tailed off once the Lateran Treaty of 1929 had been signed. In stronger answers there was also some effective discussion of Mussolini's monopoly on government after 1922. However, a number of candidates failed to address the actual question and simply wrote about how successful Mussolini was with only tangential reference to the question, with some offering no more than a general survey of Mussolini's domestic and even foreign policy.

Question 18.

This question produced a wide range of answers. There were many high level responses, with students showing a good understanding of the question and good subject knowledge. Abyssinia was covered well, although some weaker answers rather skimmed their treatment of this named event. Other events that were often identified included Corfu, alliances, Spanish Civil War, the Axis and its role, the Pact of Steel. The contrasts of a more aggressive foreign policy with Mussolini's statesmanlike stance of the later 1920s and early 1930s, as well as support for the League of Nations, featured in better answers. Many candidates were able to argue a case for or against the named factor, with many stronger responses successfully pointing out the flaws in the Abyssinian policy – mainly that it led to a hostile response from Britain and France and pushed Mussolini into his alliance with Germany. Stronger answers often saw the prevention of Anschluss in 1934 as Italy's finest hour. Weaker answers often outlined foreign policy aims in the first paragraph and then listed the policies, or focused on a very narrow range, often ignoring the 1920s. This question was also another good example of weaker students relying on a rehearsed response- in this case 'How successful was Mussolini's foreign policy' and ignoring the actual question. However, in contrast, the nature of the question encouraged more

candidates to offer judgements. But even with weaker answers, there was generally more knowledge shown here than on, say, Question 16.

Question 19.

This was a not a popular question. Although there were some reasonable answers with a good focus on consequences, a number were vague, quite often focusing on pre-1911 events or simply describing the events. The better responses sought to assess such areas as: the legacy of 1911; issues of authority and power, not least Sun Yat-Sen's; the reordering of the political elites; the advent of the warlords; the 4th May movement; economic and social tensions; the rise of the GMD and the CCP. Most responses were able to give a list of at least some consequences, although assessment and evaluation was often lacking, with more explanation of the consequences than assessment, but knowledge was evident of the aftermath of the revolution (though some went beyond 1925). The warlords were often dealt with well and the different characteristics of some of the leading figures were understood. However, weaker answers tended to drift into lengthy discussion of the various warlords – the 'Dogmeat general' being a popular choice.

Question 20.

Weaker responses, as is often the case, suffered from a lack of subject knowledge and many students tended to produce weak generalisations. Most agreed with the premise and gave several reasons why Chiang was a failure – usually basing their argument on the Japanese war, reliance on foreign aid and his inability to crush the CCP, and the eventual outcome of the great power struggle in 1949. Better candidates were able to offer a more balanced appraisal, noting at least short-term successes. The stronger responses often considered such areas as: initial democratic ideas, defeat of warlords, some economic upturn, ideas for social reforms. Of course, these initial successes often became ultimate failures, and this was also noted in the stronger answers. Other factors that were adduced, often by way of contrast and for the argument of ultimate failure, 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; lack of American support at crucial moments. A few stronger answers qualified his failure with discussion of success, particularly in the earlier years, but then went on to justify how far Chiang failed. Many candidates stopped their analysis in 1945 and missed out the most obvious failure – defeat in the Civil war and exile to Taiwan in 1949. The stronger answers were balanced and did not simply offer blanket condemnation but considered possible achievements.

Question 21.

Candidates did not always stick to the dates and weaker students focused on Mao's rise to power and the Long March. The better answers assessed both the problems that the Communists faced in the early 1950s, and then the policies that were enacted. Areas that featured often were economic and social, industrial and agrarian reforms, collectivization and five year plans, The Great Leap Forward, the treatment of peasantry, education, the place of women in society. Some discussed political control, Mao's power, the changes within the CCP, the Hundred Flowers campaign. There was awareness of unevenness of performance and delivery and of the enormity of human sacrifices involved. This was another question where many candidates wrote a list of success/ failure which, although showing a good depth of knowledge, could not access the higher levels as evaluation and judgement was absent. Some also drifted beyond the time period into discussion of the Cultural Revolution. Once again, analysis tended to be limited to fairly basic assessment of success in a concluding paragraph,

although the stronger answers attempted to offer some balanced judgements. The focus was mostly on economic policies and the political aspects were somewhat neglected.

Question 22.

As might be expected, this was a very popular question, but too many students focused on immediate problems following the First World War and did not look at the latter half of the 1920s, or did not maintain the focus on political instability and discussed economic or foreign policy issues without linking to the precise question set. A number struggled with the concept of political instability or the reverse. A major problem here was that many responses said too little about political and too much about economic problems, which was either not linked or poorly linked to the question. Although there is a clear link between the two, the focus had to be on the political. Economic coverage needed to be kept brief and brought back to the question to achieve credit. International relations and foreign policy were acceptable areas, but again had to be linked to the political. Often this concentration on the economic (aftermath of the War, hyperinflation, recovery, new currency and all) unbalanced the answers and meant that much of the answer was not focused on the question, which had an impact on the Level reached. The better responses did try to assess the nature and depth of political problems and considered issues such as 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. Some highlighted regional issues, not least the tension between Berlin and some State governments, but this was not common. Reparations, Stresemann and his recovery plans (usually linked to foreign policy) appeared often, but not always well used or focused on the actual question. Many made much of Stresemann, but again were unable to link him to the idea of stability other than in quite superficial terms. The effects of the Versailles Treaty, the international isolation and then acceptance into the international community (Locarno, Kellogg-Briand and so on) featured. The best responses did assess apparent success in containing or removing instability, and set it against continuing underlying problems manifesting themselves at the end of the 1920s. A number were able to identify the problems of the early 1920s and then went on to argue that these issues had largely disappeared by the late 1920s and it was only the onset of the depression that opened up old wounds, although others argued that the underlying issues were never resolved and that stability was superficial. In stronger answers the weakness of the system was understood, as were the crisis years and attempted Putschés of both Kapp and Hitler. Stronger answers identified that the army generally stood by Weimar and the democratic parties became increasingly popular, with some answers showing a very good knowledge of election results. The lack of elections between 1924 and 1928 was often used as evidence for stability. In weaker answers there was often much description of unrest, some of it before 1920 and there was also some doubt about what 'political stability' really meant, whilst some answers focused on the period 1925-29 at the expense of the period of much greater instability.

Question 23.

Rather surprisingly, the named factor was not dealt with as well as it could have been by many students. Many ended up focusing solely on propaganda, or looking at Nazis' rise to power and finishing their analysis in 1934, which again offered only a partial answer. Some students got carried away with a narrative of anti-semitism and scapegoats, which students argued led to a rise in support, although they failed to provide evidence for such claims. Better answers looked at a range of factors, including terror and fear (Gestapo, SD, KRIPO, SIPO, informers, denunciations). 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, as stated, spent too much time on anti-semitism, no matter the need to provide linkage to the named factor. Some useful points were made about promises to groups such as the farmers and the *Mittelstand*. References to the *Volksgemeinschaft* were helpful but still needed the link to popular support. However, too often popular support was taken for granted and other factors predominated. More skilful answers did blend Hitlerian policies and terror and fear with the strengths of popular

support, at least well into the war. Stronger candidates were able to identify what was meant by popular support and argued that this came from Nazi policies on the economy and did indeed help them stay in power. These answers then compared popular support with other factors – legal revolution, terror, propaganda, army and elite support and came to a judgement largely concluding that it was terror and the perceptions this created, particularly in the war years, that kept them in power. Surprisingly few mentioned that Nazi popularity came as a result of opposition to Communism. Many weaker candidates simply listed reasons why the Nazis stayed in power or focused on their rise to power in the early 1930s. This was better done than Question 22 but some simply neglected the issue in the question and moved directly on to repression and propaganda, limiting their answer to, at best, Level IV for AO1b.

Question 24.

It was pleasing to see that this topic proved quite popular - evidence that Centres who teach this Study Topic are giving adequate teaching time to the post 1945 period. Some students provided well argued essays that looked at the relative responsibility of the western powers and Stalin. However, some got carried away with providing schools of thought and historiography, which is not needed to achieve any level, and lost focus on the question. There were many students who possessed a lot of knowledge but did not always apply it effectively in answering the question. Some wanted to write about the role of Truman and the USA, so deflecting from the real focus on the Soviet Union and Stalin. Stronger answers were seen which considered motives such as: Stalin's personality and personal ambitions; ideological drive to extend Communism; this was often linked to the goal of creating new, pro-Soviet ruling elites on Eastern Europe; a desire to create a buffer zone of depth to protect the USSR; a desire to ensure there could be resurgence by Germany; determination to avoid the problems pre-1939; the effects of the Yalta and Potsdam Conferences; Stalin's reactions to Truman as USA President and to the 'Iron Curtain' rhetoric from 1946 onwards. There were a number who failed to provide a balanced approach and were largely dismissive of Western powers as the most culpable and focused almost exclusively on Soviet intentions. It was pleasing to see that even if the argument was weak, most displayed a reasonable depth of knowledge; the majority of responses were able to at least describe, if not analyse, the most notable incidents that led to division – the conferences, ideologies, Stalin's paranoia, Bizonia and Berlin - whilst the strongest answers were able to come to a judgement on importance. Some stronger answers argued that division was almost inevitable after the common enemy of Nazi Germany was gone. Weaker candidates sometimes showed very limited knowledge about events in Germany and often wrote a general 'cold war' answer. Unfortunately there were a number who thought the Berlin Wall dates from this period.

Question 25.

Although this question was quite popular, a significant number of candidates either failed completely to deal with 'the rearmament of West Germany' or wrote only a superficial and brief paragraph before launching into other factors. As a result, many answers tended to be generalisations, some students covering the rise of communism and events following World War I and Russian Civil War, losing focus of the actual question. Quite a number of responses wrote extensively about Berlin and the Berlin Wall of 1961. There were references to military equipment, USA military support, the membership of NATO; but all too often the named factor was dismissed far too easily and other factors assessed. In dealing with the other factors, there was plenty for candidates to consider, and this often included issues such as Ideologies, Stalin-Truman relations, USA and the Atom Bomb, misunderstandings and misreadings of situations and actions. A few stronger responses were able to see that West Germany's admittance to NATO led to a reaction from the Soviet Union. Though most explained the significance of the issue, many restricted their survey to the period 1945-51.

Question 26.

This question produced a wide range of responses, with some good answers, but also some weak comments. A number of students had good subject knowledge and were able to draw comparisons across a range of case studies. Most students dealt with the time period effectively. Poland, Hungary and Czechoslovakia were the focused areas, whilst even East Germany appeared in a number of answers. While some answers described events, most tried to assess the nature of the challenges and the scope of Soviet responses (use of force, Red Army, Warsaw Pact force, ideology, censorship, clampdown on political groups and leaders, arrests, executions). There were some list-type responses, but these were in a minority. Most candidates argued that the Soviet Union was generally successful in keeping control and used specific examples to reinforce the point, from the decision to give Poland a measure of freedom under Gomulka to the harsh crackdown in Hungary. However, weaker answers had limited knowledge of the challenges and many simply offered superficial or weak statements such as 'force was used' or 'tanks sent in'. Even where there was more developed explanation it did not include much in the way of balance. This is an area for development.

Question 27.

This Question often led to a listing of factors. However, students on the whole looked at a range of factors, from Gorbachev and Reagan to economic issues. The best answers made links and evaluated factors. Gorbachev was often seen as crucial; his different attitudes, his policies, his internal reforms, openness and dealings with the West; his determination to proceed with changes and not to stop reform developments inside the Soviet bloc. The context of an USSR economy in decline was cited; the war in Afghanistan was used to explain problems of the 1980s. Reagan's attitude towards the USSR, the shift after 1985, the summits and deals over nuclear arms and forces were also mentioned. Many argued that there was a dynamic created, one that could not be stopped. The best answers did assess relative importance, but again many candidates struggled to assess and many responses tended to be a list of factors with little attempt at judgement. A few managed to link the more liberal rule of Gorbachev, Soviet economic problems and the aggressive policies of the USA under Reagan, which allowed them to access the higher levels. This differentiated between answers which linked knowledge of changes in Eastern Europe with the end of the Cold War and those who merely described changes and assumed that they ended the Cold War.

Question 28.

This question was not so well answered. Many ended up producing a narrative of the Suez Crisis, with some writing about the background and causes of the Crisis. Better answers looked at Nasser's standing inside Egypt and the Arab world, his promotion of Arab nationalism, military, political and economic developments that underpinned his rule; some considered his relations with the USSR, his rhetoric, charisma, his skills, not least survival, the Anglo-French and Israeli interventions and how they were presented and the attitude of the USA. Some argued that, though Suez was a setback to Nasser, he cleverly used that to his advantage. Most responses were descriptive and also tended to be topic based rather than focused on the actual question, with general discussion of the period. Stronger answers contained detailed analyses which looked at the wider context and set Nasser's leadership against external pressures.

Question 29.

This was probably the best-answered question in this section as candidates focused on the issue and weighed up the importance of the named factor against other issues. The development of Israeli Settlements was discussed effectively, but in some instances students tended to focus on the latter period. Some common themes against which settlements were balanced included: territorial acquisition by Israel and Israeli needs, the context, the impact; issues of enhanced security and the effects, the growing Palestinian refugee problem, the Israeli control of more Arab areas, the growth of terrorism, the nature and outcome of the attempted

peace settlements, the Intifada movements, the role of the USA and its Presidents. A number of responses focused on hardline Israeli attitudes preventing peace and gave only passing reference to the named factor. However, there were some good explanations with a higher than usual number of judgements about the relative importance of different factors, whilst weaker answers did not consider the whole period or were superficial in their treatment of the named factor.

Question 30.

There were a number of responses to this question. Some tended to focus on the reasons behind the Second Gulf War and, mainly, WMD: these did not produce effective answers that spanned the whole time period, and a number of responses were more of a narrative. However, there were those who did assess a range of factors: the Kuwait crisis, Saddam's actions, the legacy of the First Gulf War and the perceived links to 9/11 and later developments. When candidates did assess success it was generally well done, with most responses identifying the limited success of the First Gulf War and contrasting that with the second invasion of Iraq. Weaker responses tended to give a descriptive account of Hussein's regime and lost question focus.

F963 and F964 AS History Enquiries

F963/01

General Comments

As with past Enquiries papers, most candidates were entering this examination for the first time. It is clear that candidates are much more successful in addressing some of the skills required for the two different types of question. It is very rare for candidates to compare the wrong sources in part (a), and sequencing, when one source is considered followed by the second with nothing but implicit comparison, is also uncommon. Similarly, the grouping of sources is now normal in part (b), although here sequencing, sometimes with the content of the individual sources described, is more common. Candidates should, however, consider carefully the groupings that they choose. There are not necessarily “correct” groupings in many part (b) questions and some sources are susceptible to alternative interpretations. For example, factional rivalry could be inferred from different combinations of sources on the question on the Mid-Tudor Crises. However, some groupings are wrong and candidates must appreciate that there must be a clear logic behind the groupings selected. Candidates are aware of the need to consider both content and provenance for both part questions, although achieving an effective balance between the two remains a problem for many. Fewer candidates than in the past are over-dependent on a formulaic approach to each source, although there are still comments that a source lacks completeness as it does not include the views from both sides of an argument. There has been a rather cavalier attitude by some candidates towards the identification of the sources by letter. Examiners appreciate that candidates are under considerable pressure in all of the Enquiries papers, but it is not helpful if the source being discussed, or the sources being compared, are incorrectly identified. Whilst in most cases this is not significant – the references to the content will normally show which source is being discussed – there are occasions when incorrect labelling can render a response very unconvincing. Candidates also should be encouraged not to extract a few words from a source in order to make a point when the sense of the complete sentence from which the words have been taken is very different. Thus, to use the phrase “is spread abroad by my opponents that I was beaten at Marburg” to argue that Martin Luther agreed that he had lost the debate at the Colloquy of Marburg is clearly misleading and incorrect when the whole sentence reads “As to the statement that is spread abroad by my opponents that I was beaten at Marburg, they are not only liars but the very incarnation of deceit and hypocrisy”.

Comments from previous reports continue to be true, in that the integration of content from the sources with the discussion of the provenance and the evaluation of the sources’ reliability or utility remains a major problem for the majority of candidates. In both part (a) and part (b) responses, the content of individual sources was reviewed and the evaluation of that content dealt with quite separately. As a result, it was difficult to understand clearly whether candidates felt that the content they had considered was trustworthy and accurate or not. This was particularly difficult where candidates’ evaluation was ambivalent. So, for example, for question 4 in F964/02 (Dictatorship and Democracy in Germany 1933-1963) Source B was a Government (i.e. Nazi) report on an incident. Candidates frequently evaluated this both as reliable (because it was an official report and was meant to provide information) and unreliable (because it was Nazi in origin and therefore both biased and, probably, propaganda). Unless the candidate expresses a clear opinion on the reliability of the source, any final judgement is likely to be unconvincing or even asserted. Evaluation is a difficult skill to master, and requires more than a comment about a writer that she or he “would say that, wouldn’t they”. Such evaluation is formulaic at best. What is required is the application of the candidates’ own knowledge to test the validity of what is said in the source. For example, in Source D of question 2 in F964/01 (The German Reformation 1517-1555), the reformer Ulrich Zwingli makes a claim of winning over to his side one of Martin Luther’s key supporters, Philip of Hesse. Candidates might well

know that Philip of Hesse was considered by some to have sympathies for Zwingli's teachings, but rather more that he continued to support Luther's position on the Eucharist and later became the leader of the Schmalkaldic League to defend Protestantism in Germany. The deployment of this information to challenge (or support) Zwingli's assertion is effective evaluation and also makes use of the candidate's knowledge rather than just deploying it. Moreover, the source and its content is driving the argument rather than merely being used to illustrate the candidate's own views. Similarly, cross-reference is more than merely placing two extracts together. They must relate to each other in some particular way and relate to the question, whether in terms of the evidence for a part (a) response or in support of, or challenge to, the interpretation (part b). Candidates who used Sources A and B on the England in a New Century question to argue that extracts showed that Churchill and Lloyd George were on a mission to follow through on the promises made in the 1906 election, showing their determined leadership, were rewarded appropriately.

With any of the Enquiries papers there are certain expectations that need to be met for a candidate to achieve success. Ideally for the part (a) questions (the comparison of two sources as evidence for a particular issue), they will produce a response that compares the content of the two designated sources in such a way that comparisons are valid and not mere juxtapositions of extracts from the sources. Candidates were also guilty of making asserted comparisons, where they state that two sources are similar for a particular reason, but without support from the sources. In the English Civil War and Interregnum question on the formation of the New Model Army, several candidates pointed out that one reason for its formation was because of weak leadership of parliament's armies but then failed to pick out the evidence from Sources A and B that demonstrated this. Candidates should also compare the provenance of the two sources at more than a basic level (i.e. that they are both letters). They should subject the two sources to some level of evaluation that is more than a basic or formulaic response about the writer of each source, and deploy their own knowledge to help answer the question. Such knowledge will therefore be relevant and may well be used to test the reliability of each of the sources. Contextual knowledge can sometimes dominate these answers and it is worth noting that such knowledge should be pertinent and need not be extensive. Techniques for evaluation also differ significantly, although a number of candidates continue to refer to sources as "authentic" which leads to answers which are vague and unhelpful - this is a term that is best avoided. Similarly there were numbers of candidates who suggested that sources were not useful because their authors had a clear purpose, but then failed to state what that purpose was, something particularly noted in source C of the Churchill question on F963/02. If candidates had then stated that his purpose was to defend the return to the Gold Standard, at a meeting of shareholders who were likely to benefit from the additional income to financial services that the return would bring, then the evaluation of purpose would have been sharply focused. Finally, and crucially for marks in the higher levels, they will provide a judgement as to which source (if either) is more useful in providing evidence for the topic highlighted in the question. The degree to which this done and the quality of the argument that arises from these comments will determine the level and the mark that is awarded.

For part (b) questions, for the higher marks it is expected that candidates will organise the sources into relevant groupings to produce, at least, a two-sided argument. This argument will be driven by the sources and will involve pertinent references to, or quoted extracts from, the content of the sources. In support of these arguments, and to evaluate the sources' reliability, they will deploy some relevant, although not necessarily extensive, contextual knowledge. Finally, candidates will provide some synthesis between sources and contextual knowledge, even if it is uneven, leading to a judgement. This judgement will not be on the topic per se but on the degree to which the sources do, or do not, support the interpretation advanced in the question.

Comments on Individual Questions:

1. The Normans in England 1066-1100

a). This question was answered fairly well, with most candidates able to pick out several points of comparison. Those who noted the different time periods and locations of the two sources were suitably rewarded. Those candidates who did less well concentrated on the state of the Church without using the sources. A few candidates confused Vikings with Normans in source C, whilst some answered on William I and the impact of the Norman Conquest rather than the state of the Church as in the question set. Some candidates missed the detail of Source C and its later date. Stronger candidates were able to contrast the context of the out of touch state of the English Church in contrast to continental developments. Only a few candidates pointed out the importance of monastic foundations in both sources, whilst many had a tendency to see source C as showing William rather than individual monks improving things. The best candidates were able to differentiate between the geographical locations of the sources - although a significant number were not able to place Peterborough correctly. Comments on provenance were sometimes quite simplistic, or stock, with a handful of students questioning the reliability of C because it was produced by a 'modern historian', although there were a few exceptionally strong candidates who knew much relevant information about Simeon of Durham. Unfortunately provenance was often stated formulaically and not linked to content, although a significant number used the information in the sources effectively. Judgements were handled less effectively with many candidates seeing the comparison as being enough for this question.

b). Responses here sometimes suffered because candidates simply said that William either was or was not the driving force. Fewer candidates identified an alternative driving force, such as Lanfranc or the individual monks in C. Stronger candidates were also able to distinguish between being a "driving force" and merely a participant in reform, leading to sophisticated and well-developed arguments. There was some confusion between the roles of bishops and monks, and, as in Q(a) between Vikings and Normans concerning the destruction of churches. Weaker responses repeated a learned view of William's piety, referencing his "reforming zeal" in Source D. Alternative driving forces were usually seen as monks and bishops, especially Lanfranc, and there was often some very pertinent knowledge to link them to William. The Pope was also used by several candidates, both as integrated and stand-alone knowledge. Better answers noticed the different locations and dates in evaluating provenance, although evaluation was less well developed in this question. Several candidates misinterpreted and therefore misused Source E, thinking that the comments on Stigand showed support for him from William and that it was only papal intervention that saw him deposed. Judgements tended to be on the topic rather than on the content of the sources.

2. Mid Tudor Crises 1536-1569

a) This was generally well handled with most candidates able to develop some similarities and differences from the two chosen sources on the situations of Cromwell and Anne Boleyn. Many candidates were able to find points for comparison, particularly the seeming calmness of Anne measured against the anger of Cromwell, although weaker candidates misinterpreted Anne as angry like Cromwell. Often they described events and expressed opinions about Anne's innocence, although most candidates were able to discuss Henry's desire to marry Jane Seymour and the conflict between Anne and the Aragonese faction. Knowledge of the context of Cromwell's arrest was also in evidence. Provenance was used less well and there were many stock answers based on Anne's character and situation or the report of a foreign enemy. Only the best candidates saw the significance of Anne already being a resident of the Tower compared to the spontaneity of Cromwell's arrest. Weaker candidates missed the nature of the ambassador's report being based on hearsay at court, undermining attempts at judgement. Marillac was often seen as an enemy, and was therefore biased. Some weaker candidates also thought him an eyewitness. A number of candidates did not focus on 'reactions to charges of treason' but, instead, discussed whether they thought the charges of treason were justified. Consequently, they failed to make best use of the sources which were provided for this question.

b) This was answered less well, with many candidates lacking a secure understanding of court faction. Some candidates thought it was something to do with law courts, or ignored the nature of faction altogether, causing much confusion. Anne Boleyn was placed in and out of factions, whilst the sources were used in a variety of groupings which were not always successfully linked. Sources A and B gave strong evidence for factions, with both Anne Boleyn and Cromwell citing others as reasons for their fall from favour with the monarch. The arguments produced in many answers were often of a simple two sided nature, although better answers noticed detail which allowed them to create well-argued alternative views that personal ambition, the breaking of the Treason Law or the changing attitudes of the monarch were also to blame. Contextual knowledge was surprisingly thin and where it was used, it was often incorporated discretely rather than being integrated in the source based answer. Many candidates saw conspiracy in all the sources. Weaker candidates without knowledge of Thomas Seymour struggled with Source D and misunderstood the role of Parliament in the events. Evaluation was weak, with many candidates ignoring this aspect of the question completely. Provenance was left undeveloped in a number of cases, meaning that candidates were in many cases unable to access the higher levels of the mark-scheme. Better candidates used contextual knowledge to evaluate the sources and were rightly credited.

3. The English Civil War and Interregnum 1637-80

a). In Qa) most candidates grasped at least one reason why the New Model Army was formed, but this was sometimes linked to the Scots and was less clear. When Cromwell's role, religious sects and 'winning the war' were discussed, this question was answered well. Many candidates could point out the key reason as being the weaknesses of the previous parliamentary commanders and were able to name Essex and Manchester. A significant number of candidates were then able to discuss the significance of the Self-Denying Ordinance. However weaker candidates continue to answer every question on this topic by referring to irrelevant contextual knowledge, including the Personal Rule, Laud etc. Many candidates spotted Source B as showing religious liberty was also a key factor, but were unable to develop a sustained comparison from source A to support this. Fewer candidates noted the challenge to Cromwell from Essex in source A or the implication in B that there was a desire for military control of church and state. Most found points for comparison, but there was confusion over Presbyterians and Independents. Also there were some who pointed out Cromwell was an Independent and he therefore hated the puritans. Comments on provenance tended to be simple, the date being the main point of comparison, although better answers recognised Whitelocke's purpose in A. However a significant number of candidates suggested Whitelocke would often know nothing about the formation because he was an MP. Where candidates noted the differences between the political and religious background of the sources in their evaluation they were more successful.

b) This question elicited a range of responses which were not always related to the question set. A significant number of candidates discussed the formation of the New Model Army as in Qa, whilst others focused on why the NMA won, rather than examine its driving force. Many though were able to use the sources to create an argument for the key issue in the question. Some candidates saw Source B as irrelevant to religion, despite the reference to Independents and its authorship. Weaker answers saw lack of religion as the alternative view, supported by killing and mistreating innocent Royalists referencing Source D. Surprisingly the alternative view of Cromwell as a driving force of the NMA was largely ignored, despite the content of Sources A and B. Students were generally able to construct two sided arguments and there was evidence of cross-referencing throughout answers. Arguments ranged from desire for pay and plunder, the role of Cromwell and anti-Royalist fervour (Laud was again introduced by the weaker ones who argued this) and where candidates were able to argue a range of reasons, they were more successful. There was little in terms of own knowledge for this answer, with some candidates looking outside the First Civil war to try to show the driving force i.e. the quest for power and equality as shown by the Putney debates . A few indicated wrongly that Marston Moor showed the success of the NMA. Provenance was treated largely discretely although many candidates

failed to pick up on the nature of the authors such as the political emphasis of the statesman in Source A, or the military nature of the Colonel in source C. Many saw Source C as propaganda, but few developed this concept.

F963/02

General Comments:

As with past Enquiries papers, most candidates were entering this examination for the first time. It is clear that candidates are much more successful in addressing some of the skills required for the two different types of question. It is very rare for candidates to compare the wrong sources in part (a), and sequencing, when one source is considered followed by the second with nothing but implicit comparison, is also uncommon. Similarly, the grouping of sources is now normal in part (b), although here sequencing, sometimes with the content of the individual sources described, is more common. Candidates should, however, consider carefully the groupings that they choose. There are not necessarily “correct” groupings in many part (b) questions and some sources are susceptible to alternative interpretations. For example, factional rivalry could be inferred from different combinations of sources on the question on the Mid-Tudor Crises. However, some groupings are wrong and candidates must appreciate that there must be a clear logic behind the groupings selected. Candidates are aware of the need to consider both content and provenance for both part questions, although achieving an effective balance between the two remains a problem for many. Fewer candidates than in the past are over-dependent on a formulaic approach to each source, although there are still comments that a source lacks completeness as it does not include the views from both sides of an argument. There has been a rather cavalier attitude by some candidates towards the identification of the sources by letter. Examiners appreciate that candidates are under considerable pressure in all of the Enquiries papers, but it is not helpful if the source being discussed, or the sources being compared, are incorrectly identified. Whilst in most cases this is not significant – the references to the content will normally show which source is being discussed – there are occasions when incorrect labelling can render a response very unconvincing. Candidates also should be encouraged not to extract a few words from a source in order to make a point when the sense of the complete sentence from which the words have been taken is very different. Thus, to use the phrase “is spread abroad by my opponents that I was beaten at Marburg” to argue that Martin Luther agreed that he had lost the debate at the Colloquy of Marburg is clearly misleading and incorrect when the whole sentence reads “As to the statement that is spread abroad by my opponents that I was beaten at Marburg, they are not only liars but the very incarnation of deceit and hypocrisy”.

Comments from previous reports continue to be true, in that the integration of content from the sources with the discussion of the provenance and the evaluation of the sources’ reliability or utility remains a major problem for the majority of candidates. In both part (a) and part (b) responses, the content of individual sources was reviewed and the evaluation of that content dealt with quite separately. As a result, it was difficult to understand clearly whether candidates felt that the content they had considered was trustworthy and accurate or not. This was particularly difficult where candidates’ evaluation was ambivalent. So, for example, for question 4 in F964/02 (Dictatorship and Democracy in Germany 1933-1963) Source B was a Government (i.e. Nazi) report on an incident. Candidates frequently evaluated this both as reliable (because it was an official report and was meant to provide information) and unreliable (because it was Nazi in origin and therefore both biased and, probably, propaganda). Unless the candidate expresses a clear opinion on the reliability of the source, any final judgement is likely to be unconvincing or even asserted. Evaluation is a difficult skill to master, and requires more than a comment about a writer that she or he “would say that, wouldn’t they”. Such evaluation is formulaic at best. What is required is the application of the candidates’ own knowledge to test the validity of what is said in the source. For example, in Source D of question 2 in F964/01 (The German Reformation 1517-1555), the reformer Ulrich Zwingli makes a claim of winning over to his side one of Martin Luther’s key supporters, Philip of Hesse. Candidates might well

know that Philip of Hesse was considered by some to have sympathies for Zwingli's teachings, but rather more that he continued to support Luther's position on the Eucharist and later became the leader of the Schmalkaldic League to defend Protestantism in Germany. The deployment of this information to challenge (or support) Zwingli's assertion is effective evaluation and also makes use of the candidate's knowledge rather than just deploying it. Moreover, the source and its content is driving the argument rather than merely being used to illustrate the candidate's own views. Similarly, cross-reference is more than merely placing two extracts together. They must relate to each other in some particular way and relate to the question, whether in terms of the evidence for a part (a) response or in support of, or challenge to, the interpretation (part b). Candidates who used Sources A and B on the England in a New Century question to argue that extracts showed that Churchill and Lloyd George were on a mission to follow through on the promises made in the 1906 election, showing their determined leadership, were rewarded appropriately.

With any of the Enquiries papers there are certain expectations that need to be met for a candidate to achieve success. Ideally for the part (a) questions (the comparison of two sources as evidence for a particular issue), they will produce a response that compares the content of the two designated sources in such a way that comparisons are valid and not mere juxtapositions of extracts from the sources. Candidates were also guilty of making asserted comparisons, where they state that two sources are similar for a particular reason, but without support from the sources. In the English Civil War and Interregnum question on the formation of the New Model Army, several candidates pointed out that one reason for its formation was because of weak leadership of parliament's armies but then failed to pick out the evidence from Sources A and B that demonstrated this. Candidates should also compare the provenance of the two sources at more than a basic level (i.e. that they are both letters). They should subject the two sources to some level of evaluation that is more than a basic or formulaic response about the writer of each source, and deploy their own knowledge to help answer the question. Such knowledge will therefore be relevant and may well be used to test the reliability of each of the sources. Contextual knowledge can sometimes dominate these answers and it is worth noting that such knowledge should be pertinent and need not be extensive. Techniques for evaluation also differ significantly, although a number of candidates continue to refer to sources as "authentic" which leads to answers which are vague and unhelpful - this is a term that is best avoided. Similarly there were numbers of candidates who suggested that sources were not useful because their authors had a clear purpose, but then failed to state what that purpose was, something particularly noted in source C of the Churchill question on F963/02. If candidates had then stated that his purpose was to defend the return to the Gold Standard, at a meeting of shareholders who were likely to benefit from the additional income to financial services that the return would bring, then the evaluation of purpose would have been sharply focused. Finally, and crucially for marks in the higher levels, they will provide a judgement as to which source (if either) is more useful in providing evidence for the topic highlighted in the question. The degree to which this done and the quality of the argument that arises from these comments will determine the level and the mark that is awarded.

For part (b) questions, for the higher marks it is expected that candidates will organise the sources into relevant groupings to produce, at least, a two-sided argument. This argument will be driven by the sources and will involve pertinent references to, or quoted extracts from, the content of the sources. In support of these arguments, and to evaluate the sources' reliability, they will deploy some relevant, although not necessarily extensive, contextual knowledge. Finally, candidates will provide some synthesis between sources and contextual knowledge, even if it is uneven, leading to a judgement. This judgement will not be on the topic per se but on the degree to which the sources do, or do not, support the interpretation advanced in the question.

Comments on Individual Questions:

1. The Condition of England 1815-1853

a). Most candidates adopted a comparative focus for this question. The question was generally well-answered, with candidates able to point out the context of workhouse conditions following their reorganisation after the New Poor Law of 1834. Some candidates were also able to discuss the Andover scandal of 1845-46 and a few knew about the Huddersfield Scandal of 1848. Many candidates could point out some similarities and differences in the harsh treatment of the poor but fewer were able to draw out the distinction between the able-bodied poor and the infirm or sick. Many noted the differences in clothing that the sources highlighted. The difference in conditions was also misunderstood by many with a tendency to dwell on 'overcrowding' in 'D' in an attempt to compare with 'E', when in fact overcrowding was not an issue in D. There was some tendency to see source D as showing that conditions in the workhouse were positive. Few noted that there was no reference to the working regime in E due to the focus on the sick. Most candidates missed the provenance that both sources were critics of the new system, with many suggesting Castle was a supporter, missing his fine and expulsion noted in Source D. Good candidates were able to discuss the geographical differences of the 2 sources and came to a valid judgement, although overall judgements were not well developed.

b). Most candidates coped well with the groupings in this question and were able to make good use of these to provide a two-sided argument. Generally A, B and D were used to support the idea that the New Poor Law was successful in helping the poor. They used the content reasonably well and there was good cross-referencing between A and B. The alternative argument was best supported by C and E with D also used to some extent. Again many candidates had little trouble with content and were able to formulate an argument based on the content of C by talking about technological advances and foreign trade, or by using the content of E to discuss the disadvantages of the new system. Contextually candidates were able to discuss the changes of the New Poor Law and the scandals of the mid 1840s, whilst some candidates were able to discuss regional variances in the effectiveness of the reforms. In terms of provenance, candidates were less secure in their understanding and evaluation of the sources. Provenance was largely treated discretely, and while many recognised the self-interested views of the reports in sources A and B, fewer candidates were able to use the geographical locations of A and B to point out that these sources came from the areas were rural areas in whose interests the New Poor Law was framed. A few good candidates pointed out that both sources were from early in the new system and it was possibly too early to tell whether reforms were helping the poor. Very few candidates made a decent attempt to evaluate Source C, with weaker candidates suggesting a poet was making things up to appeal to his audience. Several did use relevant knowledge with respect to the 'abstract theories' mentioned. D and E were treated relevantly with several candidates pointing out that at least Castle had been an inmate in the new system whilst the nature of the report in E meant that it had a wider focus. Judgements were rather stock with some very good candidates pointing out that the system worked in some geographical locations but not in more industrial areas. Others pointed out that it helped some to escape the cycle of dependency on outdoor relief, as noted in A and B, but condemned the sick and infirm to prison-like conditions.

2. The Age of Gladstone and Disraeli 1865-1886

2.a) Many candidates were able to compare the two sources reasonably effectively. The context was generally well-known in terms of the crisis in Irish affairs in 1881-1882. A few candidates provided a generalised answer based on knowledge rather than the chosen sources although such responses were infrequent. Most recognised Parnell's position in both sources but rightly understood that there were more differences than similarities in the two sources, pointing out that for Davitt the Treaty was a defeat whilst for O'Connor it was a good political victory. A number of candidates pointed out that Parnell's position was strengthened according to

O'Connor whilst Davitt felt it was now under threat. Candidates who supported their analysis with pertinent evidence from the sources were more likely to score well here. Some candidates were unclear on the differences in provenance between 'C' and 'D' with few pointing to the distinction between the political focus of O'Connor as an MP as opposed to the radicalism of Davitt, who felt betrayed by the Treaty as the Land League was wound up. Judgements were not fully developed in relation to context and provenance as a result.

b). There were some very good answers which used supporting evidence effectively with good knowledge of the problems of Gladstone's 2nd Ministry, the Irish political party and the Land War. Some candidates found it difficult to group the sources, although those that did found that there were different combinations that could be used effectively. The view that Gladstone was successful could be found in elements of all the sources, with many citing Morley in A as believing the 1881 Land Act was one of Gladstone's greatest achievements, or in C showing that O'Connor felt he restored "tranquillity" to Ireland. The alternative view was also recognised, with better candidates pointing out that, rather than failure, Gladstone had mixed success in dealing with the Irish problem between 1880 and 1885. Again different combinations of sources could be used to argue this, with parts of A, B, C and E used at various times. Evaluation was formulaic at times. Some candidates didn't notice that 'A' and 'E' were from the same author and those who did rarely made any direct connection between them in an effort to evaluate. Very few candidates considered the first three sentences in Source A about the political reaction to the Land Bill either. Hindsight was used to evaluate a number of the sources and this led to judgements which were incomplete.

3. England and a New Century 1900-1924

There was a mistake in the attribution of Source A - Churchill was not President of the Board of Trade in October 1906. This error had no bearing on candidate answers on this paper.

3 a) Most candidates dealt well with this question, particularly the content of the sources. Most were able to point out several similarities as well as differences. Where weaker candidates struggled was in interpreting vision and instead concentrating on similarities and differences. The idea that both men stood for the disadvantaged was highlighted by many, as was the idea, present in both sources, that the state ought to do something about poverty. Contextual knowledge was generally sound with good knowledge of New Liberalism, although some candidates produced a narrative of the reports of Booth and Rowntree rather than focusing on the issues in the sources. Fewer candidates noted the difference in time scales in the sources, with Churchill looking to the long term whilst Lloyd George was focused on the immediate ending of poverty. In terms of provenance, many candidates were able to highlight the differences in upbringing between the two men and used this knowledge to evaluate their positions in the sources. However, there was a sizable minority that thought Churchill was Conservative in 1906, which obviously impacted on their answers. The context of 1906 and 1908 was generally well-understood by a large majority of candidates. Few, though, noted Lloyd-George's position as Chancellor meant that he was in a position to cost the expense of the various reforms, or indeed could fund them. Judgements, where made, were limited in scope.

b). This question was answered less well than part A. As with the first question, a number thought Churchill was a Conservative, which obviously affected their answers to this question. The question appeared to throw some students, who struggled with the concept of "leadership" and wanted to talk about Campbell-Bannerman and Asquith but found nothing on them in the sources. Those that grasped the debate found alternative arguments such as the weaknesses of the opposition, using D and E to support their views. Some candidates misunderstood 'D', believing that it was a criticism of the Liberals' support for tariffs, highlighting some insecurity in basic factual knowledge, although an impressive number of candidates handled the source well with impressive knowledge of the tariff reform issue. Where source E was misunderstood, candidates misinterpreted Webb as putting forward the idea that McDonald wanted the workers

to vote Liberal. They failed to realise that Webb felt that the ordinary working man was drawn to the more experienced Liberals, and that Webb often showed contempt for those early Labour leaders. Evaluation of sources was often 'stock' with repeated acceptance/dismissal of sources on the basis of diaries being reliable and having no agenda or letters being private etc. Surprisingly few candidates used the provenance of D or E to evaluate the views expressed in these sources meaning that judgements were sometimes thin and partially developed.

4. Churchill 1920-1945

4 a). This question was answered well by the majority of candidates. Candidates were able to find several differences, including C's belief that it was essential to trade against D's argument that it brought England to destruction. The advantages and disadvantages noted by the sources were also examined. Fewer candidates pointed out the similarities such as both sources seeing the Gold Standard as once being respected. Contextual support was sometimes thin, although many candidates discussed the General Strike and conditions for miners in the 1920s. Fewer candidates were able to explain the growing influence of financial services on the British economy and the decline of manufacturing. The provenance of source C was generally well handled with many candidates able to point out his defence of the policy and his vested interests. Many candidates were confused by the nature of Source D, some evaluating it as a speech, rather than a speech reported in a letter. However in judgement most candidates were able to point out how the sources demonstrated changing attitudes towards the Gold Standard.

b). Most candidates were able to group the sources into a two sided argument. Candidates were able to see that sources A, B and C supported the view that Churchill's time as Chancellor boosted his reputation, although many were confused by the nature and message of source A, which was handled quite poorly by a number of candidates. They saw this source as being critical of Churchill, and there were many 'stock' comments on provenance including a surprising number who asserted that the Daily Mail was a left-wing paper, which led to a confused attempt at evaluation. Fewer candidates were able to comment on the idea that source A dealt with different aspects of Churchill's work.

Sources D and E were used to support the alternative view. Source E was generally handled well, with some impressive knowledge, although evaluation tended to focus on the idea that Churchill wasn't trusted by Amery because he had switched his political allegiances earlier in his career. Better candidates pointed out how Churchill didn't allow his failures to affect him. Contextual knowledge was thin, with few commenting on the desire to keep costs low in the 1920s, or the effect that Churchill's reductions in the military budget had on his long term reputation, preferring instead to discuss his views on India or the Abdication Crisis. This led to unevenness in a number of answers. Provenance was tackled discretely with few picking up on the exaggerated tone of source E in attempting to deflect from general concerns about the Conservative Party in 1945.

F964/01

General Comments:

As with past Enquiries papers, most candidates were entering this examination for the first time. It is clear that candidates are much more successful in addressing some of the skills required for the two different types of question. It is very rare for candidates to compare the wrong sources in part (a), and sequencing, when one source is considered followed by the second with nothing but implicit comparison, is also uncommon. Similarly, the grouping of sources is now normal in part (b), although here sequencing, sometimes with the content of the individual sources described, is more common. Candidates should, however, consider carefully the groupings that they choose. There are not necessarily “correct” groupings in many part (b) questions and some sources are susceptible to alternative interpretations. For example, factional rivalry could be inferred from different combinations of sources on the question on the Mid-Tudor Crises. However, some groupings are wrong and candidates must appreciate that there must be a clear logic behind the groupings selected. Candidates are aware of the need to consider both content and provenance for both part questions, although achieving an effective balance between the two remains a problem for many. Fewer candidates than in the past are over-dependent on a formulaic approach to each source, although there are still comments that a source lacks completeness as it does not include the views from both sides of an argument. There has been a rather cavalier attitude by some candidates towards the identification of the sources by letter. Examiners appreciate that candidates are under considerable pressure in all of the Enquiries papers, but it is not helpful if the source being discussed, or the sources being compared, are incorrectly identified. Whilst in most cases this is not significant – the references to the content will normally show which source is being discussed – there are occasions when incorrect labelling can render a response very unconvincing. Candidates also should be encouraged not to extract a few words from a source in order to make a point when the sense of the complete sentence from which the words have been taken is very different. Thus, to use the phrase “is spread abroad by my opponents that I was beaten at Marburg” to argue that Martin Luther agreed that he had lost the debate at the Colloquy of Marburg is clearly misleading and incorrect when the whole sentence reads “As to the statement that is spread abroad by my opponents that I was beaten at Marburg, they are not only liars but the very incarnation of deceit and hypocrisy”.

Comments from previous reports continue to be true, in that the integration of content from the sources with the discussion of the provenance and the evaluation of the sources’ reliability or utility remains a major problem for the majority of candidates. In both part (a) and part (b) responses, the content of individual sources was reviewed and the evaluation of that content dealt with quite separately. As a result, it was difficult to understand clearly whether candidates felt that the content they had considered was trustworthy and accurate or not. This was particularly difficult where candidates’ evaluation was ambivalent. So, for example, for question 4 in F964/02 (Dictatorship and Democracy in Germany 1933-1963) Source B was a Government (i.e. Nazi) report on an incident. Candidates frequently evaluated this both as reliable (because it was an official report and was meant to provide information) and unreliable (because it was Nazi in origin and therefore both biased and, probably, propaganda). Unless the candidate expresses a clear opinion on the reliability of the source, any final judgement is likely to be unconvincing or even asserted. Evaluation is a difficult skill to master, and requires more than a comment about a writer that she or he “would say that, wouldn’t they”. Such evaluation is formulaic at best. What is required is the application of the candidates’ own knowledge to test the validity of what is said in the source. For example, in Source D of question 2 in F964/01 (The German Reformation 1517-1555), the reformer Ulrich Zwingli makes a claim of winning over to his side one of Martin Luther’s key supporters, Philip of Hesse. Candidates might well know that Philip of Hesse was considered by some to have sympathies for Zwingli’s teachings, but rather more that he continued to support Luther’s position on the Eucharist and later became the leader of the Schmalkaldic League to defend Protestantism in Germany. The deployment of this information to challenge (or support) Zwingli’s assertion is effective evaluation and also

makes use of the candidate's knowledge rather than just deploying it. Moreover, the source and its content is driving the argument rather than merely being used to illustrate the candidate's own views. Similarly, cross-reference is more than merely placing two extracts together. They must relate to each other in some particular way and relate to the question, whether in terms of the evidence for a part (a) response or in support of, or challenge to, the interpretation (part b). Candidates who used Sources A and B on the England in a New Century question to argue that extracts showed that Churchill and Lloyd George were on a mission to follow through on the promises made in the 1906 election, showing their determined leadership, were rewarded appropriately.

With any of the Enquiries papers there are certain expectations that need to be met for a candidate to achieve success. Ideally for the part (a) questions (the comparison of two sources as evidence for a particular issue), they will produce a response that compares the content of the two designated sources in such a way that comparisons are valid and not mere juxtapositions of extracts from the sources. Candidates were also guilty of making asserted comparisons, where they state that two sources are similar for a particular reason, but without support from the sources. In the English Civil War and Interregnum question on the formation of the New Model Army, several candidates pointed out that one reason for its formation was because of weak leadership of parliament's armies but then failed to pick out the evidence from Sources A and B that demonstrated this. Candidates should also compare the provenance of the two sources at more than a basic level (i.e. that they are both letters). They should subject the two sources to some level of evaluation that is more than a basic or formulaic response about the writer of each source, and deploy their own knowledge to help answer the question. Such knowledge will therefore be relevant and may well be used to test the reliability of each of the sources. Contextual knowledge can sometimes dominate these answers and it is worth noting that such knowledge should be pertinent and need not be extensive. Techniques for evaluation also differ significantly, although a number of candidates continue to refer to sources as "authentic" which leads to answers which are vague and unhelpful - this is a term that is best avoided. Similarly there were numbers of candidates who suggested that sources were not useful because their authors had a clear purpose, but then failed to state what that purpose was, something particularly noted in source C of the Churchill question on F963/02. If candidates had then stated that his purpose was to defend the return to the Gold Standard, at a meeting of shareholders who were likely to benefit from the additional income to financial services that the return would bring, then the evaluation of purpose would have been sharply focused. Finally, and crucially for marks in the higher levels, they will provide a judgement as to which source (if either) is more useful in providing evidence for the topic highlighted in the question. The degree to which this done and the quality of the argument that arises from these comments will determine the level and the mark that is awarded.

For part (b) questions, for the higher marks it is expected that candidates will organise the sources into relevant groupings to produce, at least, a two-sided argument. This argument will be driven by the sources and will involve pertinent references to, or quoted extracts from, the content of the sources. In support of these arguments, and to evaluate the sources' reliability, they will deploy some relevant, although not necessarily extensive, contextual knowledge. Finally, candidates will provide some synthesis between sources and contextual knowledge, even if it is uneven, leading to a judgement. This judgement will not be on the topic per se but on the degree to which the sources do, or do not, support the interpretation advanced in the question.

Comments on Individual Questions:

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

1a. Study Sources B and E. Compare these Sources as evidence for Peter the Hermit.

The best responses were those that engaged most closely with the text and identified areas of similarity and difference between the two sources, and then exemplified them with specific and related quotation. Thus, Peter's success as a motivator was shown by reference to the numbers of his followers or the diversity of those who followed him. His weakness as a leader was demonstrated by reference to the destruction his followers caused, noted by both sources. The juxtaposition of quotations without a specific reason for their comparison was much less effective. In terms of evaluating the reliability or utility of the sources, the better responses looked carefully at what was being said by the authors and used their own knowledge of the period to judge the validity of those comments. Too often the evaluation was formulaic, based solely on the provenance and employing stock phrases. Thus Anna was assumed to be negative towards Peter because she was Byzantine, and Robert the Monk assumed to be positive because he was religious. However, there were clear pointers in the sources to suggest that such evaluation was too simplistic. Most ignored the reference in Source B (Robert the monk) to Peter's enjoyment of wine and food, and those that picked up on it failed to appreciate its significance – that comment and the one about "lacking the leadership of a good prince" indicated that Robert's regard for Peter was not unqualified. Similarly, Anna Comnena (Source E) was often dismissed as unreliable or hostile to the crusaders because she was the Emperor's daughter, despite the evidence to the contrary in the source. The best responses remembered that the analysis of the sources and their provenances was a means to an end – judging which, if either, was the better evidence about Peter the Hermit. A series of comments about each source without a clear judgement would not constitute an effective conclusion to the answer.

1b. Study all the Sources. Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the Crusaders on the People's Crusade were well-organised.

The better responses were constructed around a two-sided argument, having initially grouped the sources to support the alternative responses to the interpretation. This approach had the effect of focussing candidates' thoughts along the lines of a debate and so in general avoided a sequential approach to the sources. Those answers that then provided grouped analysis, discriminated between the sources and were aware of strengths and limitations of the sources, were the most successful. Many candidates recognised that some of the sources could be used to support either argument (Sources B and E, and also on occasion very successfully, A). Most grouping was reasonably convincing but candidates needed to draw inferences from the sources in order to develop effective arguments. For example, sources A and C hinted at shortages of resources which suggested disorganisation, and that could be supported by the knowledge that the People's Crusade set out with limited planning and at an inappropriate time so that there were shortages of food that had to be addressed. However, it was noticed that not many candidates used contextual knowledge to develop the arguments and such knowledge was thin on the ground. It was interesting to see a variety of explanations of 'organisation', from 'hurling arrows in quick succession' and 'they came, battalion after battalion', through the fact that the People's Crusade was the first to reach Constantinople (specified in B, implied in E) to 'bearing crosses on their shoulders', this latter to an extent grasping at straws. The most frequent use of candidates' own knowledge was in respect of source E and the reference to Peter's refusal to wait for the other leaders before crossing the Bosphorus. Many candidates were able to discuss whether Peter chose to go, as Anna Comnena states in the source, or whether Emperor Alexius hurried the crusaders across because of the problems they were creating. This allowed them to use their own knowledge to evaluate the reliability of Source E and there were well-rehearsed comments about Anna's trustworthiness as an historian. However, this synthesis of argument,

source evaluation and own knowledge was uncommon. Most evaluative comments about sources were deployed in isolation from the comments on the content and were often very formulaic, frequently merely based on whether the writer had been on crusade or had talked with returning crusaders.

Question 2: The German Reformation 1517 – 1555

2a. Study Sources D and E. Compare these Sources as evidence for what happened at the Marburg Colloquy in 1529.

The best responses were those that clearly were aware of the context for the Colloquy of Marburg and had some understanding of the issues that were debated. The best candidates developed the theological details of the sources comparatively and knew the context of previous rows between the two reformers. The better responses also picked up on the reference in Source D (Zwingli) to Philip of Hesse and used their knowledge of him as a means of evaluating the reliability of that source. It was surprising how many ignored the difference on the communion (most, clearly, did not appreciate that ‘the sacraments’ included the Eucharist). Equally surprising was the number of candidates who thought Luther had written Source E first, missing the steer and so misunderstanding the nature of his angry response. Few picked up on the significance of the letter in E being written after an earlier one and some of those who did used that as a reason for challenging the reliability of Source E. They saw it as a further example of Luther changing his mind, as alleged by Zwingli, rather than his anger that Zwingli was clearly “spinning” the outcome of the debate to suit his own position when Luther had earlier attempted to put as good a gloss on the debate as possible. There were very few sequential answers but weaker responses did not get far beyond stating that both of them thought they’d won, their comments were reliable because they were writing to friends/supporters and these were the kind of comments that they would be expected to make.

2b. Study all the Sources. Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that it was Luther who provoked quarrels with the protestant radicals between 1524 and 1529.

Candidates produced a variety of groupings for the sources in response to this question but even unlikely ones often proved persuasive when the arguments associated with them were carefully constructed and supported by relevant knowledge. Many candidates thought Sources A, B and D supported the argument that the blame for the quarrels lay with Luther. If they made a good case for this they usually balanced it with the counter-argument that the radicals were to blame, based on Sources C and E. However, the references in Source A to “Leave them alone as long as they confine themselves to preaching the scriptures” and to the iconoclasm of Müntzer’s followers were effectively used to suggest that Luther was not to blame. Equally, the language used by Luther in the letter quoted in Source E was often cited as a cause of the quarrels. In this respect the question allowed candidates to use their own knowledge in variety of ways but that knowledge had to be specific. Those who were well informed were able to make more of the sources than those who were less knowledgeable, not least in dating the Peasants Revolt accurately which was important when treating Sources A and B. Good contextual understanding also allowed candidates to expand on the events in Wittenberg when using Source C and, similarly, in explaining Sources D and E against the background of previous conferences, debates and Diets. Some of the best answers included a third argument linking Luther to the princes and this was often effective. However, the linkage was essential as attempts to blame the princes alone proved to be unconvincing. The successful responses tended to contrast Luther’s more radical theological arguments with his innate social conservatism. Müntzer on the other hand interpreted Luther’s teachings in such a way as to threaten the established order and this provoked both Luther and the princes. Whether Luther, Müntzer or the princes were to blame for the consequences of this difference of interpretation was something to be discussed. A few candidates contrasted Zwingli with Müntzer and Carlstadt, and argued successfully that, relatively speaking, Zwingli was not a radical. Credit was

given for this, although the majority of candidates placed Zwingli in the radical camp without prejudice. Overall, the positive view of the majority was that the sources did support the interpretation that Luther was to blame, but the reasons for this conclusion varied from his stubbornness and the language he used to the fact that his teachings had been used in ways that he might not have anticipated.

F964/02

General Comments:

As with past Enquiries papers, most candidates were entering this examination for the first time. It is clear that candidates are much more successful in addressing some of the skills required for the two different types of question. It is very rare for candidates to compare the wrong sources in part (a), and sequencing, when one source is considered followed by the second with nothing but implicit comparison, is also uncommon. Similarly, the grouping of sources is now normal in part (b), although here sequencing, sometimes with the content of the individual sources described, is more common. Candidates should, however, consider carefully the groupings that they choose. There are not necessarily “correct” groupings in many part (b) questions and some sources are susceptible to alternative interpretations. For example, factional rivalry could be inferred from different combinations of sources on the question on the Mid-Tudor Crises. However, some groupings are wrong and candidates must appreciate that there must be a clear logic behind the groupings selected. Candidates are aware of the need to consider both content and provenance for both part questions, although achieving an effective balance between the two remains a problem for many. Fewer candidates than in the past are over-dependent on a formulaic approach to each source, although there are still comments that a source lacks completeness as it does not include the views from both sides of an argument. There has been a rather cavalier attitude by some candidates towards the identification of the sources by letter. Examiners appreciate that candidates are under considerable pressure in all of the Enquiries papers, but it is not helpful if the source being discussed, or the sources being compared, are incorrectly identified. Whilst in most cases this is not significant – the references to the content will normally show which source is being discussed – there are occasions when incorrect labelling can render a response very unconvincing. Candidates also should be encouraged not to extract a few words from a source in order to make a point when the sense of the complete sentence from which the words have been taken is very different. Thus, to use the phrase “is spread abroad by my opponents that I was beaten at Marburg” to argue that Martin Luther agreed that he had lost the debate at the Colloquy of Marburg is clearly misleading and incorrect when the whole sentence reads “As to the statement that is spread abroad by my opponents that I was beaten at Marburg, they are not only liars but the very incarnation of deceit and hypocrisy”.

Comments from previous reports continue to be true, in that the integration of content from the sources with the discussion of the provenance and the evaluation of the sources’ reliability or utility remains a major problem for the majority of candidates. In both part (a) and part (b) responses, the content of individual sources was reviewed and the evaluation of that content dealt with quite separately. As a result, it was difficult to understand clearly whether candidates felt that the content they had considered was trustworthy and accurate or not. This was particularly difficult where candidates’ evaluation was ambivalent. So, for example, for question 4 in F964/02 (Dictatorship and Democracy in Germany 1933-1963) Source B was a Government (i.e. Nazi) report on an incident. Candidates frequently evaluated this both as reliable (because it was an official report and was meant to provide information) and unreliable (because it was Nazi in origin and therefore both biased and, probably, propaganda). Unless the candidate expresses a clear opinion on the reliability of the source, any final judgement is likely to be unconvincing or even asserted. Evaluation is a difficult skill to master, and requires more than a comment about a writer that she or he “would say that, wouldn’t they”. Such evaluation is formulaic at best. What is required is the application of the candidates’ own knowledge to test the validity of what is said in the source. For example, in Source D of question 2 in F964/01

(The German Reformation 1517-1555), the reformer Ulrich Zwingli makes a claim of winning over to his side one of Martin Luther's key supporters, Philip of Hesse. Candidates might well know that Philip of Hesse was considered by some to have sympathies for Zwingli's teachings, but rather more that he continued to support Luther's position on the Eucharist and later became the leader of the Schmalkaldic League to defend Protestantism in Germany. The deployment of this information to challenge (or support) Zwingli's assertion is effective evaluation and also makes use of the candidate's knowledge rather than just deploying it. Moreover, the source and its content is driving the argument rather than merely being used to illustrate the candidate's own views. Similarly, cross-reference is more than merely placing two extracts together. They must relate to each other in some particular way and relate to the question, whether in terms of the evidence for a part (a) response or in support of, or challenge to, the interpretation (part b). Candidates who used Sources A and B on the England in a New Century question to argue that extracts showed that Churchill and Lloyd George were on a mission to follow through on the promises made in the 1906 election, showing their determined leadership, were rewarded appropriately.

With any of the Enquiries papers there are certain expectations that need to be met for a candidate to achieve success. Ideally for the part (a) questions (the comparison of two sources as evidence for a particular issue), they will produce a response that compares the content of the two designated sources in such a way that comparisons are valid and not mere juxtapositions of extracts from the sources. Candidates were also guilty of making asserted comparisons, where they state that two sources are similar for a particular reason, but without support from the sources. In the English Civil War and Interregnum question on the formation of the New Model Army, several candidates pointed out that one reason for its formation was because of weak leadership of parliament's armies but then failed to pick out the evidence from Sources A and B that demonstrated this. Candidates should also compare the provenance of the two sources at more than a basic level (i.e. that they are both letters). They should subject the two sources to some level of evaluation that is more than a basic or formulaic response about the writer of each source, and deploy their own knowledge to help answer the question. Such knowledge will therefore be relevant and may well be used to test the reliability of each of the sources. Contextual knowledge can sometimes dominate these answers and it is worth noting that such knowledge should be pertinent and need not be extensive. Techniques for evaluation also differ significantly, although a number of candidates continue to refer to sources as "authentic" which leads to answers which are vague and unhelpful - this is a term that is best avoided. Similarly there were numbers of candidates who suggested that sources were not useful because their authors had a clear purpose, but then failed to state what that purpose was, something particularly noted in source C of the Churchill question on F963/02. If candidates had then stated that his purpose was to defend the return to the Gold Standard, at a meeting of shareholders who were likely to benefit from the additional income to financial services that the return would bring, then the evaluation of purpose would have been sharply focused. Finally, and crucially for marks in the higher levels, they will provide a judgement as to which source (if either) is more useful in providing evidence for the topic highlighted in the question. The degree to which this done and the quality of the argument that arises from these comments will determine the level and the mark that is awarded.

For part (b) questions, for the higher marks it is expected that candidates will organise the sources into relevant groupings to produce, at least, a two-sided argument. This argument will be driven by the sources and will involve pertinent references to, or quoted extracts from, the content of the sources. In support of these arguments, and to evaluate the sources' reliability, they will deploy some relevant, although not necessarily extensive, contextual knowledge. Finally, candidates will provide some synthesis between sources and contextual knowledge, even if it is uneven, leading to a judgement. This judgement will not be on the topic per se but on the degree to which the sources do, or do not, support the interpretation advanced in the question.

Comments on Individual Questions:

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

1a. Study Sources B and C. Compare these Sources as evidence for the reasons for unrest in 1795.

Most candidates identified several points of comparison for this question, and those with understanding were effective in their evaluation. They compared content more effectively than provenance, although many candidates found Source B more accessible than Source C. In terms of the reason for the unrest, most candidates saw the major similarity between the sources as a desire to return to the 1793 Constitution, although relatively few could explain why this should be the case given the very different nature of the two sources. The general consensus was that the two sources shared more differences than similarities, and a few candidates saw them as diametrically opposed. In terms of the context of the two sources, many candidates were aware of the economic situation at the time and the impact that the policies of the Thermidorean Government had had on the cost of living, but others were clearly unaware of these. That made explaining aspects of each source difficult. Evaluation of the sources and their provenance tended to be very formulaic. A popular view was that Source B was reliable because it reflected the feelings of the people of Paris, but this was often asserted rather than explained. However, those who knew about the economic situation were able to use that knowledge effectively in this respect. Source C, on the other hand, was seen as unreliable in general. The main reasons for this were either that Bourdon was a regional representative who would therefore be largely ignorant of anything outside of his region or that he had a vested interest in showing the Thermidorean Government in a good light. Few candidates considered that Bourdon's description of the Prairial revolt as being generated by "the fury of the royalists, the fury of the refractory, non-juror priests" might be propaganda and a way of deflecting criticism from the government.

1b. Study all the Sources. Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that by 1795 revolution was no longer popular.

Concern had been expressed about this question but candidates were able to approach the question of whether "by 1795 revolution was no longer popular" in a variety of ways. Some chose to consider whether "the Revolution" of 1789 and its consequences were no longer popular, whilst others understood "revolution" to mean the idea of revolution in general rather than that of 1789 in particular. Credit was given for either interpretation of the question and consequently a multitude of groupings were offered, mainly due to the individual interpretations of "revolution". Most were acceptable, assuming that the candidate was able to justify the selection by reference to content, provenance and contextual knowledge. The latter was very variable in both depth and range.

In general Sources A and E were used to support the key issue, although Source E appeared in some counter-groupings as it expresses revolutionary sentiment. Source B was sometimes linked to this group because of the clear opposition it expressed to the current revolutionary government. However, this was a minority view. Generally Source B was used to support the alternative view – that revolution was still popular. Most candidates saw this source as "pro-revolution" because of the phrase "Rebellion is the most sacred of rights, the most essential of duties", and linked this to the right of rebellion enshrined in the (suspended) 1793 constitution. Others saw the source reflecting an uprising against a counter-revolutionary government, but again the sense of the "right to rebel" was apparent. Those who placed Source E along with Source B usually were at pains to differentiate the 1789 Revolution from some of the events that came after it, in particular the Terror. The opening sentence – "All hearts were opened to the sweetest hopes following Thermidor in 1784" – was used to define the writer's position, although the fact that he had been a member of the Convention did militate against this writer's credibility for some.

Sources C and D were used for either interpretation. Source C proved challenging, as did source D, albeit for different reasons. Candidates used source C both for and against the interpretation quite effectively but most saw in it an appeal for peace whilst continuing the benefits of the Revolution, with a particular focus on “Do not make the five years of hardship and sacrifice useless”. Those who suggested the opposite view did so on the basis of “do not dishonour the glory of the revolution”. However, in terms of evaluation much of this was formulaic, based either on Bourdon’s membership of the Convention (“he would support the Convention and therefore oppose further revolution”) or the fact that he was a regional representative whose understanding of wider issues would be limited. Source D was mostly used to argue against the interpretation, and generally those who argued otherwise did so unconvincingly. The unfortunate identification of Louis XVIII as the Duke of Artois appears to have had no effect on candidates’ responses and those who accepted the steer were, of course, not penalised. However, evaluation of this source did prove remarkably challenging as many candidates failed fully to appreciate what Louis was attempting to do by issuing the Declaration of Verona.

Contextual knowledge offered was variable in depth and range. However, many candidates wrote effectively about the economic and political situation in France at that time. The nature of these sources allowed candidates to use their knowledge of the French Revolution earlier than 1795. Candidates picked up on references to the 1793 Constitution (Sources B and C), the civil war in the Vendée (source A) and the events of the Terror (through Source E) to place the events of 1795 in context and so reach a judgement on the interpretation.

2. The Unification of Italy 1815-1870

2a. Study Sources A and B. Compare these Sources as evidence for revolutionary activity in the Italian peninsula.

Overall, this question was answered well. Candidates compared the content effectively, picking up on a range of points. There was general agreement about which pieces of evidence should be paired together. The references to the Carbonari were most frequently compared and candidates showed how they were viewed differently in each source. The manner in which Source A implied that there were active and on-going conspiracies, whilst Source B suggested that revolutionaries in the central regions were more passive, was also frequently highlighted. The differences were explained by the dates of the two sources and their provenance. Good contextual knowledge, particularly of chronology, allowed candidates to relate the two sources to the different revolutions, specifically of 1820 in respect of Source A and of 1830-31 in the Central Duchies for Source B. This knowledge also aided evaluation which was, on the whole, effectively done, although that of Source B tended to be rather more formulaic than of Source A. In respect of Source B, the tendency was to assume that because Montanelli supported revolutionary activity, his comments were what would be expected. However, those candidates who pointed out that the fact that he was critical of the revolutionaries and that, therefore, the reliability of his comments was enhanced were duly rewarded. Most candidates pointed out why the Prince of Canosa might want to denigrate the revolutionary movements, stressing the fact he would want to ensure that his royal master maintained the pressure on revolutionary groups. However, that the Prince was writing at the height of Carbonari activity, when the danger was very real, adds to the reliability of the source, even if the tone and language suggests otherwise. Candidates were divided as to which, if either, was more reliable but often determined on Source B because of its later date and, therefore, wider understanding of the situation because of hindsight.

2b. Study all the Sources. Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that government repression was the main reason for the failure of revolutionaries in Italy from 1820 to 1849.

Overall candidates engaged well with the interpretation and grouped the sources effectively. These groupings were fairly consistent across the majority of responses – Sources A and D were seen to support the interpretation whilst Sources B, C and E suggested other reasons, with the various weaknesses of the revolutionaries being prominent. Within these basic groupings there were variations, with sources D and E not infrequently used to support an alternative argument to the norm. Where such groupings were convincingly supported, due credit was given. Some candidates took the involvement of Austrian forces as noted in Source D to be an aspect of government repression whilst others took it to be foreign involvement, especially when linked with the reference to “eight thousand Frenchmen” in Source E and the appeal to Piedmont in the final line of Source D. Very few candidates made much of Source E with its reference to Rome and resistance to the French. However, a few of the stronger responses did make the point that that repression was a cause of revolution as much as a factor explaining its failure. Only the very best responses were able to differentiate between the various Italian States.

The weaknesses of the revolutionaries was variously characterised as poor leadership, lack of support and misunderstanding of aims. At this point it is worth noting that a number of candidates took these different factors and essentially wrote an essay on why the revolutionaries failed, using references from the sources to illustrate their arguments. It is important for candidates and Centres alike to remember that this paper is source-based and the sources should drive the argument. A familiar topic such as this is fraught with danger in that the sources become lost in a mass of (normally very accurate) detailed own knowledge, concluding with a judgement on the topic and not on the effectiveness of the sources in supporting one interpretation against another.

As far as source evaluation was concerned, many candidates used their own knowledge to put the sources into context and therefore evaluated them with regard to more than their provenance. This was very cheering. Source E however did prove challenging, and few made very much of it. It was the only source where somewhat formulaic evaluation occurred – reliable because the writer was an outsider “with no reason to lie”, or unreliable because the writer was an outsider who therefore “did not fully understand what was happening”. Relatively few noted that Elizabeth Barrett Browning was in fact an eyewitness of events, writing to a friend and therefore likely to be a reliable, if perhaps limited, source of evidence.

Q3. The Origins of the American Civil War 1820-1861

3a. Study Sources B and C. Compare these Sources as evidence for attitudes to slavery in the Territories.

The majority of candidates answered this question well. They were able to identify a range of similarities and differences and most recognised the pro and anti-slavery sentiments of the respective sources. Many used “right of masters” and “no apology...for... slavery” to highlight this difference. In respect of similarity, the force of each argument was compared with reference to “not submit”. A few also compared evidence to suggest that the union was under threat. What was surprising was the fact that a significant number of candidates failed to pick up on the reference in both sources to the Missouri Compromise and the fact that both were, apparently, supporters of that Compromise, albeit for different reasons. Contextual knowledge was variable. Many were able to place the sources in the context of the Missouri Compromise and the 1850 Compromise and the Kansas-Nebraska Bill. However, a very large number thought that both sources were responses to the 1850 Compromise and the Kansas-Nebraska Bill respectively when in fact they were both dated before those events (and the steer in Source C made this clear). This was significant for the evaluation of both of the sources, because they were both attempts to persuade others to their way of thinking. Most candidates discussed the sectional

provenance of both sources, and for some the evaluation did not go much further than this. Better answers explained that nine out of fifteen states (Source B) was a majority and they were representatives of states, not individuals. In contrast, the abolitionists (Source C) were individuals and abolitionist sentiment was not universal in the North. A few well-read candidates pointed out that the Nashville Convention contained the most moderate of the Southern States and were rightly credited. In general Source B was seen as the more reliable because of the language of Source C and the fact that Source C reflected the views of a minority even in the North. More nuanced responses suggested that the polarised nature of the sources made each a reliable statement of their particular section, and as such equally unreliable for the general overview.

3b. Study all the Sources. Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that there was a conspiracy to extend slavery into the Territories.

This question offered plenty of scope to construct and develop a two-way argument. Most candidates identified Sources C and E as the two sources most supportive of the interpretation and it would be fair to say that most candidates considered that sources A, B and D (albeit for different reasons) opposed the interpretation. Sources A and B were regarded as ambiguous by some whilst Source D was the only source to be used consistently against the interpretation. Candidates who used source A for the interpretation did so on a “read between the lines” basis. They argued that as Alexander Stephens was a future Vice-president of the Confederacy, he was hardly likely to admit to conspiracy. A similar argument was used by some candidates for source B. However, given the content of that source and the openness of the demands of the representatives of the southern states present at Nashville, such an argument tended to prove unconvincing. The argument for the interpretation was supported by reference to a variety of events, with the Kansas-Nebraska Bill and its consequences, the Dred Scott case, the Lecompton Constitution and the role of President Buchanan all used to greater or lesser effect. There was indeed a wealth of material to draw upon and this proved a problem for some candidates. These essentially wrote an essay on the slave conspiracy debate, using references from the sources to illustrate their arguments. It is important for candidates and centres alike to remember that this paper is source-based and the sources should drive the argument. A familiar topic such as this is fraught with danger in that the sources become lost in a mass of (normally very accurate) detailed own knowledge, concluding with a judgement on the topic and not on the effectiveness of the sources in supporting one interpretation against another.

In terms of evaluation, Sources A, B and C were generally handled well. Many candidates were well-informed about the admission of Texas (as referenced by source A) and used that to evaluate Source A as reliable, although many also doubted Stephens’ overall trustworthiness, given his future role. Sources B and C were generally evaluated along sectional lines, and this was more effective for Source C than Source B where the overt efforts to compromise suggested a more nuanced approach would have been better. Sources D and E created difficulties for many candidates, with evaluation of the latter often falling back on comments on hindsight or the likelihood of a poor memory so long afterwards. That Wilson, the author of Source E, was a radical Republican did not escape the notice of many candidates, however, so that did inform evaluation. Candidates’ handling of Source D was the least assured. They understood that Douglas was arguing for popular sovereignty as an insurance against any “slave conspiracy”, and indeed that he saw the whole idea of such a conspiracy as Republican “agitation” but were often not sure how best to use this information. Overall, judgements tended to be that there was a conspiracy, based on the overt comments in Sources C and E and the fact that the authors of Sources A and B would not admit to it even if there was a conspiracy. However, sheer volume of sources to one side or the other is not always the most reliable means for judging an interpretation.

Q4. Dictatorship and Democracy in Germany 1933-1963

4a. Study Sources B and C. Compare these Sources as evidence for the religious situation in Germany 1937-1938.

Question 4 was, as ever, the most popular on the paper and as a result produced a very wide range of responses. In general candidates engaged well with the comparison of the content although it was surprising how many missed some key points, such as the fact that Source B suggests that people resisted Nazi orders but in Source C they did not. It would be fair to say, however, that the majority of responses did see this as the major difference. The better responses also identified how the state's target in both sources was German youth, explicitly in Source C with a series of statements about how religion was being "phased out" of the lives of the young, and implicitly in Source B where the focus of the action was a Roman Catholic school. In the evaluation, too many produced formulaic answers based on the nature of reports and some overplayed the significance of the dates, with a number of responses linking the increase in pressure on the religion noted in Source C to Kristallnacht. Those responses where evaluation did move beyond the formulaic frequently highlighted the limitations of each source. For example they related only to Southern or Western Germany, only to a single Catholic school, only to the Protestant Confessing Church, and so were not necessarily representative of the whole of Germany. In terms of own knowledge, there was relatively little displayed apart from references to the Hitler Youth. However, better responses did relate the sources to broad policies such as Gleichschaltung and Führerprinzip to contextualise the events described in the sources.

4b. Study all the Sources. Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that Christianity had no place within the Nazi State.

Most candidates saw the majority of the sources as supporting the interpretation with only Source A regularly being seen to argue that there was a place for religion in Nazi Germany. However, it was not uncommon to see Source B used to go against the interpretation on the basis that the crucifix and Hitler's picture hanging together was suggestive of the coexistence of Christianity and Nazism. Candidates had greatest difficulty with Source D, even when they knew of Bishop Galen and his campaign against the government's "mercy-killing" programme. It was certainly valid to use Source D for either argument, and the majority used it to support the interpretation. However, those who argued that because Galen was able to speak out, the state was exercising tolerance, were given credit. Stronger responses did however note that he was an exceptional case for a variety of reasons. It was difficult to accept the argument that, because both "the moral laws of God and Nature" and article 211 of the Nazi Penal Code condemned "mercy-killings", then religion and Nazism had common core values, as many attempted to argue. Very few candidates intimated that by 1941 what the Penal Code said and what the regime did might be very different. Many candidates stated that Galen was executed for his stance when in fact he survived the war (although evidence strongly suggests that if the Nazis had won the war, Galen would have been hanged).

In terms of evaluation, the most consistently effective analysis was of Source A, where candidates used the relatively early date and their own knowledge of the Concordat between the state and the Catholic Church to good effect. Surprisingly few, relatively speaking, picked up on the reference to "the historic struggle against Bolshevism", but many commented on the fact that this was a public statement designed to ensure that the Catholic Church's position, as recognised by the Concordat, would continue to be secure. Therefore this was likely to be couched in terms that would not offend the censors so might not be telling the whole truth. The evaluation of Source E indicated the perils of formulaic responses. Many candidates adopted the stance that this was a high-ranking Nazi bureaucrat and that therefore the source was biased and not to be trusted. However, the fact that the writer was Martin Bormann, a man who by this date wielded immense power within the Nazi hierarchy, gives the source considerable authority. A significant number of responses did make this latter point. The quality of the

contextual knowledge deployed varied considerably but the Concordat, the growth of the Hitler Youth movement, changes in the school curriculum to ease out religious studies in favour of PE, eugenics etc. and detail about the Confessing Church and Galen's successful campaign (albeit temporary) all contributed to the stronger responses. The overall conclusion was that the idea of "no place" was too extreme. The sources suggested that Christianity retained a place in the Nazi state, despite the best efforts of the government, and the fact that after 1941 people began to turn back to the Church bore this out.

Q5. The USA and the Cold war in Asia 1945-1975

5a. Study Sources A and B. Compare these Sources as evidence for the difficulties faced by the Diem Government in South Vietnam.

Candidates tended to struggle with this question, although there were clear points of similarity and difference that could be developed. The most common comparisons related to the lack of support for Diem. Source A specifically references lack of support from "ordinary people in large areas of the countryside" whilst Source B noted Diem's lack of support amongst the "Vietnamese educated class". Source A refers to the "billions of dollars" that the USA has invested in the Diem government and Source B indicates that the Diem family and administration have lost the support of the American people who have been "alienated ... to an incalculable degree", suggesting a link between the money and corrupt usage of it. The two sources have a significant difference of opinion as to how the USA should support the Vietnamese administration, and both suggest that Diem has lost the US government's support. Source A advises leaving the Vietnamese to sort out the insurgent problem themselves. Source B suggests permitting the anticipated coup to go ahead so that the USA can continue to support the new administration as "the war cannot possibly be won under a Diem administration". Source A specifically references the Vietcong and its successes "outside the cities" and, whilst Source B does not mention the Vietcong, its views on the war imply their growing strength. Source A also refers to the role of Diem's brother Nhu and again, whilst there is no specific mention of Nhu in Source B, the reference to "neither Diem nor any member of his family" suggest that Diem's relations are another of the difficulties he is facing. Evaluation of the provenance was extremely variable. The fact that Mansfield in Source A was a democrat and likely at this stage to be very concerned about the financial implications of US policy in Vietnam was used by candidates to indicate the reliability of the source, and the roles of both men were also adduced to suggest that the sources could be trusted. The fact that Mansfield had merely been on "a mission" to Vietnam was sometimes used to suggest his knowledge would be limited. Likewise the fact that Cabot Lodge was an ambassador was seen as increasing his reliability, except when it was considered that he was newly-appointed. The difference in dates was used by many to suggest that Cabot Lodge was probably more reliable as events had moved on in the intervening time and a crisis was clearly approaching. Attempts to suggest that source A was more reliable as it was a report to the President, whereas Source B was "merely" to the Secretary of State, were not convincing.

5b. Study all sources. Use your own knowledge to assess how far the Sources support the interpretation that the USA wished to distance itself from the problems of South Vietnam from 1962 to 1964.

The groupings chosen for this question varied considerably and only Source A was consistently used for the interpretation. The phrase "emphatically do not recommend" in relation to full-scale war and "neo-colonial rule" was correctly seen as Mansfield's unequivocal advice. Source D, the Resolution from the Vietnam Workers' Party, was generally used for the counter-argument but there were some unconvincing attempts to make to support the interpretation. Although the content of the source is speculative, with much use of the conditional tense, Source D was written (as the steer indicates) after Diem's overthrow and the postponement of US withdrawal, so it was not entirely unrealistic speculation. It might have been expected that Source E, the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, would have been seen as firmly rejecting the interpretation but the

phrase “The USAhas no territorial, military or political ambitions in that area” was frequently taken at face value and seen as distancing the US from South Vietnam. Sources B and C were interpreted both ways, dependent upon which phrases or sentences were selected. Source B however is unequivocal – Cabot Lodge clearly sees that withdrawal is no longer “reasonable”. The risk of losing Vietnam if the US supports the up-coming coup is real but there is “no reasonable chance of holding Vietnam with Diem”. Source C is equally clear. Although the first part suggests “distancing” as the NSC tell Cabot Lodge that there will be “no active encouragement” for a coup and all actions will be “totally secure and deniable”, the rest makes it clear that any new regime can rely on US economic and military help as long as it is an effective regime.

Candidates did not deploy much in the way of contextual knowledge. A small number didn't understand the term “distance itself” and became tangled in a general discussion of US policy across a longer time frame than the question required. In fact, a number of candidates wanted to discuss Vietnamisation – way beyond the scope of the question. Good candidates wrote about various aspects of Diem's regime and the nature of US support in the early stages of the war, whilst the best candidates were able to discuss the involvement in Diem's assassination and the later Gulf of Tonkin incident.

In terms of evaluation, the approach to source D was almost invariably formulaic although better candidates did highlight the speculative nature of the tone and did suggest that there was a strong element of propaganda in the source anyway. Some noted that in fact the Source was completely correct in its assessment of the situation as American activity turned out much as predicted. Source E was evaluated in the light of later knowledge about the Gulf of Tonkin incident and so judged the source unreliable. However, the fact that the President was prepared to lie about these events just confirmed the argument for many that the USA did not wish, by August 1964, to distance itself from South Vietnam. Most candidates judged that, whether because of containment, the “domino” theory or a democrat determination not to be regarded as “weak” on communism, the sources did not support the interpretation that the USA wished to distance itself from South Vietnam.

F965 Historical Interpretations and Investigations

General Comments

There continues to be a considerable gap between centre marking which focuses on the key elements of the mark scheme, that is the evaluation of the four passages in the Interpretations element and the sources chosen by the candidates in the Investigations element, and marking which makes little reference to these skills and offers comments about analysis and argument of the issues themselves rather than the evidence. Where the criteria have been used, centre marking was often realistic. It was notable that assessment in the middle and lower range of marks was much less likely to be modified by moderation than assessment at the higher end of the mark range, and so often there was much agreement even when centre marks as a whole could not be accepted. Where OCR criteria were not used as the basis of marking then there was more disagreement throughout the mark range. On a positive note, most centres produced an acceptable rank order of merit.

The coursework does continue to differentiate successfully. The highest quality work offered was impressive in its acuity of judgement and flexibility in using contextual knowledge. The questions give the opportunity for very strong work which shows a mature understanding of how to assess interpretations and evidence.

Middle range candidates were able to demonstrate understanding of texts and to use selected evidence in arguments. Though there was some evaluation, the quality varied. There was often a reliance on a consideration of the origin of secondary evidence rather than considering the strength of arguments and the supporting evidence. Judgements were sometimes supported but also merely asserted. This year fewer candidates tried to assess the Interpretations passages as sources by looking at their provenance. This is not likely to be effective in judging the actual interpretations offered and can lead to low-level speculation based on assumptions about the author ('Evans is a university lecturer so likely to be left wing and oppose Thatcher'). This sort of evaluation was more common in the Investigations and was no more convincing or effective unless there was hard evidence to support possible 'bias'. However, arguments were often sustained and some critical sense was demonstrated.

At the lower end of the mark range, there was some neglect of the content of the Interpretations. A broad understanding was shown but there was little engagement with the texts. Alternatively, there was over-reliance on a somewhat indiscriminating description of the passages with insufficient linkage to the issue in the question. In the Investigations weaker responses merely offered an essay with some reference to sources. There were very few answers with no reference to any evidence.

Comments on Individual Questions:

Interpretations

Centres still persist in encouraging candidates to adopt a thematic approach, identifying various elements in the issue in the question and extracting sections from the passage which seem to support a view on this and adding additional knowledge. The problem is that the interpretation of the passage as a whole is not firmly identified and knowledge is not applied to test that identified interpretation. This makes it difficult to assess how far candidates have understood and assessed the four passages.

Most answers did address all four passages but many neglect key elements in the passages and, despite having time to read and re-read the passages and to reflect on their contents, they

seem to have barely considered their content in detail, omitting key arguments and evidence. While understandable in an examination under pressure of time, it seems inexplicable that these four key and carefully-chosen documents do not receive the fullest possible attention from candidates.

There is still a large number of answers which show very little contextual knowledge, or deploy only quite limited and basic knowledge which shows very little research into the topic. Of course, this is not universal and must be balanced by many answers which offered well-researched contextual information. However, the impression is given that many candidates seem to regard the task as simply using the four passages with limited critical sense. Many candidates and teachers overvalue cross referencing between the passages and see this as a higher level skill. It certainly has its place, but it is the evidence in the passages that must be used in alliance with contextual knowledge to form a view, not merely to offer a series of comparisons.

It should be re-stated that there is no specific requirement for candidates to group the passages. It obviously is helpful in most cases if this is done. However, marks should be awarded for supported analysis and evaluation, not for grouping as such.

Question: Investigations

The four passages give candidates a clear focus and structure and generally evaluation was more evident and sustained in the Interpretations and marking was better for this element. The temptation in the Investigations was for candidates to lose sight of the main assessment objective which is the evaluation of sources, not merely their deployment to support an answer which considers different possible explanations. Too often sources were used to support explanations: 'Appeasement was a flawed policy as Churchill's speech of 1938 shows.'

The other elements which tended to be over-rewarded by some centres were comparisons of historians - 'Jones and Brown both agree that....' - without looking at why they agreed or the evidence they used. In addition, comments on the origin of evidence were often over rewarded 'As a post revisionist, Gaddis will take a balance view....', as were simple comments – 'As a historian X will be reliable as he has looked at many sources, even though he was not there at the time and may not be reliable'

Young historians are feeling their way in assessing evidence and it is right that critical evaluation should be seen in terms appropriate to the age group. However, critical use of evidence is not a concept that has been introduced at A2. It has been part of the experience of historical education almost from the start, and both centres and candidates might be encouraged to be more demanding here and to distinguish simple and asserted critical comments from those which are supported by knowledge or effective cross-referencing.

Recommendations

In terms of deciding on the quality of evaluation, it would be helpful to see more marginal annotation referring to the contextual evidence used to assess both passages and sources. If it is simply basic knowledge then this should be indicated. If the knowledge is more developed, then an indication of 'good', 'very good' or 'excellent' would be helpful in order to see why the centre awarded marks. Where this was done, it was extremely valuable.

It would also be helpful to have more comments on how fully the passages in the interpretations element had been used. It would prevent very high marks being given where there had been a bare reference to the overall views and the answer had become more of an essay than a review of given interpretations.

It would be helpful if 'evaluation' as a comment were used only when a specific judgement was being made about the view in a passage or about a source. It is not 'evaluation' of an issue that is being sought by the mark scheme it is a judgement about specific evidence.

It would be helpful if very careful checks were made before coursework was sent that there were no addition or transcription errors. Moderators work hard to ensure that their marks are entered on time and sending back work because of avoidable errors is time consuming for both moderators and centres

Final Comments

The very careful annotation offered by most centres is a tribute to the professionalism of teachers in OCR centres and even where there was disagreement; moderators were helped to make their judgements by the work done in comments.

Though the report stresses some problems, there was a great deal of agreement and a great deal of realistic marking which showed an good understanding of the criteria. Importantly, while trying to do the best for their candidates, most centres were fair and recognised achievement at different levels.

It was clear that many candidates gained a great deal from a demanding but rewarding element and that the independent and critical approach was of considerable benefit.

F966/01 Medieval and Early Modern 1066–1715

General Comments

The quality of work was similar to previous years, with the most popular topics remaining Rebellion and Disorder in Tudor England (Unit F966/1) and Civil Rights and Russia and its Rulers (Unit F966/2).

Performances ranged widely in each paper, but there were some very strong answers which were a pleasure to read. In these responses candidates were able to establish a clear thesis, which was then examined in a thematic manner, allowing synthesis to be displayed across the whole period. Although the whole period may not have been covered in every paragraph, by the end answers had shown a balanced coverage of the whole period. Many now seem to understand that to achieve marks in the higher Levels on the generic mark scheme there needs to be a consistent focus on synthesising material, the formulation of well-structured arguments and the making of synoptic judgements. Consequently there were many good to very good responses marked at Level II or above and relatively few that fell into the lower Levels.

Most candidates appeared to have been well prepared and only the weakest candidates relied on heavily narrative or descriptive approaches, with most answers beginning with an overview of the period and providing some elements of a synoptic answer. Unfortunately, this synoptic approach was not sustained by weaker candidates, who often resorted to a chronological approach. This type of approach makes synthesis very difficult to demonstrate and centres should be aware by now that the higher levels for AO1b need evidence of synthesis across most or all of the period. As stated in previous reports, this is much easier to achieve if candidates adopt a thematic approach. Thorough analysis of factors will take a candidate to Level III for AO1b but no further, and therefore strong analytical answers which lack synthesis will not reach the levels required for the highest grades. Weaker answers also displayed a lack of thorough planning, an important element when there is such a wide range of material to cover. As a consequence, many of these answers lost focus on the question or resorted to using pre-prepared answers or answers to slightly different questions, which again will limit the level that can be achieved. There was a significant number of answers where attempts were made to argue, but the lack of supporting detail meant that the argument was little more than assertion rather than analyses. This feature was particularly evident among some of the response to questions on the Tudor rebellions and Russian rulers.

Despite the pleasing overall standard of work witnessed, as always there are still areas that many candidates in the future need to pay attention to. Of particular note is the way in which assessment objective A01a was approached. A significant number of responses showed that there are many who have a strong capacity for assimilating a vast range of relevant and interesting factual material. The assessment objective A01a, however, is not designed to test the ability to memorise; it is in place to get candidates to give careful consideration to the accurate use of historical evidence (however that might be defined). Thus, in a significant number of cases, answers consisted of an 'all I know about' type of approach with a drift from the exact requirements of the question. In such instances responses were considered to be 'on the topic' and did 'not address the question set'. Hence, it was not possible for such answers to reach higher than Level V even though they may have been quite lengthy and detailed.

Questions that require candidates to weigh up the relative importance of factors continue to cause candidates problems. It is important that in these evaluative essays answers compare the importance of the factor under discussion with the factor named in the actual question. Too much time can be spent on other factors, with the named factor dismissed in little more than a short paragraph, with not enough time spent on the main thrust of the question. Candidates should be encouraged to adopt a more balanced approach. This is also true of turning point

questions and those that focus on the role of individuals. In many instances candidates miss the central premise of the question and produce a list of turning points without addressing their relative worth. Candidates often list or describe events but have difficulty in assessing the short and long term consequences.

Candidates do try to cover the whole period and try to make cross-references between key developments, but the quality of synthesis was quite disappointing, with many well argued responses remaining in Level III because synthesis was either absent or very limited. It might be worthwhile reminding Centres of the basic exam skills required, namely the careful reading of the question and the importance of focusing on the key demands, which are sometimes emboldened to aid focus, or the importance of words such as main or most, which should encourage candidates to balance the named factor with others. Misinterpreting a question or trying to adapt a previous question remains a problem. Some questions ask candidates ‘how far’ a factor or event was important, yet many candidates still respond by describing ‘how’ or ‘why’ something took place.

Perhaps the best advice in preparing candidates is to remember that this is not another Period Studies paper. Topics may have been taught chronologically, either superficially before examining key developments in more detail, or in reasonable depth from the start. Although having a clear understanding of the chronology is important if the candidate is to understand the links between developments, the structuring of essays chronologically can create serious problems if the candidate cannot analyse the material thematically. After all, questions are set on themes not period studies, and therefore it is important to analyse the period thematically throughout the course of study, perhaps considering issues such as politics, economics, social and foreign affairs, and also examine short and long-term developments during the period. It might be helpful to practice cross-referencing these links to earlier and later periods in both class discussion and essay writing. The more flexible students become in using their knowledge and understanding thematically, the less likely they will write a pre-learned chronological answer.

Individual comments

Question 1: This was the most popular question of the three in this section of the paper. There were some high calibre answers, which analysed and compared the importance of Exchequer against other institutions, such as the Chancery or Justiciar, although other responses did consider issues such as the imposition of feudalism and Magna Carta, which was seen by some as an institution of central government. The best offered very assured synthesis of the relative significance of the changes, linking these changes tightly to English central government and reaching a well-justified conclusion, comparing it with other developments, especially the chief Justiciar and, in a few cases, increased centralisation as a whole. Some tried to use the personality of the monarch as a significant change in English central government, but this was less effective as it did not address the precise demands of the question and the focus on institutions. Most candidates were able to explain the significance of the Exchequer, but there were some responses which had a considerable lack of detailed knowledge and relied on sweeping generalisations, sometimes mixing it up with the chief justiciar or not knowing much beyond sheriffs having to account regularly at the Exchequer. A common feature of many responses was individual paragraphs on the various institutions of central government which concluded with assertion about the importance of the institution in relation to other bodies rather than a direct comparison with other developments. Even many better responses compared relative importance only in the conclusion; the best sustained the comparison throughout. Evaluation, which is the weighing up of the importance of the issues in the question is required for the higher levels and unfortunately this was often absent.

Question 2: Although questions on the Common Law have become more popular with candidates it is still apparent that a significant number are unsure of the actual meaning of the term, which obviously makes it challenging when answering questions on the topic. Many candidates began by attempting to define common law, although some had only a very basic idea of what was meant. Stronger responses often established a set of criteria against which to judge 'more important' and this allowed well-supported judgements to be reached. Stronger candidates were able to synthesise and compare aspects of English common law by a range of themes between Henry II and his successors and previous kings, and a number were very well informed across the whole period. Some pointed out that William I both furthered the development of common law through the introduction of feudalism and hampered it with his sanctioning of honorial courts alongside existing ones and separate ecclesiastical courts. Magna Carta featured in many answers, perhaps in response to its anniversary. However, many weaker candidates had limited knowledge of developments in English common law from 1066 to 1154, with some focusing on only Henry II and sometimes omitting any reference to his assizes, which was particularly surprising given their importance in his reign. Weaker answers often simply described how the law was administered in the two periods with little attempt to make comparisons or to take a thematic approach. As has been mentioned in many previous reports, it is much easier for candidates to display the crucial skill of synthesis if a thematic, rather than chronological, approach is adopted.

Question 3: This question produced a wide range of responses. The best weighed the importance of royal support against other sources of support, especially the papacy, and in some cases support of other bishops in the English church, and made excellent connections, typically comparing Lanfranc with Becket or Langton. It was not necessary to go beyond the four archbishops mentioned in the specification, but some made very effective use of their knowledge of Theobald and Hubert Walter. Better responses adopted a thematic approach and identified areas in which the archbishop of Canterbury tried to establish his authority, eg the primacy and through church councils. However, it might have been helpful for some candidates if they had defined what an archbishop's authority amounted to. Weaker candidates tended to offer chronological, often descriptive, approaches of each archbishop, or in a number of instances a limited number, even ignoring Becket, with no synthesis. These answers often described either the struggles between archbishop and monarch or relations between archbishop and the papacy, with little precise focus on the demands of the question.

Rebellion and Disorder in England 1485-1603

Question 4: This topic continues to be the most popular of all the Units, and this was a very popular question for this particular theme with the majority of candidates opting for it. The best answers established a set of criteria against which to judge the importance of disputes over succession, although for some the criteria were very narrow with only 'dangerous' considered; however others did consider the threat to the person of the monarch, the numbers involved, the frequency or the threat to policy. There were some genuinely independent and evaluative responses. The question focused on 'succession' and some defined this very narrowly, arguing that rebellions in Henry VII's reign were not succession rebellions, as they were designed to change the dynasty, whilst others drew a distinction between dynastic and succession rebellions. However, the most common approaches were to go through the causes of rebellion, with perhaps a general comparison in the final paragraph, or to examine the different rebellions in a chronological order, which seriously limited attempts at synthesis. Weaker candidates focused almost exclusively on explaining or describing rebellions to do with succession in a chronological manner, which also hindered their ability to make meaningful comparisons or to demonstrate convincing synthesis. There were some responses which, although they focused almost exclusively on 'disputes over the succession', did distinguish between different types of succession disputes, such as succession under Henry VII or factional under Elizabeth, or explained the relative importance of succession in multi-causal rebellions, such as the Pilgrimage of Grace. Some found it difficult to focus on the importance of disputes over the

succession as a cause of rebellion and drifted into the importance of rebellions caused by disputes over the succession. Better answers were those that broke causes of rebellions into clear themes and cross-compared rebellions in detail whilst evaluating the significance of 'succession' at different points in the period.

Question 5. This was also a relatively popular question chosen by candidates for this theme. Many candidates argued clearly that a 'lack' of support was not the main reason for failure, and used examples from the Pilgrimage of Grace (1536) to support these points. Most also looked at other reasons for failure, such as leadership and location, which worked well when it was compared and contrasted to support. Better candidates were able to break down the concept of support into various sub-themes such as foreign support and noble support. This enabled some excellent comparison between rebellions and allowed an assessment of the whole period. Sometimes, answers were complicated by a lack of clarity about what was a success or failure - for instance, was a rebellion less of a failure if it lasted longer? Location also gave rise to some illogical chains of reason - failed because it was too near to London or because they were too far away. In discussing leadership as a cause of failure, some relied heavily on general assertions and were unable to provide examples of weak or poor leadership, but simply asserted that Wyatt or the Northern Earls were poor leaders. Moreover, candidates were then unable to explain how this resulted in the failure of the rebellion; instead they simply assumed that it brought about the failure. Some candidates discussed Irish rebellions, even though the question referred to England. Weaker answers often listed the causes or reasons for failure and failed to make the necessary comparisons required by the question; once again a thematic approach made comparison across a range of issues much easier. There were some weaker responses which drifted from the demands of the question and instead wrote about the reasons for the rebellions, without linking this to why they failed or considered the causes for which the rebels fought.

Question 6: This was the least popular question out of the three for the theme. The stronger answers defined 'effective' and used the various aspects of this as the basis of their thematic approach. They were consistently focused on Henry VII, comparing elements of his effectiveness with those of other Tudor monarchs. A significant number of candidates recognised similarity between the approaches of Elizabeth I and Henry VII. However, some candidates described or explained how each monarch handled various rebellions, taking a chronological approach with often brief or underdeveloped comments, attempting comparison. In a number of answers where candidates adopted a chronological approach, a disproportionate amount of time was given over to the reign of Henry VII, whilst later monarchs often received cursory treatment, which again limited a candidate's ability to cover the whole period. Most notably, many ignored the Mid Tudor period, despite the large number of rebellions, and the opportunity to argue that Edward VI's government was particularly ineffective or that Mary might be seen as effective in dealing with both Lady Jane Grey and Wyatt. Weaker answers that attempted analysis frequently asserted a conclusion on each monarch, often concluding Elizabeth was the most effective, but not in Ireland as the rebellions lasted a long time and were difficult to put down. Where preventive measures, such as propaganda or legislation, were discussed they needed to be linked to specific rebellions, which was often absent. Candidates are reminded to read the question carefully as quite a number did not discuss Irish rebellions, which limited their ability to tackle the whole period in depth.

England's changing relations with Foreign powers 1485-1603

Question 7. The question required candidates to compare the relative importance of security with economic gain in terms of the aims of English foreign policy. The question did not require other issues to be discussed, although a number spent time considering issues such as religion, but this was only relevant when it was linked to security. Many candidates were able to compare security and economic gain well although some opted for a monarch by monarch approach which limited effective cross comparison and synthesis. The majority of answers made some valid comparison, some at a good analytical level, often showing how trade and security went hand in hand. Many argued that monarchs were willing to sacrifice economic advantages when

security was at stake and pointed particularly to the reign of Henry VII and his relations with Burgundy. Weaker answers were unbalanced in their attention to and comparison of economic and security considerations often seeing only wars fought in the defence of the throne or commercial treaties aimed at improving trade. However, there were some responses that saw how security and economic gain were linked and drew attention to agreements such as Medina del Campo to support their argument. In weaker answers, the grasp of the trade off between the objectives was often lightweight, or just dealt with by assertion. On the whole candidates had a narrower interpretation of economic gain, sometimes no more than gaining money in a treaty, than of security.

Question 8: A significant number of answers were able to explain why and when relations between England and Scotland changed, but were less strong at evaluating the relative importance of the factors that brought about the changes. Instead, candidates were often more comfortable in tracing the changing relations, rather than assessing the reasons for the changes. The best responses were notable for their very good grasp of the wider European context of Anglo Scottish relations, which enabled really good synthesis, with many pointing out the crucial role of developments within France and the rising power of Spain. Most candidates were confident in discussing the significance of the Auld Alliance and religion as reasons for the changing relationship and some included the personality of rulers. Once again, a thematic approach made it easier to compare and contrast the significance of reasons over time. Weaker responses tended to explain the reasons for change through a chronological approach although even here there was analysis and few responses were predominantly descriptive, which is a pleasing development as foreign policy questions have, in the past, often attracted a chronological approach. However, it was noticeable that Elizabeth's reign after 1560 did not attract the level of attention that perhaps it should in order to give a balanced coverage of the whole period, with little attention given to the importance of Mary Queen of Scots and the succession to the English throne.

Question 9: This was the least popular question of the set, with many candidates unsure of what was meant by 'personalities' of the rulers, sometimes transforming this into personal ambition. Paragraphs on the personalities of the various rulers were often short as candidates wanted to discuss other factors with which they felt more confident, and attempts therefore to evaluate the relative importance of factors often resulted in little more than assertions. Better answers were able to compare the monarch's personality with other issues such as security, trade, relations with France and religion within context and to compare monarchs within each theme. Some candidates tended to be particularly unsubtle with Henry VIII, seeing glory hunting as his sole objective throughout. Although candidates are not expected to know much in detail about foreign rulers, there were some responses which did consider the personality of Philip II.

The Catholic reformation in the Sixteenth Century

Question 10: This was a popular question and was mostly very capably answered, with the Catholic and Counter Reformation arguments compared within themes. Some created a genuine debate, synthesising the key developments very well. Less common and weaker responses tended to deal with arguments for Counter Reformation and Catholic Reformation in separate sections, even if they still tackled it thematically within each section, but this approach showed far less linkage and synthesis. The stronger answers discussed a range of themes such as education and religious orders, doctrine and discipline in order to explore the argument. Some failed to notice that the question referred to the Catholic reformation in Europe and wrote about the worldwide contribution of the Jesuits. It was surprising that a number of answers were weaker on some of the developments pre-Luther and this limited the effectiveness of the response.

Question 11: Although this was less popular than other questions in this theme, candidates often tackled it well. Most were able to handle the concept of ‘institutionally’ and consider a range of institutions such as the Council of Trent, the Papacy, Jesuits and the Inquisition, although some did discuss individual Popes or rulers. Candidates were usually able to demonstrate good knowledge of the Council of Trent and its actions, although some did spend overly long on this and, if it was considered discretely, failed to make comparisons with other institutions until the conclusion. Stronger responses adopted a thematic approach and often broke down the idea of ‘advances’ and looked at sub-themes such as clerical reform, education and Catholic works and compared the work of Trent with other institutions such as the Jesuits. Weaker answers either described the actions of Trent only or compared Trent to individuals rather than institutions, or tried to use secular rulers as an institution.

Question 12: The best responses engaged with the Europe wide context of revival and evaluated Cisneros’ contribution in comparison with individuals such as Paul III, Ignatius Loyola, Erasmus and Luther and the context in which they operated. Many candidates were able confidently to discuss the works of Cisneros and its impact in Spain and on others and to weigh up his limitations such as his work being confined to Spain and the early part of the period. There were also some responses which argued that the Spanish monarchs, rather than Cisneros. In adopting a thematic approach, candidates considered issues such as education, monastic and church reform and the suppression of heresy. Better candidates could break down what was meant by ‘contributions’ such as education and were able to compare Cisneros and his achievements convincingly and synoptically. However, there was also some description of his achievements and assertion of his merits. The question did draw a number of responses which did not adopt a thematic approach with candidates starting their answer with a paragraph on Cisneros and then writing subsequent paragraphs on other individuals, making limited evaluative comparison. There were also some responses which went beyond ‘the revival of the Catholic Church in Europe’ and considered the importance of the work of individuals in Asia or the Americas.

The Development of the Nation State: France 1498-1610

Question 13. There were some very strong answers to this question, but much depended upon what candidates understood by ‘French provinces’ and how well they were able to compare the limitations imposed by them with other issues. Some candidates handled the provinces well and were able to explain their significance using some good examples across the period, particularly Brittany and Languedoc, although some also made good use of the Paris Parlement and the problems it created for a range of monarchs. The strongest answers often interconnected other factors, eg finance or nobility, with the discussion of how the provinces challenged royal authority, but some candidates focused on other limiting factors such as the nobility or economy and gave little attention to the main area of discussion. Candidates should be aware by now that they cannot simply dismiss the named factor (it is the same at AS level for the Period Studies), and that they need to compare other factors with the named issue if they want to reach the higher levels. However, there were a significant number of answers where candidates did consider a wide range of factors, such as the personality and strength of the monarch, religion and the nobility, that limited the power of French kings.

Question 14: The best answers often started by defining what a good relationship between monarch and nobles may have looked like and used this as the basis for their thematic treatment. They also distinguished between the nobility of the robe and the nobility of the sword. Francis I was often compared with Louis XII or Henry IV and less often with Henry II. However, some candidates were describing more than explaining the relationship between monarch and nobility. Weaker answers either put too much emphasis on the monarch, rather than the nobility, perhaps because the candidates were unable to cite examples of individual nobles, or went through the sixteenth century chronologically and thus displayed little evidence of synthesis. A number of answers lacked the necessary depth on the issues in the middle of the period and produced a response that was less well-balanced or relied on sweeping generalisations when discussing the reigns of Francis II, Charles IX and Henry III.

Question 15. Questions on this particular theme have often attracted weak and general responses, but this year there were a significant number of very strong answers, which supported their arguments with precise details. This topic was also more popular than in the past, but some candidates misread it and focused on reasons why France had financial and economic problems rather than the reasons why these were hard to solve. It is important that Candidates are reminded to read the wording of the question carefully and ensure that they focus on its precise demands. It was pleasing that most candidates were able to use a wide range of evidence and financial figures to explain their view, with some being able to show synoptic appreciation of how actions of the earlier Valois monarchs made it increasingly challenging for later monarchs such as Henry IV to solve these issues. However, financial issues tended to be tackled more fully than economic ones. Some of the best answers demonstrated that different reasons might explain the failure to solve financial issues compared with economic ones. However, some responses failed to assess the relative importance of the various factors that were discussed. Many responses considered a good range of reasons and it was interesting to see specific discussion of issues such as the weather and its impact on the economy.

The Ascendancy of France 1610-1715

Question 16. This was the most popular question for this theme and many candidates were able to explain with confidence the role of various ministers, typically Richelieu, Mazarin and Colbert, and their impact. Better candidates defined what was meant by the term 'absolute monarchy' and then compared the various ministers and their contributions thematically. Weaker candidates discussed each minister as a theme and often this lent itself to a narrative approach, with excessive consideration often given to Richelieu. Many answers struggled when it came to the majority of Louis XIV and showed surprisingly little knowledge of Colbert, or when they did comment on him suggested that he was able to solve all the problems. Some candidates failed to see that the question was about the relative contribution of various ministers to absolutism, not who was most responsible for achieving absolutism, and so dwelt on the contribution of Louis XIV. There were some answers that adopted a very simplistic approach and argued that because Richelieu came first and began the process he was the most important, without really considering how his policies helped or hindered the process.

Question 17. This was the least well answered of the three and the least popular question on this theme. Some candidates knew little beyond the Huguenots, and knowledge of them sometimes lacked detail or accuracy. It was disappointing how few candidates appeared to know, let alone understand, the issues surrounding either Jansenism or Gallicanism, and this resulted in limited or simplistic answers, with candidates struggling to deal with the actual question. There were a few stronger answers which tended to examine Huguenots, Jansenists and Gallicans. However, even where candidates had some knowledge they were not always able to link it to 'hindering the development of France' and explain its contribution.

Question 18. The strongest answers often began by defining the characteristics of being a European power, such as strong borders, effective military, expansion of territory, and a strong financial base which would allow for these things, and compared the eras effectively and in depth. They appreciated the foreign policy implication of the question and were able to look at France's relationship with various countries across the period. Evaluation of the situation at different points in time was well done, so that a synoptic conclusion which genuinely weighed the factors could be offered. Weaker answers were often unbalanced between the two periods, often making a fair, supported case for one, and asserting why the other was less great. Some weaker responses resorted to describing or narrating the events of 1610-1715 often with a domestic focus, which hindered their ability to address the question fully. There were also some answers, which were focused almost exclusively on the treaties and did not link the details of the treaties to the actual question as to whether France was a greater European power in the first or second half of the period.

F966/02 Modern 1789–1997

Historical Themes Option B: Modern 1789-1997

Q1. A number of candidates struggled with the key concept in this question. The demand was to argue for and against the proposition of war's impact. All too often candidates divided the essay into 1871-1919 and 1789-1870. If a thematic approach was adopted, often that was based on the two periods independently. Rarely was there any significant attempt to closely and directly compare and contrast the two periods. At best this meant synthesis was partial and uneven. Candidates were able to deploy good, at times very good, knowledge of both periods, although with some overall tendency to favour the earlier one. They were able to assess political, cultural, linguistic, constitutional and regional issues (particularism was often handled well) as well as economic and social (for example social classes and North-South differences). There was some tendency to dwell too much on the Wars of Unification and the First World War, often with a drift to describing what happened. There were also some strange omissions in a significant number of responses; a few had a 'blind spot' for the Franco-Prussian War and some did not make anything of the First World War. There were some answers in which candidates diverted too easily from wars to other factors. Generally, more synthesis was needed to aid argument and assessment. Quite often there was not enough linkage of wars and other factors and conclusions did not cross-assess these factors sufficiently strongly enough. The full range of the period was often not engaged, more so where there was a strong focus on the Wars from 1864 (and therefore a neglect of conflicts in the early part of the period). The Wars of 1866 and 1870-71 received too much attention in some answers, resulting in unbalanced coverage.

Q2. This was done better than question 1, especially by those who offered up a thematic approach, but many wrote about each minister or ruler without any developed links, synthesis or evaluation until the very end. There was a tendency to argue that Metternich kept nationalism weak, Bismarck rescued and strengthened it and finally Wilhelm II took it to a big war and major disaster. Useful themes centred on political, economic, social and cultural events and there were indeed some very good answers that resulted from this approach. But some responses surprisingly lacked stress on Kleindeutsch/Grossdeutsch, lacked appreciation of the democratic as opposed authoritarian management of nationalism and tended to argue simplistically for change rather than continuity after 1890. Candidates did not really get to grips with some of the fundamental issues involved; this was not helped by the individual-by-individual approach. 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, then European military domination if not colonial expansion. A few wrote about the aim of making Germany more unified still after 1870-1 or spent time on aims and events in the First World War or in 1919. That said, a noticeable feature here and in the other questions on German Nationalism 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 period. Overall, there was not sufficient close comparative analysis and evaluation of the ministers and rulers for many candidates to achieve marks above Level III.

Q3. Most candidates quite sensibly started by discussing economic issues before adducing others including those of a military (wars), cultural, religious and social nature. Industrialisation was handled well enough though some candidates generalised when some illustration of the size and scale of changes would have helped. Associated economic areas were covered, including the Zollverein, and links were often made to the big political issues. Range across the period was usually good and connections made to nationalism were sound, but often there was not enough synthesis and comparative evaluation. Industrialisation was often lined up against other possible factors but without full development and explanation of relative importance. Better candidates carefully explored associations between industrialisation and military success or

militarism (for example, army reforms, naval developments). Some separated industrialisation from trade expansion (and commercial activity in general), which gave the impression of a weak understanding of the term 'economic'. One point that was generally missing was the importance of population growth and movement as Germany industrialised (and how this impacted on nationalism). Also, more could have been made of the political and social dimensions. Most answers tried to evaluate the factors as a whole but quite often without enough sense of judgement of relative importance.

Q4. Alliances were fortunately the main focus of most answers, but there was often too much description and narrative of these. Some showed some understanding of the 'pros and cons' of alliances, but not enough cross-evaluated and/or revealed genuine synthesis. Most candidates introduced a range of other factors, though not always joined to the thrust of the actual question. Quite often the focus was on resources, manpower, support, firepower (weaponry) and technology. Where these were skilfully linked closely to the needs of the Question, all was well and good. Too often, though, they were set up as counter-argument to the place of Alliances, thereby diminishing coverage of the latter. Another issue was that periods were considered by many in isolation. There was a tendency to start with the Allied stance in the First World War and the Second World War, often with a focus on the weaknesses of the Central Powers and the Axis and the position of the Anti-Comintern Pact. A significant number of answers then jumped back to discuss in turn earlier examples, primarily from the Napoleonic era, the Crimean War and the Wars of Unification.

Q5. The 'organisation of state for war' was problematical for a number of candidates. Some were unclear about what constituted 'the state' (with a few misreading 'for' and replacing it with 'of'). Providing there was a fundamental grasp of the changing scale of warfare, this question worked well, but weaker candidates failed to compare the earlier and later wars effectively and missed obvious opportunities to discuss 'organisation'. This was especially true of the First World War and the Second World War, where the influence of central government control on strategy and tactics was often not fully explored. Areas of state influence frequently considered included command structures (through, for example, DORA), communications, the development of weaponry, the direction of resources and conscription. Many candidates found the concept of a turning point challenging and ended up simply listing features of different wars. Some answers also lacked range across the whole period.

Q6. Generalship was understood well enough but all too often there was too much description and not nearly enough synthesis and analysis. In many responses, paragraphs contained lists of generals, campaigns and battles but without comparative assessment. More could have been made of comparing and contrasting the roles of generals; many responses were simply a list of names with examples of military conduct thrown in. Many looked at the relationships between generals and their troops, other commanders and politicians to frame their answers. Some discussed, to good effect, how generals used resources, technology and weaponry without drifting to an 'all I know about' type answer. Overall judgements about generals tended to be quite bland (they were either very good or bad and incompetent).

Q7. The focus of this question was on the leadership of Revolutionary Nationalism in Ireland and better responses stuck closely to this. The most successful responses considered firstly how weak leadership could be seen as undermining the movement (citing the relative failures of Tone and Emmet, for example) but then moving on to discuss how leadership changed in nature and brought more success (through Griffith's, DeValera and Collins, for example). The very best answers included even more balanced analysis by looking at how early leaders could be considered successful (through the inspiration they gave to later Revolutionary Nationalists). Unfortunately, too many looked at how other factors influenced Revolutionary Nationalism. A few candidates were adept at linking such factors (for example, the role of the British government) to leadership issues, but most who adopted this approach did not do that. Far too many compared the movement with Constitutional Nationalism, which was not the thrust of the question. Also,

and rather surprisingly, there was some confusion over who constituted a Revolutionary Nationalist (for example, Parnell was included quite often).

Q8. There were some very good responses to this question by candidates who had a clear handle on what constituted 'economic conflict'. Thus, there was some sound coverage of agrarian issues (including the Great Famine and land rights), changing patterns of trade, and industrialisation in the North. Such answers then measured conflicts in these areas against the importance of other factors, particularly those pertaining to constitutionalism and religion. Weaker responses were characterised by description, patchy support and rather thin coverage of the period (with the post-1870s often being neglected).

Q9. Many candidates understood that the best approach to this question was to compare and contrast the influences of different governments through themes that focused on political, religious, economic and social issues. So, for example, some candidates argued convincingly that politically the Whigs/Liberals offered more than the Tories/Conservatives through matters of Municipality and Patronage (in the 1830s and 1880s), Irish Disestablishment (1869) and Home Rule (1886 onwards). On the other hand, the Tories/Conservatives seemingly offered more when it came to the economy (Land Purchase Acts) and religion (Catholic Emancipation); many candidates hit on these achievements to provide a balanced, well-structured answer. However, there were a significant number who either provided a chronological account or who dealt with the different political parties separately. This made it difficult for any semblance of synthesis to be introduced and resulted in essays that struggled to get marks beyond Level IV.

Q10. This was a very popular question and was generally handled effectively. Most candidates realised the need to deconstruct 'domestic policies' by adopting, at least, an economic, social and political factor based framework for analysis. The very best responses broke the factor headings down into sub strata: for example, economic became agricultural and industrial policies. Despite this, some candidates were clearly more secure when discussing economic and political issues than those of a social nature. The latter often involved discussion of educational provision, living conditions (especially housing) and religion. In fact, some candidates still seem to have problems in defining the economic, social and political. Once a factor-based structure was adopted, the best answers then focused on the extent to which policies changed or remained the same. A significant number drifted to looking at changing motives for policies (that is, why there was change), whilst others described how policies altered over time. These approaches were not what the question demanded, and in some cases reasonably well informed answers had to be confined to the lowest Levels as they were deemed to be more on the topic. Also, this question drew responses that clearly illustrated how candidates had been drilled to use connectives (for example, 'similarly', 'comparatively') but without the necessary explanation and development to make the link words 'work'. Thus, for example, to state that Stalin's industrial policies were similar to those of Witte does not equate to synthesis; the link between the two would need to be fully explored for such a point to be recognised of being of Level II (and above) quality.

Q11. Most responses started with discussion of Stalin's policies and at least attempted to compare them with those of other leaders. The very best essays offered a clear definition of 'successful' and linked this to different types of opposition and the various methods used to deal with it. Most focused on domestic (internal) opposition (for example, peasants, workers, elites) and some looked at external opposition (for example, via warfare). Thus, generally, candidates were comfortable in using a range of material to cover the whole time period. Some responses fell down by, as with answers to question 10, not fully explaining comparisons between leaders. Also, some of the end judgements about Stalin in particular were rather simplistic. Many argued (or asserted) that he was the most successful leader as he killed most of his opponents

Q12. Some candidates struggled with this question, for two reasons. First, they found it difficult to compare and contrast the importance of factors as they influenced government. Second, and despite comments made about this on previous reports, they drifted to looking at issues not related to government (that is, of an economic and social nature). There were a significant number of very good responses that did avoid these pitfalls though. The very best argued how revolution could not be divorced from other developments especially war but also the ideologies of particular leaders. Such responses were invariably well informed about the different facets of government, including ideology, tools of government and governmental structures. Some candidates were less well versed in Russian politics and government and ended up making gross generalisations about authoritarianism, dictatorships and totalitarianism. Overall, success on this question depended on how much thought was given to the key terms involved and how an answer could be planned to cover all the key variables effectively.

Q13. Many responses were replete with knowledge of legislative acts and legal judgements, but were too descriptive. Too often simple lists predominated. The Supreme Court, Presidents and Congress were often treated separately, without much attempt to evaluate the three together. Better responses did try to assess contributions, interactions, impact areas and outcomes. Those answers that adopted a thematic approach (for example, by looking at political, economic and social dimensions) succeeded rather better. There were those who wanted to write much about African American leaders and movements and pressure groups, or about external context factors (media, Cold War), thereby introducing irrelevances. References to State governments were more acceptable but had to be placed in the context of the Federal arena to be valid. The better and best answers obviously did more than merely list (and describe) legislative actions; they assessed them and made comparisons with respect to impact and outcomes within themed paragraphs. This resulted in some effective synthesis between, for example, the Reconstruction era, the 1920s and 1930s and the 1960s. A good number of responses traversed much or all of the period, right down to 1992, but there were quite a number that focused very much on the twentieth century only. The standout responses were able to consider the often complex interplay between the three Branches, assessing where one took the lead, where one played a delaying role or a correcting role. Such answers appreciated such factors as the party politics in the Congress, the choice for and so make-up of the bench of the Supreme Court and the personal interests of Presidents. Answers displaying these features usually gained marks in the highest Levels.

Q14. Again much knowledge was displayed in many responses. There tended to be a good deal on actions of governments, legislation, events and the impact of individuals and groups. However, much of this knowledge was revealed in the form of description, with limited analysis and evaluation. Too often candidates described features of the 1980s and did not seek evaluative comparison with other periods, events, actions. Many answers adopted a chronological approach, building sections around decades or twenty year periods; it was usual to see that decade or period compared to the 1980s or to another. Better responses adopted a much more thematic approach, so allowing comparison of different decades and periods and events. This worked well where themes such as employment opportunities and rights, membership of unions, legal status, employer attitudes and federal government attitudes were focused on. Usually the same responses compared and contrasted the 1980s with the 1890s, the New Deal era and the 1960s. Occasionally too much emphasis was placed solely on the PATCO events of 1981 (when a broader view of the decade would have been beneficial). Some candidates viewed the question as one about turning points; this was fine although the response demanded attention be given to time periods rather than discrete events. Even where this was the case, there was often some confusion over what constituted a turning point and also some ignorance of key time zones (especially the 1890s). A significant number saw the 1890s as of marginal significance and not really fitting the phrase 'turning point'. Alternative turning points that emerged were: the 1877 railroad strike, the 'red scare' of 1919-21, the New Deal, especially the Wagner Act, the 'Great Society' period of the 1960s, and the PATCO dispute in 1981. Weaker candidates who looked at events (rather than themes) tended to adopt a list approach and dealt with happenings as stand-alone turning points with sign posted links to the named

factor. Also, a chronological approach was fairly frequently adopted towards this question which, as always, made it difficult for candidates to show synthesis.

Q15. A major issue here was the prevalence of answers that adopted a very chronological route or else tried to adapt answers to previous questions (for example, those that have focused on divisions within women's movements). Many described changes that happened rather than focusing on the exact demands of the question (that is, reasons for the degree of change and continuity). Quite often sections did start with reasons but soon moved on to assessment of the nature and extent of opposition to gender equality. Common 'reasons' looked at were: the 'separation of spheres', male attitudes, fears over the workplace, employment needs, intense social and political conservatism, feminism and anti-feminism and the impact of events such as wars. Even where a thematic approach was used, it all too often became a vehicle to examine degrees of change, turning points, big events and/or generalisations about more gender equality. Quite often coverage was limited to the twentieth century and to certain phases (for example, the 1920s, and 1960s and, above all, the 1970s). Successful answers tended to cross reference reasons with thematic based definition of gender equality (that is, politically, economically and socially), before arriving at balanced judgements. Such responses also tended to spot the ambiguities in the phrase 'gender equality' as they charted patterns of change and continuity over time. On balance, answers to this question were disappointing. Of particular note was a tendency to offer gross generalisations and assertions about gender equality or to provide copious amounts of detailed factual material about, for example, feminism and gender related legislation, without directing it at what was being asked.

Q16. The best answers offered up a balanced argument. They tended to start by offering a case in support of the assertion in the question. This was often done with reference to women gaining the vote, political representation through the election of female MPs and labour market developments (as they were linked to politics). To counter this, it was observed that such developments did not necessarily equate to steady progress but were more representative of rather discordant change or even discontinuities. For example, more nuanced responses pointed out that the period 1868 to 1905 witnessed very little progress for women and, equally, from 1918 to 1935 politics remained patriarchal. Less successful approaches were characterised by narrative based and/or chronological writing which made it very difficult for candidates to make links between periods of political emancipation and therefore to display synthesis. However, in the main, such responses did at least focus on political emancipation and did not drift to discuss the role of women more generally.

Q17. As with answers to question 16, the best essays seen a showed balanced analysis and evaluation of a range of issues. Most started with discussion of the named factor although the level of knowledge about the Trade Union movement varied considerably with respect to range and accuracy. For example some confused New Model Unions with New Unionism, the details of landmark legal cases affecting unions were often confused and there tended to be scant awareness of the role of unions in later Labour party developments. Attention then tended to be given to a range of other influential factors such as the extension of the franchise, the role of the Liberal party, the impact of wars, party leadership and the importance of particular events (for example, the General Strike of 1926). Poorer responses invariably were characterised by a narrative, chronological based structure and, rather surprisingly, by limited and often imprecise knowledge about the origins of the Labour party.

Q18. This was not a particularly popular question. When attempted, candidates did show a competent knowledge and understanding of key developments such as the power of the Lords to reject or get amended key pieces of legislation such as Home Rule (1894) and, later, the impact of the 1963 Peerage Act. Such evidence was used to argue there was limited change to the authority of the House of Lords and that the institution continued to have an important influence on the functioning of British politics. Candidates arguing this way then proceeded to assess the extent to which the Lords did change often by looking at the crisis of 1909-11 and developments in composition after the late 1940s. Such an approach tended to lead to

judgements about how changes to the Lords did not go far enough and how the body was still in need of reform by the end of the period in question. Only a few responses were witnessed of a low Level quality. Such answers mostly featured generalised comment and/or a narrow focus with respect to the time period.

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

OCR Customer Contact Centre

Education and Learning

Telephone: 01223 553998

Facsimile: 01223 552627

Email: general.qualifications@ocr.org.uk

www.ocr.org.uk

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

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

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

© OCR 2015

